U. S. Congress

Appendix

Energy in an Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the United States will consume 25 billion tons of coal during the next four decades and will be using 75 percent more coal in 1975 than at present. That is an estimate made in Dr. Joseph L. Fisher's address to the national dinner meeting of the National Coal Policy Conference at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here Wednesday night, March 30, 1960. Dr. Fisher is president of Resources of the Future, Inc.

In stressing the importance of energy sources to the Nation's economy, he said that energy consumption expressed in B.t.u.'s is increasing at the rate of 88 percent for the 20-year period which will end in 1975, while the population of the United States will increase only an estimated 41 percent during the same period.

Dr. Fisher referred to new studies of the U.S. energy picture which have been made by his organization and which indicate that many new and exciting possibilities in research and development in the coal and related industries are now in the horizon.

Mr. President, the address by Dr. Fisher is an illuminating discussion of the energy commodities, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY IN AN EXPANDING ECONOMY

(By Joseph L. Fisher, president, Resources for the Future, Inc.)

The history of the energy commodities—coal, oil, natural gas, hydropower—in a real sense has been the history of the American economy. The passage from an agrarian, handicraft system of a century or more ago to the industrial colossus of today has been made possible by discovering and developing these energy commodities, by harnessing them to man's welfare. The achievements in steel, aluminum, cement, the automobile, the airplane, the tractor, and the electrically powered home may be measured by progress in coal, oil, gas, and hydropower—the giants who move our industry, without whom our material way of life would have remained primitive. Overwhelmingly we depend on these fossil fuels to heat our homes, cook our food, smelt our metals, transport our goods and ourselves, and furnish the raw material for a large number of manufactured items. Most of our electricity, also, is produced from fossil fuels, although here waterpower is of considerable importance in certain regions. Thus far we have even depended on a net input of energy from fossil fuels for our vast atomic energy program.

This evening I should like to trace rapidly the course of development of energy in the American economy chiefly through reference to selected statistics, and then to indicate the general directions of change for the future. Finally, I shall highlight a few of the more pressing and persisting problems I think the energy industries, coal especially, will have to deal with.

In this country we now consume more than 40,000 trillion B.t.u.'s of energy a year, more than five times the amount consumed in 1900. This amounts to some 250 million B.t.u.'s per capita. For those who still visualize these things in terms of the amount of work a strong horse can do in an hour, this amounts to nearly 100,000 horsepower hours per capita per year—or the equivalent of some 11 horses per person working round the clock every day of the year.

It is revealing to examine more closely the age of fossil fuels as it has unfolded in this country. In 1850 a little more than a 100 years ago, most of the inanimate energy supplied to the American economy came from wood as a fuel. Between 1850 and 1895 energy from coal increased from 9 to 65 percent of the total, while wood declined from 91 to 30 percent—a massive shift from wood to the first of the great fossil fuels to be exploited on a large scale. Between 1910 and 1955 oil and gas increased rom 9 to 65 percent; coal declined from 77 to 29 percent—a second massive shift within a century. The automobile, truck, bus, and airplane have come along rapidly as consumers of oil. The newspapers a few days ago carried a nostalgic story that the last two steam locomotives operating on a regular schedule had been retired from service in a small town in Michigan. A large part of the household heating job formerly done by coal is now done by oil and gas.

Coal has held on tenaciously and even gained in several important uses however. The use of coal for the production of electricity has increased nearly three times since 1940, not quite enough to offset the decline in use on railroads and for space heating since then, but nearly so. Coal maintains its unique advantage over the other fuels for the reduction of iron ore. Of the several modern energy giants coal came first, declined without in any sense disappearing, now more or less holds its own, and may in the future fight its way back to greater prominence.

Several other trends of importance may be noted. Energy consumption per unit of gross national product has been falling consistently since about 1920; it has dropped by more than a third during this 40-year span. This does not mean that the fuels are in any basic sense any less important than they were; it simply means that they support a much larger superstructure of manufacturing, transportation, and services than they used to.

In many respects the best indicator of increasing or decreasing scarcity of a fuel or other raw material is to be found in the behavior of its price over a period of years with allowance made for changes in prices generally. Since 1900 bituminous coal prices in constant dollars at the point of production have increased by around a half; crude oil prices have decreased by about a quarter and natural gas prices by about a half. Since 1947, however, the price trends have been quite different: by 1955 bituminous coal has dropped some 6 percent, crude oil has risen 25 percent, and natural gas about 50 percent. A long period of declining natural gas prices has come to an end and has been sharply reversed. Crude oil prices have behaved eratically in the postwar period. Bituminous coal prices have been steadier and have generally been increasingly favorable for consumers.

Having sketched very quickly the energy picture for this country as it is today, let me turn briefly to a consideration of what it may look like in the 1970's. In this, as well, as in what I have said already, I am drawing heavily on research either completed or underway in "Resources for the Future." The principal study, now in the hands of the Johns Hopkins Press, our publishers, is called "Energy In the American Economy 1850 to 1975." This study contains a careful historical and analytical account of the shifting role of the various energy commodities in American economic development to date and presents detailed estimates of the demand for the various energy commodities by principal categories of use for the year 1975. These estimates are related not only to what would appear to be in store for the several commodities and categories of use, but also to the overall size and shape of the American economy 15 years hence.

Between 1955 and 1975 energy consumption expressed in B.t.u.'s is estimated to increase some 88 percent. During the same span of years population is estimated to increase 41 percent, to 233 million persons, and gross national product by 119 percent. By simple division energy consumption per capita would increase by 33 percent, while energy consumption per unit of GNP would decrease by 15 percent. Thus, according to Sam Schurr and Bruce Netschert, the principal authors of the study, the increase in energy consumption to 1975 will fall somewhere between the increase in population and that of GNP.

The percentage in consumption of the several principal energy commodities between 1955 and 1975 is interesting. For bituminous coal the increase is estimated to be 75 percent; for anthracite, minus 30 percent; for oil and natural gas liquids taken together, 95 percent; for natural gas 107 percent, and for hydroelectric power 121 percent. Not counting anthracite which makes up only a little more than 1 percent of the total consumption at the present time, the other energy commodities all show substantial increases. Electricity which may be produced from coal, oil, gas, or hydro power is expected to increase during the 20-year period by 211 percent, far outstripping the increase in any of the basic commodities. This would augur well for those fuels which have relative advantage for production of electricity. Compared with past periods, the mix of energy commodities in the economy is expected to remain relatively stable during the next 15 years, although still slightly favoring gas, oil, and hydro power compared to coal.

The study I have mentioned turns from estimates of demand to a consideration of the likely availability of supply to meet the estimated demand. The general conclusion reached is that all conventional energy sources—coal, oil, gas, and hydropower should continue to be available at least through 1975 at no appreciably higher constant dollar cost. This is based on the finding that the natural stocks of these energy sources are higher than is generally estimated and that the significance of technology as a dynamic element of cost determination has been underrated. If these demand and supply estimates are correct, the

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

energy requirements of the economy could be met entirely from domestic sources at no significant increase in cost. It should be pointed out that these are not predictions; they merely state that under the economic and technologic trends and assumptions, this could be the result. It does not argue that energy might not be obtained more cheaply through more rapid technologic advance, a higher level of imports, or the substitution of some cheaper source of raw material.

Availability of oil under these estimates will rest increasingly upon large secondary recovery, but also upon continuation of vigorous exploration and discovery activities. The natural gas availability estimates are related to the oil estimates and turn out rather favorably partly because of the anticipation that the gas-oil ratio will be higher in the future than it has been in the past.

This conclusion regarding oil and gas may surprise many who have been told over and over again that proved reserves of oil are only 12 or so years and for natural gas only 20 or 25 years. The resources for the future estimates are based on new definitions of resource availabilities which are thought to be more suitable for the purpose of long-range estimating.

For coal it is widely known that this country has enormous stocks in the ground. The State by State compilation drawn together by the U.S. Geological Survey shows nearly 2 trillion tons of which about half is recoverable. Whatever the difficulties of concept and definition of coal reserves may be, there is obviously an enormous quantity available for exploitation. According to recent Bureau of Mines estimates, current recovery methods would allow some 240 billion tons to be mined at 1954 prices. This is far more than enough to meet projected accumulated demand not only to 1975, but to the end of the century and far beyond that. In another study now being prepared at Resources for the Future (a comprehensive appraisal of trends and prospects for all natural resources provisionally entitled "Resources in the American Future" it has tentatively been estimated that in the four decades from 1960 to 2000, something on the order of 25 billion tons of coal will be required. This is only about 10 percent of the reserves estimated to be minable without a price increase and on the basis of present recovery techniques.

The period beyond the 1970's to the end of the century can be seen only more dimly, but it may be interesting to try now to peer into that distance. That minable supplies of coal will be available in large amounts in this country is unquestionable; whether the same will hold true with oil and gas is open to some doubt. Should petroleum products increase sharply in price relative to coal during the last quarter of this century, and assuming the percentage of total U.S. consumption imported does not greatly increase, the prospect for coal regaining a larger share of the total market will brighten. This, one may speculate, will be particularly true in steampower generation, to a limited extent in industrial operations, and conceivably in some kinds of space heating. Since electric power consumption is expected to go on increasing rapidly through the remainder of the century, coal's present advantage in this use may be heightened. The prospects will be much better, of course, if further cost reductions are achieved in the mining, preparation, and transportation of coal.

The future for coal, as for the other energy commodities, is bound to be a competitive one no less than the past has been competitive. The shifting pattern of energy sources will continue to hinge upon relative prices among them, the quality and reliability of the services they give, and the unique advantages each possesses for particular uses. In a basic sense the ultimate consumers of energy don't greatly care which commodity they use. For example, the family wants a warm, pleasant home and within limits will be quite willing to heat with oil, gas, coal in a modern burner, or electric power which in turn can be produced by coal, oil, gas, hydropower, or nuclear power.

An important unknown for the period beyond 1975 is atomic power. If, as several competent analysts have thought, the cost of providing the heat for electric power production by means of nuclear reactors is greatly lowered to the point that it becomes competitive with presently used sources, then coal may not get any respite from severe competition. Oil and gas might then be replaced by atomic power as coal's chief competitor. In this case, the Indian summer for coal could be very short, indeed. In one sense the contest may come down to one between capital cost reduction for atomic power against transportation cost reductions for coal, although other elements of coal cost will also bear importantly on the matter. Since atomic power producing facilities can be placed anywhere in the country at about the same cost, while coal-produced power will still involve heavy transport charges on coal (or on electric power produced from coal and transmitted at high voltage), one would expect atomic power to find regional advantages in parts of the country where coal is costly long before it can compete in regions more accessible to coal supplies. Cost of hauling coal still runs some 70 percent of the value of the coal in the mine, and this percentage has been increasing during the last decade.

Overall adequacy of supply seems assured to 1975 at least, although the precise mix of coal, oil, gas, and hydropower is uncertain. This picture of middle range adequacy, if not longer, may be sharpened by noting again the substitutions that have been and undoubtedly will continue to characterize many parts of the energy field. Oil has displaced coal in locomotives. Gas is replacing coal and now oil for domestic heat. Many steam powerplants can turn from oil to coal almost at the flip of a switch. If the cost and price of any one energy commodity moves upward, even slightly, this commodity then runs the risk of losing some of its market to one of the others. So delicately balanced are the price and market forces that business and public policy in taxation, foreign trade, transportation, or research may tip the balance one way or the other.

The energy economy may be viewed as a big, expandable room with a whole series of ceilings. Thus, starting with underground liquid oil, if its cost and price rise, a ceiling is quickly reached above which its price cannot go. This ceiling is set by the cost of recovering oil from shale of which there are immense reserves in the Colorado plateau which could now be exploited and the product delivered to the west coast market at a cost only slightly above costs from present sources. Beyond this are the possibility of extracting oil from the Athabasca tar sands of Canada and the liquefaction of coal. Another ceiling is provided by imports from northern South America and the Middle East where reserves are enormous. Further in the distance are the possibilities for using grain alcohol as a motor fuel, the adaptation of the fuel cell based on hydrogen or natural gas for driving vehicles, and so on.

Coal, of course, is another ceiling against oil price increases in steam plants, for industrial process fuel, and in other uses.

The ceiling which covers all the conventional fuels, as we now see it, is nuclear power. As the cost of producing this kind of electric power and process heat is reduced, it is expected to cross, or at least approach, the cost from conventional sources.

If this is the broad picture of the future of the energy commodities in the American economy, what would appear to be the principal problem with which the energy industries and the Nation will have to deal? Particularly, what are the foreseeable problems for coal—the foreseeable problems and the foreseeable opportunities?

The first problem is not a new one: it is technological unemployment. This problem is not new to the coal industry in which employment has been decreasing for many years and now stands at less than half what it was before the Second World War. Technological advance in coal has been one of the thrilling stories of recent times. The tremendously greater productivity in strip mining as compared with underground mining is well known. Here productivity per man-day currently averages about 22 tons versus 9 tons in underground mining. Supergiant shovels and other machinery can now handle overburden up to 120 feet in thickness where only a few years ago 80 feet was thought to be the maximum, and the end is not in sight. Even more remarkable has been the development of the continuous miner which can be operated very efficiently, especially when accompanied by other types of equipment of related equipment, and now accounts for approximately 20 percent of total underground production. The extension of this kind of mining to another 20 or 40 or 60 percent of underground mining would work a veritable revolution in the industry and would leave in its wake further technological unemployment.

Related to this problem is the so-called depressed coal area problem. The combined effect of rapid technological improvement plus diminished total production as compared to years ago has left a number of coal-mining areas in very bad shape indeed. The anthracite area in eastern Pennsylvania, eastern Kentucky, southern Illinois, parts of West Virginia—these are among the chronically areas of the country. When the rest of the country is prosperous, these areas do only moderately well. When the rest of the country is in a recession, these areas are in deep depression. The problem in these areas is further compounded when other difficulties are overlaid that in coal mining. In eastern Kentucky, for example, where Resources for the Future has been sponsoring a series of studies, partially worked-out and high-cost coal mines are accompanied by a paucity of other economic resources to which to turn. Farmland here is not rich, forests, while adequate, are not the best and locational advantages for industry do not measure up to what can be found in other places.

Both technological unemployment and the chronically depressed areas in which it is found are human and social problems as well as economic. The solutions, which will not be achieved easily, will have to be sought along lines of stabilizing and then improving the coal industry itself, attracting other economic opportunities into the areas, reeducation and retraining of workers, quite probably some outmigration of people, and the creation of a total political, economic, social environment conducive to these lines of action.

Another problem, which also is not new to coal, is competition which it will continue to face from the competing fuels. In the final analysis competition is the means by which the overriding goal of meeting the Nation's energy needs at lowest cost is achieved. For coal to play its proper part in meeting these needs, it will be necessary to encourage further technological improvement, even though it may mean further unemployment for a temporary period at least. In this regard, both labor and the industry, have shown remarkable insight and courage in not choosing what at many times must have appeared to be the easier course for the

short run. Many new and exciting possibilities in research and development in the coal and related industries are now in the horizon. Further adaptation of continuous mining has been mentioned, product improvement through preparation of coal to reduce impurities, and further extension of strip mining are among the promising trends that may be mentioned. Immense reserves of lignite offer prospects for a future time in some parts of the country.

Production of electric power at mine heads with lower cost transmission of electric power over distances of 500 or more miles is a hopeful possibility now developing in a number of places. The location of coal and electric power-using industries near the mines is even better from the point of view of depressed coal areas since it provides added employment. Concerted efforts to reduce costs of transporting coal are to be encouraged. For example, in the future the coal carrying railroads should be able to achieve economies in handling and hauling coal in larger lots from larger mines to larger consumers. The 108 mile long coal pipeline in Ohio is being watched closely since it seems to promise considerable reduction of transport cost over routes where large amounts of coal can be transported.

Not all research and development related to coal will favor coal. For example, further reductions in the amount of coal required to produce a kilowatt-hour of electricity or a ton of steel may not immediately help coal, although in the longer run, by building markets for electric power and steel, may actually be more helpful.

These are some of the problems that appear in my horoscope for coal's future. But with each problem come opportunities and challenges. The coal industry knows what hard times are and knows that it will have to continue to fight for its place in the American economy. It is the most mature of the energy industries and has learned that it must temper its public policy demands to what is good for the Nation as well as for coal. Statesmanship will continue to require that the best efforts of the industry be devoted positively to research, development, vigorous competition, social welfare, and economic development in the coal areas, and not to policies which aim to beggar the competitors. The positive, constructive accent is called for now as always.

Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 8601 because it is an intrusion into the responsibilities of the States in the field of elections. The reforms recommended, if they are needed, must come from the human heart and cannot be accomplished by the force of law against what I conceive to be a clear mandate of the Constitution to the States.

Our Constitution was born out of travail and compromise and out of the crucible of bitter experiences shared by the Founding Fathers. It is not perfect—no human document ever is—but it is the foundation of the greatest Government ever devised by freemen.

Free elections are essential to our integrity as a nation and to our survival as a free people, but the responsibilities for these things rest with the States. If the States fail to meet those responsibilities ably and well, then failure is theirs, and they will face the mandate of an aroused public opinion which is the heart of a democracy—the bane of suppression. In these days even a sparrow's fall is seen and heard instantly around the world.

This legislation will not lead to good will between the races. Again I say that the solution of these problems rests in the human heart. Each of us must remember that tomorrow or even today we may get the final call to come before the Supreme Judge of all of us. We must conduct ourselves the best we know how so that each of us will be able, we hope, to hear Him fondly say "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it to me." And then He will let us in. We will then know hate, sorrow, disappointment, and heartache no more.

Time for a New Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of American policy in the Middle East, which was formulated at the national conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, held in Washington on March 26–27, 1960. The committee is headed by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Rochester, N.Y.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR A NEW INITIATIVE
A STATEMENT OF POLICY

The time has come for a new and vigorous initiative to secure economic development, political stability, and peace in the Middle East. Growing international opinion summons all nations to seek understanding and cooperation.

Peoples everywhere pray that at the forthcoming summit conference the great powers will succeed in reducing tensions and achieving international cooperation everywhere.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

We favor the mutual security program as an indispensable condition to the security of America and the defense of freedom everywhere.

The major problem in most Middle East countries is poverty—the failure to put people, land, and water to work. Tensions arise from economic instability and political immaturity which make the region vulnerable to internal conflicts and subversion from without. To meet this threat this committee continues to favor both economic assistance to raise living standards and adherence to the U.S. position which regards "the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East" as "vital to the national interest and world peace." (Resolution of Congress, Mar. 9, 1957.)

Thus, we favor economic aid to the Arab peoples; we stress economic assistance to raise living standards rather than arms for external adventure.

We favor continuing economic assistance to Israel. American economic aid to Israel has been used wisely and well. Israel has made dynamic progress and has become a showcase testifying to other new nations that a democracy which preserves free institutions does more than any other form of government to help its people. With American cooperation, Israel is strengthening the cause of freedom.

THE FACTORS FOR TENSION

Three factors aggravate tensions in the Middle East:

1. UAR President Nasser remains undeterred in his drive for power in the Middle East and Africa and persists in his seige of other nations in the region.

2. The Arab States are emboldened by lavish aid from the Soviet bloc. Approximately 40 percent of all Soviet aid to non-Communist countries has gone to the UAR, Iraq, and Yemen since 1955, and Soviet arms shipments to these states have totaled a published $580 million.

3. The Arab States have been encouraged by the failure of the U.N. and the United States to curb boycott and blockade.

AMERICAN POLICY

U.S. policy on these issues has often been stated. But a statement of policy is not self-executing. What is needed is the vigorous implementation of announced policies and a positive initiative to reverse the dangerous drift toward war.

1. Aggression

Our Government, in a joint statement with England and France, has declared "unalterable opposition to the use or threat of force between any of the states" in the Middle East and its undertaking to "take action both within and outside the United Nations" to prevent any attempt to violate frontiers or armistice line." (May 25, 1950.)

The United States, "in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, will observe its commitments within constitutional means to oppose any aggression in the area. * * * The United States is likewise determined to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression." (The White House, Apr. 9, 1956.)

Neither of these statements has been rescinded or set aside.

2. Soviet arms shipments

We fully share worldwide sentiment which favors disarmament, adequately enforced and supervised. Soviet protestations advocating disarmament cannot be reconciled with their massive export to the Middle East of weapons of great striking power. The time has come to call upon the Soviet Union to end this dangerous traffic with Arab States and enable the peoples of the region to concentrate their resources and energies in productive pursuits instead of wasteful preparations for war.

While we have always opposed an arms race, we recognize, as has our Government, that "widespread discrepancies in armed strength would be likely to create tension." (Secretary of State Dulles, May 8, 1956.) The West must take effective measures to prevent an arms imbalance in the region and to insure that the Arab States are not permitted to gain a disastrous military superiority which would tempt them to renew their aggression. The Arab States are not

likely to make peace with an Israel they believe they can destroy.

3. (a) Blockades

Egypt's discriminatory practice of impeding navigation through the Suez Canal is a glaring example of the failure of the United Nations to enforce its charter and its decisions.

Our Government has always opposed the Egyptian doctrine that it is entitled to blockade the Suez Canal on the alleged ground that it is at war with Israel. (U.N. Security Council Resolution, Sept. 1, 1951, and U.N. Security Council debate, Jan. 4, 1955.) This position was reaffirmed by President Eisenhower (Feb. 20, 1957) and by Secretary of State Herter (U.N. General Assembly debate, Sept. 17, 1959).

Moreover, the United States firmly upheld Israel's right to maintain freedom of shipping through the Straits of Tiran, and at the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea in April 1958, the U.S. delegation worked successfully to preserve the international character of that waterway which provides Israel with an outlet for its trade with Asia and Africa.

Our Government and the United Nations must intensify their efforts to open the Suez Canal to the shipping of all nations without discrimination.

(b) Boycott

Another factor for tension is the Arab boycott of Israel and those who trade with her. The Department of State has stated that: "We do not recognize or condone (the boycott) and have protested to the Arab Governments their discriminatory practices which affect U.S. firms and citizens. This Government and its representatives abroad will continue to emphasize to the Arab Governments, as occasion permits, that there should be no discrimination against American firms because they carry on business relations with Israel." (Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., Jan. 9, 1959.)

Despite these declarations, the Arab boycott is pursued with even greater intensity. More and more American citizens and firms have been discriminated against and blacklisted. U.N. authority is flouted, and even the U.S. Navy regrettably took formal and official note of the Arab boycott in its invitations to bidders—a procedure which evoked wide protests and brought about governmental reconsideration.

We note with appreciation the strong stand taken by the Congress of the United States in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act in 1959, which declared congressional opposition to discrimination by recipients of American aid against Americans on grounds of race or religion.

We favor the amendment to the Mutual Security Act now pending before the Congress, reaffirming America's traditional support for freedom of the seas and its opposition to the extension of aid where such assistance is used by one country to boycott and blockade another recipient of our aid.

THE ARAB REFUGEES

By the end of World War II, the world was confronted with the staggering problem of mass homelessness. There were 40 million refugees. More than half have been integrated—in every case by resettlement, never by repatriation. But little progress has been made to solve the Arab refugee problem. It is a deplorable and tragic waste of human life. Proposals that Israel agree to the return of the refugees are unrealistic. Such proposals call upon Israel to adopt a suicidal gesture incompatible with her own security and survival. They postpone any constructive progress toward resettlement.

The Arab refugees remain prisoners of Arab leaders who exploit them as pawns both in their conflicts with Israel and with each other. The best hope for the Arab refugees is integration by resettlement in Arab lands where there is room and opportunity for them in their own culture and environment. Israel, which already has more than 220,000 Arabs within its borders, has offered to compensate the Arab refugees for their abandoned property, and our Government has offered to assist Israel to do so. (Secretary of State Dulles, Aug. 26, 1955.) Any such resettlement programs will depend largely on the economic development of the Middle East as a whole, as U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold's report has stated. (June 15, 1959.)

THE ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT

The major obstacle to an Arab-Israel peace is the continuing refusal of the Arab States to recognize Israel and the reality of her existence. In contravention of the U.N. armistice and the U.N. Charter, they illegally proclaim themselves to be in a state of war with Israel. The expansionist United Arab Republic has sought domination over the Arab world by intensifying the war against Israel and by challenging other Arab governments to match its reckless adventure.

Our Government aided the 10 Arab States and the State of Israel to win and preserve their independence and sovereignty and has helped strengthen their economies. Our Government has also declared that "the preservation of the State of Israel is one of the essential goals of U.S. foreign policy." (Secretary of State Dulles, Feb. 25, 1956.)

The United States and other Western governments cannot tolerate postures of belligerence, contempt of the U.N. Charter and a continuing threat to the peace.

The objectives and policies of the United States qualify our Government to assume leadership in achieving an Arab-Israel peace. There is no alternative to direct face-to-face talks between the leaders of Israel and the leaders of the Arab governments.

We urge our Government to undertake a new initiative to bring Israel and the Arab States to the peace table.

IN SUMMARY

To achieve peace in the Middle East, we urge:

1. Continued U.S. economic assistance to Israel and the Arab peoples to raise living standards.

2. Full adherence to the U.S. policy to preserve "the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East."

3. Efforts to halt Soviet arms shipments to the Middle East and to prevent an arms imbalance in that region.

4. No compromise with boycott, blockade and other warlike acts.

5. Resettlement of the Arab refugees in Arab countries, with compensation from Israel for their abandoned property.

6. A U.S. initiative to promote direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

Peace can be won in the Middle East when the Arabs finally recognize that the American people stand firmly against aggression and are committed to a program which stimulates economic and social development and which preserves individual liberty and national freedom. This will require a tenacious adherence to declared principle and its consistent and forceful implementation.

Rehearse the Articles of Thy Belief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rehearse the Articles of Thy Belief," written by James Reston, published in the New York Times of today, April 1, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHEARSE THE ARTICLES OF THY BELIEF

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—He probably didn't mean to do it, but the fact is that President Eisenhower has just shoved Vice President NIXON off the high dive into deep water.

He accomplished this simply be setting Mr. NIXON free yesterday to proclaim his own program for the future. He said the Vice President would be "stupid" merely to stand on the Eisenhower programs of the past. He added, in what was certainly not the most graceful definition of the presidency, that he (Mr. Eisenhower) was "fortunate" that he didn't have "to go any further with this thing." Whereupon, he cut Mr. NIXON loose in a wicked world.

The Vice President hasn't landed yet, but in due course this is bound to produce quite a splash, for, as every beauty queen knows, it is one thing to look good in a bathing suit, and something else again to swim the English Channel.

Prior to the President's act of liberation, Mr. NIXON had the perfect formula for painless campaigning. He could do it in Siberia. He could speak in generalities. It was wonderful. All credit and no responsibility.

THE PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY

When the Vice President was asked to discuss his activities in the field of policy, he was able to decline on the ground that it would not be courteous to the President. If the administration was making peace or proclaiming prosperity, he could stand prominently in the glow of the White House. If the administration was getting into political trouble over medical insurance for the aged, it was easy to get word around that the Vice President was really in favor of a different program.

Any politician in a similar situation would have exploited this advantage. While all other candidates for the Presidency had to vote or speak up and answer questions, Mr. NIXON enjoyed his own political privileged sanctuary, unopposed by Republicans, and unavailable to anybody he didn't want to see.

He can still go on as before, of course, but the President has now relieved him of his excuse. Mr. Eisenhower has in effect appointed him Vice President in charge of the future and this provides him with both an opportunity and a problem.

The opportunity is that he is now free to answer the incessant questions about what he really believes. Even his strongest supporters, who range from Senator GOLDWATER to Secretary Mitchell (which is quite a distance), cannot answer these questions with anything but a tangle of contradictory hunches.

This is a serious situation for the candidate of a minority regional party, which needs the support of independent voters. Everybody knows about the "Democrats for Eisenhower"—they elected him twice—but where are the "Democrats for NIXON"?

If the Vice President speaks out clearly on policies for the future, he may bring many of them over to his side, for the Democratic Party resembles nothing so much at the moment as a rabble of "Beatniksons," but he has done little more this year in public than talk tactics and hand out awards to all-Americans and Boy Scouts.

His problem is that if he talks out clearly on his programs for the future, he runs into precisely the dilemma all the Democrats have been grappling with for months—namely,

that any clear definition of policy tends to alienate some essential group of supporters.

"DAMNED IF HE DOES, ETC."

Eisenhower was nominated by the liberal wing of the GOP, but once elected, he chose to hand the primary positions of power not to the liberals who supported him in the 1952 convention but to the conservatives who opposed him: to the Tafts, and the Humphreys, whose economic theories dominated the policies of the liberals in the Cabinet.

He did not resolve the ideological conflict within his party, but compromised the conflict and passed it on.

So that while NIXON must speak out to get independent support, he must also hold together Wall Street and Main Street, Secretary Benson and Secretary Mitchell, the conservative Chicago Tribune and the liberal Chicago Sun Times, the conservative CHARLIE HALLECK and the liberal he needs most—Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

It's no wonder the man took refuge in throwing out balls and handing out loving cups, but all good things come to an end, especially in politics.

Max Levand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the death of Max Levand last week, Kansas lost one of its colorful newspaper editors. For over 32 years Mr. Levand was actively in charge of the publication of the Wichita Beacon. This newspaper has a very extensive circulation around Wichita and the southern and western part of our State.

Rolla Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times has written a very interesting editorial on Max Levand, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAX LEVAND

Max M. Levand died suddenly at Wichita Monday. He was the spearhead of the famous Levand brothers' trio which bought the Wichita Beacon from Henry J. Allen in 1928, and thereby introduced new methods of newspaper operation to the Kansas scene.

The three ruling spirits of the Beacon over the past 32 turbulent years were Max, Louis, and John. Of these, Max was always the chief; invariably he sat at the head of the table. Louis, who died in 1953, and John made sterling contributions to the paper's operation—but Max was the leader. He was vigorous; he was direct; he was alert; he never lost sight of the main chance. He was a driver who gained results for the Beacon and, in his forceful way, he left an indelible mark upon Wichita—one beneficial to its growth.

The journalistic school in which he had been reared was the hard one of Bonfils and Tammen in the heyday of the old Denver Post. Max learned his lessons well and this knowledge, coupled with his natural pushing instict, made him a formidable figure to all rivals. The kind of journalism which he and his colleagues brought to Kansas was decidedly not the kind to which Kansas had been accustomed. In fact, it was painfully jarring to some of those who clung to the status quo, and while it had its followers in the days of its noisiest hullabaloo it never caught on entirely. Still, it had the valuable effect of jolting other Kansas papers out of the staid ruts which they had been following—and thus served as an evangel for progress.

Max Levand—and the newspaper concept he typified—stood as a debatable figure over his more than three decades in Kansas. Some embraced him as a newspaper genius, others avoided personalities but decried his policies, while a third group hated him bitterly. There was hardly ever any middle ground in individual estimates of him; these were either at one extreme or the other.

But, whatever shade of opinion existed, none could deny that Max Levand was enterprising, diligent, and persistent. He worked tirelessly, efficiently, and fearlessly. While he and his paper had toned down considerably from its shades of the early thirties, Max, in his latter years, remained the same rugged person—practical, sure of himself, unbending in his beliefs and his judgments.

Kansas—a prime realm for the development of newspaper folk in all its 99 years—has never seen his like before, and may nevermore see it again.

Address Delivered by Alexander F. Jones at the Sixth Annual Career Service Awards Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including an address delivered by Alexander F. Jones at the Sixth Annual Career Service Awards Dinner, National Civil Service League, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on Tuesday evening, March 15, 1960. In order that readers of the RECORD may know more about this distinguished editor and writer, I am including the introductory statement of Mr. Edward F. Thomas, president, Edward Thomas Associates, Inc., New York City:

Every now and then a newspaper editor in Washington wins national distinction. And, once in awhile a newspaper editor around the country makes his impact on the national scene. Our guest speaker tonight is the only man I know who has achieved both of these honors.

Alexander F. "Casey" Jones is well known in Government and newspaper circles in Washington, across the United States, and abroad.

Casey Jones came on the Washinton scene in 1935.

Born in Wisconsin and graduated from the University of Wisconsin, he learned his business as a news reporter and editor in Milwaukee, New York, Chicago, and Minneapolis—with time out for military service in World War I.

Mr. Jones was 44 years old when he came here in 1935 to take over the editorial direction of the Washington Post as managing editor. The New Deal was only 3 years old and some of the Nation's most crucial years were about to explode. Through the next 15 years of national and world crisis Casey Jones was at the throttle of this great newspaper—first as managing editor, and later as assistant to the publisher.

During those turbulent years he won national attention as an outstanding newspaper editor. His fellow editors honored Casey Jones by electing him president of their American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In 1950 Mr. Jones headed north to become executive editor of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal and Herald-American—the position he holds today. During the past 10 years he has won new honors as a distinguished editor. His work has been honored by Syracuse University, the University of Missouri, and Colgate University—as well as by several national associations.

Jones is no desk-borne editor. Since he moved to Syracuse in 1950 he toured the NATO countries in 1951. He went around the world in 1955 to visit the key trouble spots. Last year he visited the 7th Army Installation in Europe and later covered the Khrushchev tour of the United States. Next summer he will go with Eisenhower to the Soviet Union.

These foreign trips are no sightseeing junkets for Jones. He seeks out the facts, and the reasons behind the facts. He and I were members of the group that made a strenuous 3-week swing through the NATO countries in 1951. Mr. Jones reflected credit on the United States whenever he interviewed the high officials of the various countries. He revealed a broad understanding of the issues and a keen insight into the local situations in the questions he put to the government, military, industrial and other leaders we met in these countries.

As we honor tonight the 10 who have distinguished themselves in their field, it is fitting that we hear from one who has achieved excellence in the field of American journalism—a force that is so important in promoting excellence in government.

It is a personal pleasure to present Alexander F. Jones.

ADDRESS BY ALEXANDER F. JONES

Ladies and gentlemen, I cannot say I am happy to be here tonight because I am never happy when I have to inflict myself on an audience. I am well aware of my limitations. For one thing I am the only illiterate member of the Cosmos Club.

I have so much admiration for our form of government on all levels, however, that I have the temerity to join discussions of it and plans to improve the already magnificent service it renders to the American people. Thus my shrinking presence here tonight.

In a way I suppose this is a case of the culprit returning to the scene of the crime for I spent many long years here—from early in the New Deal until Korea—perpetrating countless journalistic atrocities: It is a strange thing but when I leave a newspaper they tear the building down. I like to think this is a gesture of despair, that management knows the standards set could not be maintained. There is a considerable body of thought, however, that insists efforts to fumigate the place and restore a proper journalistic odor are futile and that strecklichkeit is the only alternative.

As a great part of this audience knows the years 1935–50 were among the most turbulent periods of American history. Living through them here I have a multitude of memories of men and events. I would not dare to start mentioning them. I would find myself talking to empty chairs along toward morning.

Suffice it to say we saw more changes in government, more social departures, a greater revolution in our military posture than any other comparable period.

New Deal and subsequent legislation have established one new department after another with thousands of additional employees and although the Supreme Court invalidated a few of them, the major part are operating today and performing invaluable service.

The declared purpose of the Civil Service League is to improve public service personnel and governmental administration.

I am sure that you are all aware that this vital end has been greatly accelerated in recent years by the social, scientific, educational, and technological developments in government itself.

There are so many hundreds of fascinating projects demanding superskills today that Government service is a tremendous challenge.

No young man or woman could ever feel bored, or in a rut, if he or she really meets the demands of government today, and tomorrow.

You can honestly say that a Government employee can be a minor clerk performing office drudgery if he chooses, but if his sights are on the moon and the stars he can jolly well actually get there in the not too distant future.

There never was a time in American history when its government could say to its most promising sons and daughters with as much truth that public service today offers as many lasting satisfactions of every nature as any career that could be chosen.

The hazard in talking to this audience about Federal Government here in Washington is that you are way ahead of me on anything I may say.

This is your home grounds and you know every turn in the road.

So I am going to take you, first, to my home grounds and make a few suggestions on how to obtain top personnel at the county level and, more particularly what could be done if the general public is to appreciate fully what the Federal Government is doing, and what it offers to career people.

There are something in excess of 400,000 people in Onondaga County, of which Syracuse is the county seat.

The Federal Government pours something in excess of $200 million into our county annually.

How many U.S. Government offices and bureaus do you suppose there are in Syracuse?

I did not know until we did a series on the subject some time ago.

There are 71 counting every single man office, and on up to the 26th Air Division at Hancock Field.

Every activity of the Agriculture Department is represented, every Veterans' Bureau facility including a big hospital, and every branch of the armed services.

You name it—we have got it.

I am not going to say the community is not conscious of the myriad of Government services it gets. The postman comes around, the internal revenue offices speak up quarterly, the U.S. district attorney gets his name in the paper now and then, and our big plants are busy with defense work.

But there is not one in a 1,000 in our county who is aware of the extent of Federal services.

This is due, to a degree, to the fact that most Federal workers go about their duties so quietly and seem so anxious to avoid public attention that too often they do not even know each other.

We had an internal revenue bureau chief named Alvin Meyer who formed a Federal Council in Syracuse. The members, all Federal employees, met at luncheon regularly and someone always discussed his work. They started to exchange office equipment as needed, and even office personnel. We became keenly aware of the existence of the Federal Council and its aims.

Unfortunately, Mr. Meyer was transferred to Philadelphia and I have not heard of his council since.

In the business of securing an ever better type of Federal employee, it seems to me, it is of equal importance to make a Government career attractive on the local level as it is to influence promising young men and women to come to Washington to prepare for service here or abroad.

There may be live wire Federal Councils in many cities. I just don't happen to know about them.

There may be civil-service information officers outside Washington. Again, I have never encountered them.

Nor do I know of Federal men whose job it is to go to universities and colleges, as the big corporations do, and compete for top students. I remember Dr. Davenport very well. He used to bring some wonderful groups to this city for exposure to Government service.

But there should be more of it.

It is my opinion that an information service on what the United States is doing and what it has to offer is as important and as badly needed in Syracuse, N.Y., as it is in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

It may be argued that United States information in this country is a job for the newspapers and other communications media.

We do the best we can but I submit when a firm does a $200 million business with a customer it would seem worthwhile to explain what the money is being spent for and what the Federal Government is giving its citizens in services.

It would help in making boys and girls in schools and colleges conscious of what a variety of interests the Federal Government covers.

As it stands, covering the Federal run in an American city is a pretty routine job that the average newspaper city desk feels can be handled by a not too bright cub.

And may I digress for a moment to point out that the news coming out of Washington is not always of the character that endears even so sacrosanct an institution as Congress to the burgers, young and old, in the hinterlands.

One of our favorite indoor sports in these United States is self-examination with such emphasis on criticism that it sometimes approaches sadistic flagellation.

This phenomenon is most graphically illustrated by testimony of Americans of standing before a congressional committee.

A man may have a reputation of being a well-balanced leader in some important activity whose word has on all other occasions been accepted as being pretty close to gospel. He may even be known as being a lopsided optimist with a sense of humor.

But let him get before a microphone facing a congressional committee with the television cameras whirring and reporters with pencils poised and he is more likely than not moved to break down and have a good cry about the tragic decrepitude of this Republic of ours, starting with the President and progressing to its shoddy foreign and domestic policies, its fangless Army, Navy, and Air Force and on down to the profits on soothing sirup and the immoral viciousness of some disk jockey who got a free cup of coffee at a diner from a waitress for playing "Hang Down Tom Dooley."

If Nikita S. Khrushchev ever said one-tenth in speaking "poor mouth" about the United States that some of our own great patriots do, there would never be a summit conference and Ike would cancel his coming visit to Moscow in an indignant huff.

Congressional committee hearings have become the "national wailing wall."

There is a movement to acquaint businessmenn, young and old, with the mysteries of local and State government that is acquiring amazing momentum.

It has taken hold in remarkable fashion in Syracuse where banks, big and small industries, and retailers are holding regular courses in seminar groups to study the organization of local and State government from precinct committeeman up.

We have found corporation executives who did not know the identity of their own councilman, to say nothing of the county chairman.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has taken on this project as a major activity.

The newly announced president of the U.S. Chamber is Arthur H. Motley, publisher of Parade magazine, who has spearheaded the "know your government" movement in hundreds of cities.

Red Motley is a perpetual motion ball of fire and probably the best salesman in the country. If the Civil Service League ever got him to add a Federal Government course to the local and State government seminars and induced him to make speeches about it, more bright boys and girls would be knocking at your doors.

As an editor I am really a frustrated reporter. I love to go places and see things and to talk to people.

Sometimes I carry this urge too far.

A furious Farmer Garst, intent on explaining Iowa cornplanting to Nikita Khrushchev and resenting the intrusion of the press, aimed a boot at my shins and kicked Harrison Salisbury instead.

Come June, and with God and Jim Haggerty willing, I am going to Moscow with the President.

But last spring I spent May and June with the Seventh Army in Germany, Italy, and France.

I came home with the conviction that we have a powerful and extremely important weapon working for us which witnesses befor congressional committees, criticizing our defenses, never mention.

It is a weapon development of which has Communist nations backed off the map.

American civilians, and probably some members of this organization, are responsible along with the military for its smooth as grease operation.

I am referring to the way in which our forces, both military and civilian, have knit themselves into the life of the communities in which they are stationed.

Everywhere I went, from Berlin to the smallest villages, there is a joint committee composed of the U.S. commanding officer in the area, the burgomaster or mayor, the superintendent of schools, prominent women who are sometimes local, sometimes wives of officers, and usually the top civilians in the district.

They meet to discuss local matters like schools, traffic regulations, marriages of U.S. servicemen with local girls, rent charges, and the occasional police matter.

The result is friendly understanding of all problems and close attention to local customs.

The conduct of our servicemen has been magnificent in the overall picture and there is wide agreement that if trouble comes—if the balloon goes up as the GI's put it—there will be no fifth column behind our lines.

There is equal agreement on what would happen in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist satellites. Revolution would take place overnight.

I mention this because we are talking about high type of U.S. employees.

There are about a half million of the highest type American employees in our European services today that any generation ever saw.

The young officers, many of them the product of ROTC training, the noncoms and enlisted men, the mutual aid men and

women, the younger officials in our Embassies are uniformly representations of this country of which too much cannot be said.

To one who was part of the 1917–18 AEF, our Armed Forces today are a matter of such pride, on every score, that restraint is difficult.

One more point and I am done.

No one from Syracuse could possibly discuss Government employment as a career without calling attention to the splendid work that is being done at the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at our university in training young men and women for service overseas in both government and business.

I am sure many here tonight know Dean Harlan Cleveland.

I have been reading some of the galley proofs of his latest book "Americans At Work Abroad," which will be published in a few weeks.

An incredible amount of research has gone into this fascinating book and it is equally of interest to businessmen and government people involved in diplomacy and our political posture abroad.

If I was to express an opinion about it in capsule form, I would say it proves all Americans abroad are not ugly.

There are probably those who think the foregoing is a rather brazen plug for a school and for a book.

I agree, without the slightest embarrassment.

We are very proud of the Maxwell School, its dean, its faculty and the type of men and women who are trained there to come to you.

I went to a party in Athens a few years ago and six of the top men in our mutual aid program there had had their training at the Maxwell School.

In concluding may I add my congratulations to those that will be expressed to the winners of the awards tonight.

How much farther out on cloud nine can anyone get than to be named one of the top 10 in the best Government on earth?

And may I also congratulate the officers, the sponsors and the members of the National Civil Service League on the vigor with which it is pursuing its most vital purpose—the perpetuation of this great Republic of ours through ever more effective direction.

Civil service faces a tremendous task in planning for the transition to a new administration this fall, regardless of whom is elected.

I know planning for this job is well underway, for which we can all be thankful.

In this fast moving age not even the remnants of the spoils system can be tolerated.

It represents a luxury we cannot afford and I am confident there are men in this room who will see to its inconspicuous burial.

Thank you.

Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it was the unanimous judgment of our Original Thirteen States, as expressed in their Independence Declaration, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In my opinion there is no measure coming before this body, more fully designed to promote the enjoyment of these rights to American citizens than the appropriations bill, now under consideration, for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The basic units and activities of these executive departments are more closely connected with the lives of our citizens than any other agency of our Government "for the people."

That is why I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not urge you all to approve and accept the appropriation here unanimously reported and recommended to us by the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations directed by our esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. The recommendations of the sucommittee are unanimous and represent the best compromise decision of reasonable and capable men.

There is no greater authority on this subject in this country than Representative FOGARTY. One of the greatest joys of my legislative experience here has been to listen to his clear, concise, and forthright explanation of the provisions of this bill which he has been presenting annually to this House for the past 10 years. It is an everlasting tribute to his acknowledged integrity, scholarship, and leadership that the recommendations of his conscientious subcommittee have been so overwhelmingly and regularly adopted without prolonged debate or technical quibbling on such a vitally important measure.

Mr. Chairman, to attempt to either regulate or improve the health and happiness of human beings in terms of dollars and cents is a most difficult, if not impossible, task. We are all, I am certain, agreed on the necessity for practicing economy in Government expenditures and to preserve our financial stability and world position. However, I think we are further agreed that gestures of doubtful economy at the expense of lowering national standards of working conditions, health protection, and educational advancement is most unwise and impractical, more especially in these days of communistic competition.

For that fundamental reason, I most earnestly hope that no crippling reductions will be attempted during our action on this bill; indeed, it is my deepest hope that the moderate increases recommended by the subcommittee and the chairman, principally in the fields of hospital construction, vocational education, assistance to the schools in federally impacted areas, grants to States to build waste-treatment plants, and research at the National Institutes of Health will be unanimously accepted.

I would like to emphasize that the subcommittee has not advocated general increases in all the areas covered by this bill. The subcommittee adopted the very sensible approach that there are certain selective and essential areas of public need that can and must be met in the national interest. It would be most difficult to justify any wide disagreement on these specific activities the subcommittee has chosen for their special attention.

The fundamental objective of the subcommittee, so obviously and patriotically revealed in their report, was to keep all of the many and varied activities of these two major public service Departments of Government in operation at their highest economically efficient level while encouraging a selected few activities to moderately advance their scope of service in response to particular and proven expanding public needs.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations we grant under this measure are designed to continuously improve the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us have the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

Should the Family Doctor Be Outlawed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Gen. E. R. Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, in one of his misguided efforts to improve air safety, has proposed to outlaw the family doctor. He wants to set up a list of selected doctors approved by the Federal Aviation Agency to give physical examinations to private pilots.

It would be assumed from this action that aviation medicine as it relates to pri-

vate pilots' physical examinations is a highly specialized field and that, therefore, only selected medical examiners specially trained are competent to give such examinations. The fact is that the physical examination required of private pilots is very easy to pass. I refer to the provisions of Civil Air Regulations Manual 29. A private pilot can pass the eye examination "if the vision in either or both eyes is poorer than 20/50 and is brought up to 20/30 or better in each such eye by glasses." He can qualify if he is able to "hear the whispered voice at 3 feet." These are two examples of the present requirements. Actually anyone in fairly good health can pass the physical examination, and there is no part of the examination that the family doctor cannot give without having any special training or equipment.

Since it is clear from a careful review of the regulations that no special competence in aviation medicine is required to give an applicant an examination for a private pilot's license, I see no reason for outlawing the family physician or any physician who is qualified to practice under the laws of the respective States. General Quesada's proposed plan will, of course, further build up the Federal bureaucracy and provide a special patronage system for the Federal Aviation Agency. The plan is a reflection on the competence of family doctors. Furthermore, it would put private pilots to unnecessary trouble and expense.

The resentment toward this kind of operation, in the name of safety, is very strong among the private pilots of the country. I commend to the attention of my colleagues a letter I have received on the subject under date of March 28, 1960, from Mr. James G. Morton, vice president of the American Weekly. Mr. Morton sent me also a copy of the letter he wrote under the same date to General Quesada. Mr. Morton, a newspaper executive as well as a business pilot of more than 20 years experience, makes a very clear presentation of the reasons the private pilots take exception to being burdened by the proposed action.

I ask unanimous consent to have the correspondence printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 28, 1960.*

The Honorable CLAIR ENGLE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I cannot think of a more flagrant example of bureaucracy for bureaucracy's sake than the senseless, high-handed action of the Federal Aviation Agency in their plan to outlaw the family doctor for physical examinations for a private pilot's license.

A copy of my correspondence to FAA Administrator Elwood R. Quesada on this matter is enclosed.

Will the encroachment of Government individuals continue unbridled? Is there no one to fight this growing intrusion into the privacy of the individual?

It is palpably demonstrable that a so-called aviation medicine specialist (in itself, largely a myth) cannot possibly on cursory examination gain comparable knowledge of an individual's physical condition and mental attitude as the family doctor who has treated him all his life.

There are two very obvious reasons for visiting this inconvenience and unnecessary expense on the thousands of pilots throughout the country—"empire-building" by the FAA and "pork barrel" by an organized group of doctors who have dabled in so-called aviation medicine.

The family doctor, who has the most thorough knowledge possible of the patient, is eminently qualified to examine for a private pilot's license. They have been doing it for years and no one can cite any good reason why they should not continue. Could an FAA designee, seeing a patient on a cursory physical, have any knowledge of a patient's underlying neurosis, for example? The family doctor would certainly know.

If this connivance between the bureaucrats and a medical lobby serve any useful purpose of air safety or progress, I would support it. But they are turning the clock back 20 years. Their contemplated action fizzled then, and it would serve no useful purpose now.

As a Member of Congress, I hope you will fight such efforts to burden us with still more inconvenience and expense for bureaucracy's sake.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. MORTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 28, 1960.*

Administrator ELWOOD R. QUESADA,
Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL: Both as a newspaper executive and as a business pilot of more than 20 years' experience, I have wholeheartedly supported your objectives as chief of the Federal Aviation Agency.

In your policies and decisions I know you have the national interest at heart.

I am sure the overwhelming majority of responsible pilots—airline, business, private, and military—is devoted to the cause of air safety and progress.

And it is palpably true that the individual cooperation and support of the many thousands of pilots throughout the country will greatly expedite the function of the Federal Aviation Agency and the attainment of your objectives.

The various organizations which represent civil aviation have their place, of course. In various areas each has made important contributions to air safety and progress. But I think the support and cooperation of the thousands of pilots as individuals transcends that of the collective groups representing the segments of civil aviation.

On that account it becomes difficult to reconcile the arbitrary action of the FAA medical officials in wanting to turn back the clock 20 years and require private and business pilots to journey to certain self-ordained medical aviation experts for periodic examinations. We tried that in 1938 and it was a nuisance and served no useful purpose. It will serve no useful purpose now.

From the standpoint of full knowledge of a patient's health, who could be so thoroughly informed as a family doctor? Is the impersonal examiner, on a brief and cursory examination, able to know nearly as much about the physical condition of an individual as the family doctor who has treated him consistently over the years? Of course not.

Really, from the standpoint of the pilot, the issue, in the personal sense, becomes one of inconvenience and wasted time. For example, I have medical checkups regularly every year. For me, going to a designated expert will mean extra expense, wasted time, and travel.

This sort of inconveneince, when it is needless and serves no useful purpose—indeed, when it is a step backwards—has only one interpretation to the intelligent individual. It is evidence of bureaucracy for bureaucracy's sake. It makes suspect other rulings and decisions which have real importance. It alienates the rank and file of pilots. It fails to win the voluntary cooperation so essential to the attainment of major objectives.

If indeed the Airline Pilots Association, the AOPA, and other organized bodies of civil aviation are "pressure groups," is there a better way to drive more and more pilots to their door and solidify their ranks than the imposition of such useless nuisances as this medical thing?

As a pilot who once wasted a half a day or more going to a designated office, waiting the hours, and finally getting the most cursory physical I've ever had, then paying unnecessarily for it, I can't think of a more senseless reason for annoying and inconveniencing thousands of pilots—business executives, company presidents, articulate spokesmen in the community—and divorcing their good will, cooperation, and support.

I respectfully suggest this measure be tabled for the present, at least until it can be demonstrated that substantial benefits will accrue to air safety and progress.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. MORTON.

Ninetieth Anniversary of 15th Amendment to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last Wednesday, March 30, 1960, was a particularly fitting day for the Senate to resume the consideration of the pending civil rights bill, of which such an important portion is devoted to the protection of voting rights protected by the 15th amendment to the Constitution For that day was the 90th anniversary of the ratification of the 15th amendment, with which we are concerned so deeply here, and under whose grant of power to the Congress we are legislating.

I think that it is appropriate to read to the Senate the complete text of this succinct and clear amendment; perhaps that should have been done every day since we took up the civil rights bill on February 15 so that no one would misinterpret why and under what authority we are legislating here. The amendment reads:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial from the New York Times of March 30, which eloquently hails this anniversary.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETIETH CENTURY

Ninety years ago today the 15th amendment to the Constitution was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation issued by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish. The key words of this amendment are: "The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged * * * on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The amendment expressly gives to Congress the "power to enforce this article by apropriate legislation."

We have printed these words in this space before, and shall doubtless do so again until the day, perhaps not too far off, when all citizens of the United States actually enjoy the equality at the ballot box proclaimed by our democracy as a basic right. They do not all enjoy it now. Many hundreds of thousands—no one can say with precision how many—do not enjoy it in the South solely because of the color of their skins. That is a situation that must end. The legislation that comes before the Senate today will help to end it.

This 90th anniversary of the 15th amendment is a good day for the Senate to take up the House-approved civil rights bill of 1960 as it comes—by force majeure, as it were—from Senator EASTLAND'S Judiciary Committee, traditional stronghold of entrenched conservatism. The House bill is by no means the best civil rights bill that could be devised; but it does represent an important forward step to insure voting and some other rights for our Negro fellow citizens in the South.

If Majority Leader JOHNSON'S impressive strategy succeeds in the Senate, a bill will go to the President more or less as the House passed it. This will not be enough for many sincere liberals; but it will be a bill of substance and it will be a positive achievement. It will certainly be infinitely better than no bill at all, or a bill watered down for political reasons even further than this one has already been. We too would like to see some of the provisions that have been cut out of the House bill restored to life—but not at the expense of indefinitely tying up this measure once again.

Conflict-of-Interest Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a long-time student of conflict-of-interest statutes, and consistent supporter of efforts to modernize and strengthen these laws, I have been gratified by the strong editorial support accorded the most recent congressional effort in this field. I refer to the bill introduced by my senior colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], myself, and other cosponsors to carry out recommendations of the special committee on Federal conflict-of-interest laws of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

This proposal, S. 3080, is an excellent effort to codify the scattered laws in this field and to make them apply more realistically to Federal employees. Unfortunately, it covers only the executive branch of the Government. However, the committee which drafted the bill suggested that a study be made of possible legislation to include the legislative branch.

I am firmly convinced that any kind of legislation which is enacted in this field must apply to Senators and Representatives, as well as their employees. The people expect the same high standards of ethics from their elected representatives in Congress as from Federal officers and employees in the executive branch.

Last year I introduced legislation which would include Congress and its employees under conflict-of-interest statutes. Among other things, these bills would make a matter of public record any written or oral communication between a Member of Congress or his staff on the one hand, and any regulatory agency of the Government. One would establish a code of ethics for Congress and the executive branch, setting forth the specific standards with regard to all aspects of the ethical conduct of these public servants. I am extremely hopeful the interest stirred up by the latest proposals in this field will prod congressional action on all these bills.

In this connection I was pleased to read an excellent editorial in the Jamestown Post-Journal which, after surveying the provisions of S. 3080, urged that study be devoted to including the legislative branch in any final conflict-of-interest statute. I am glad to have this strong support and I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jamestown Post-Journal, Feb. 29, 1960]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING have introduced bills designed to provide a complete overhaul of the conflict-of-interest laws enacted over a period of a century or more. These measures are based on recommendations of a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York after a 2-year study financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The committee reported that the present laws are inadequate and some are obsolete. It wants a single unified act that will fix responsibility on the President by giving him a conflict-of-interest administrator.

That there is a real need for stiffening of the laws against conflict of interest by Federal Government employees has been apparent for a long time. They have been exposed periodically in both Republican and Democratic administrations and in some cases have reached into the top echelons of government.

The Javits-Keating proposals would prohibit the acceptance of gifts, gratuities, or favors when offered to an employee because of his post with the Federal Government, or if the giver is one who does business with the employee's agency or is regulated by it. An employee could not accept pay from outside sources in return for personal services, unless the work is performed outside Government hours and is not otherwise prevented by regulations. Former workers would be barred from giving assistance to a private interest in transactions with an agency in which he was employed for a period of 2 years.

While the bar association's recommendations embraced in the Javits-Keating bills relate only to the executive branch of the Government, it urged a similar study of the legislative branch. That would be in order. But Congress has always been slow in doing anything about conflict of interest among Senators and Representatives.

Keeping the Pork Out of Pork Barrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in the Armed Services Management magazine of February 1960, there was an article entitle "Keeping the Pork Out of Pork Barrels" by Col. Robert R. Robertson.

Colonel Robertson is one of our outstanding public servants and is Public Relations Officer for the Corps of Engineers.

The article contains information which I believe should be widely circulated. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING THE PORK OUT OF PORK BARRELS

(By Col. Robert R. Robertson)

For the 135th straight year, Congress, before adjourning last year, voted appropriations for the Corps of Engineers civil works program.

This program develops our Nation's water resources and protects its citizens from floods. It is a program of critical projects undertaken because they are beyond the means of local areas concerned.

Also for the 135th straight year, various uninformed but vocal elements have raised the cry of "pork barrel." As one omniscient columnist given to something less than perceptive reporting put it, "a going-away present for Congressmen."

That there are those who make such statements, and worse still, many more who believe them, betrays an abysmal lack of information on the water problem in the United States. It is particularly distressing to find many well placed individuals in the Defense Establishment, both military and civilian, who have fallen prey to this "pork barrel" sophistry.

While it may be a sad commentary on our progress toward becoming civilized, it is a historical fact that the material advancement of our race has been paced, in the main, by requirements of the military. It was the critical need of nonavailable engineers to build fortifications 140 years ago which inspired Major Sylvanus Thayer, an Engineer officer, to develop the U.S. Military Academy into the only school in the young Nation qualified to train engineers and scientists.

A knowledgeable Government soon recognized that only at West Point was there the talent needed to meet the technological demands of our expanding country. In 1824 Congress gave the Corps of Engineers responsibility for developing a transport system of roads, canals, and waterways to weld the Nation together. It was Sylvanus Thayer's students who undertook the job.

In 1824, the big problem was transportation. And the Corps of Engineers concen-

trated on making our inland waterways and our inland and coastal harbors usable. Improved waterways attracted villages which grew to become towns and cities. Floods became of great concern as each year the cities suffered loss of lives and heavy property damage. At first, the local people cleared river channels and built levees themselves to escort floodwaters past their towns. Such local solutions merely aggravated the problem of a downstream community.

Dollars were wasted and enmity created before the need for a centralized coordinated effort became recognized. But the wheels of Government grind slowly.

In 1927 the most disastrous flood in the history of the lower Mississippi River occurred. Cities, towns and farms were flooded. Scores of lives were lost; property damage ran into the hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands were left homeless.

This great disaster awakened the Nation to the dire need for a comprehensive flood control program. Various legislation followed, culminating in the 1936 Flood Control Act, in which Congress added to the Corps of Engineers' navigation mission the related responsibility of nationally developing flood control works.

It takes large dams to control floods. Large dams can also be used to generate power and store water during periods of plenty for use during dry seasons. As our country's continued growth put increasing demands on our rivers, the Engineers were given the job of creating works ancillary to flood control dams necessary to meet these other demands.

Our Nation has grown up now, but harnessing the power of its mighty rivers is still far too big a job for local management. For example, the Mississippi River system is one of the world's greatest. Mark Twain had an idea of the size of the task when he said, "The military engineers have taken upon their shoulders the job of making the Mississippi over again—a job transcended in size only by the original job of creating it."

But even Sam Clemens would be amazed were he able to see "The River" today. The levee system on the main stem of the Mississippi alone consists of 1,565 miles of embankments containing enough yards of earth to fill a freight train reaching halfway to the moon. For every dollar invested in this effort by the Corps of Engineers, $6 in prevented flood damages have been returned to date. These are only dollars saved—who can put a value on the lives saved and the human misery prevented?

Perhaps at this point those who cry "pork barrel" will agree that it is proper for the Federal Government to be in the water resources business. Possibly then they do not agree with the way the program is conducted—the way politics enter into it.

A principal charge levied by critics of the public works program states, in essence, that unnecessary projects are built to benefit a chosen few or to create jobs in the districts of the various Congressmen. A picture is conjured up with each Congressman riotously voting funds for projects in the areas of interest of other Congressmen so that they, under previous secret cloak room agreements will vote for projects in his area.

Public works projects originate where they are needed by the initiative of the people concerned. A disastrous flood, an expanding economy needing improvements in navigation, or similar circumstances caused local people to unite toward a solution. When the problem goes beyond their capabilities, an appeal is made to Congress. If the request seems reasonable, Congress authorizes the Corps of Engineers to investigate and report. This first report is based on an inexpensive preliminary investigation. It is made by an engineer district, reviewed by a division, reviewed again by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The Board, after studying the report, sends it to Chief of Engineers with its recommendation. The Chief of Engineers decides if a more comprehensive investigation should be made.

If further study is not justified, Congress is so informed and that is that. If it is, a more detailed survey is ordered, giving full consideration to engineering problems and probable economic benefits. (To speed the process, a recent procedural change eliminates the preliminary investigation. But it provides that the comprehensive investigation may be abandoned at any point that evidence warrants.)

CHECK AND DOUBLECHECK

Again the long check and doublecheck process through district, Division, Board, and Chief of Engineers. If the project will not return more than $1 in benefits for every dollar invested, it is automatically recommended against. If it appears economically and engineeringly sound, Congress is informed.

Here again, the project encounters a lengthy, laborious screening. It runs the gauntlet of the Bureau of the Budget and various congressional committees before Congress votes to put it on an approved legislative list. Subsequently, it must go through a similar process before funds are made available.

The preliminary studies are not prefunctory gestures. Over the years, the Corps of Engineers has recommended against 55 percent of the proposals investigated.

Commenting on this, General MacArthur said, "There is one attribute, perhaps it should be classified as an accomplishment, which has been overlooked. It is the unswerving capacity of the corps to say no—to resist all pressure from whatever source, high or low, to enter upon unwarranted projects involving great sums of money. Billions of dollars thereby have been saved to the Government * * *."

To those who are familiar with the procedures, the complaint is that the elaborate screening is delaying work on many needed projects. A rather different picture of the civil-works program from that painted by the purveyors of the pork barrel illusion.

A rosy picture, but to the skeptic's mind comes a question—the payoff question. What has the Corps of Engineers' civil works program created to date besides tradition and some stringent screening procedures?

In its 135 years of supervising the civil works program, the Corps of Engineers has received annual appropriations varying from $75,000 in 1824 to almost $900 million in 1959. During this 135 years, total expenditures for all facilities—dams, powerhouses, locks, levees, channels, harbors—have been less than $8 billion.

For the $8 billion invested to date, United States has 2,800 active Corps of Engineers' projects which include:

A navigation system second to none in the world—23,000 miles of improved waterways and 500 harbors. In 1957 over 230 billion ton-miles of traffic used this system.

The Great Lakes Navigation System, the St. Lawrence seaway, the Mississippi River, the Ohio River, to name a few, are all parts of this inland waterway system.

Flood-control works, though only partially complete, have prevented $9 billion in damage over the past 12 years. When the present system is completed, the taxpayer will receive some $3 in flood damages prevented for every dollar invested.

Just under 28 billion kilowatts of hydroelectric power are generated annually at Corps of Engineer dams. This represents over 20 percent of the total U.S. hydroelectric output.

Releases from reservoirs for power generation, navigation, and floodwater drawdown all supply water for domestic, agricultural, and industrial use. Also, where feasible, Corps of Engineers' reservoirs provide space specifically for water storage. Some 40 cities and towns throughout the United States derive their water supply directly from such facilities.

Over 4-million acre-feet of storage are provided for irrigation water. Further, releases from these reservoirs are becoming increasingly important in supplementing major rivers during low flow seasons.

Corps of Engineer reservoirs and waterway projects provide over 6 million acres of land and water surface for fish and upland game and the nesting, resting, and feeding area for millions of duck, geese, and other migratory waterfowl.

The pork barrel psychology is particularly dangerous today. It casts public doubt on a program critically important to the Nation's future. The need to maintain a military posture, the need to meet an economic challenge around the world, and the need to absorb an explosive population growth variously estimated as 40 million to 60 million in the United States in the next 15 years, will combine to demand an unprecedented expansion of industrial, commercial, and agricultural capacity.

Department of Commerce, in an official report, concluded the Federal Government alone must spend $28 billion on flood control, navigation, water supply, the hydroelectric power over the next 15 years if we are to keep up with the demands of our growth. For the same period, the total Federal and non-Federal expenditures needed to meet water use demands was set at $231 billion.

What many people, even those who understand the need for rapid development in this area, do not realize is that today we are irrevocably dictating the limits on our water supply 15 years from now. This is not an exaggeration. It is in fact most conservative. The lengthy process of investigations, surveys, authorizing legisaltion, appropiraitons, and finally design and construction, consume a minimum of 15 years.

Pork barrel? In this land of abundance in the last 5 years, over 1,000 communities housing over 15 percent of our citizens have had to ration water. Corps of Engineer flood control works now prevent $600 million in damages each year, but an equal amount of damage occurs in unprotected areas. Our waterways handle over 230 billion ton-miles of traffic each year, but newer, larger, and more efficient tankers and barges already have made obsolete many of our locks and river channels.

Pork barrel? Our problem is too little too late. History is replete with the chronicles of the civilizations that have risen and fallen as they succeeded or failed in their efforts to develop and maintain water resources. It is of more than academic interest that the advance of early western civilization followed the development by those surprisingly competent Roman engineers of water supply projects throughout Africa, Europe, and western Asia. Of even greater significance is the fact that destruction by the Goths and the subsequent neglect of these great water systems was a major contributing factor to the decline of the Roman Empire.

Such projects are a part of our overall defense effort just as surely as is the development of weapons. We must each consider it a duty to see that the pork-barrel myth does not do to our civilization what the barbarians did to the Roman Empire.

School of Education, University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a Nation, we recognize that further improving our educational programs continues to be a major national objective.

As Congress considers legislation in this field, it is always extremely helpful to be better informed on the specific ways in which our outstanding educational institutions are now carrying on projects and programs, not only to meet the needs of today, but to further improve our system for the evergrowing challenges of the years ahead.

Recently I was gratified to receive from Lindley J. Stiles, dean of the school of education of the University of Wisconsin, an excellent report on the fine progrems of teacher training and education being carried on at the university.

For interested Members of Congress and the general public, I would wholeheartedly recommend reference to this splendid report for data and information on the constructive ways in which the school of education of the University of Wisconsin is meeting its challenges.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have brief excerpts from the report on the scope and progress of its efforts to further improve our teacher educational program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, EMPHASES AND DEVELOPMENTS, 1955–60

The University of Wisconsin faces no greater responsibility than the one it bears for the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel as well as for research to improve education. How well it is discharging this obligation is properly the concern of faculty members, State officials, members of the teaching profession, as well as citizens in general. To assist with such an appraisal, a summary is presented of the major program developments, research emphases as well as service and professional contributions that have characterized the work of the school of education during the past 5 years.

Although the period covered represents the span of new leadership for the school of education, it will be appreciated that the general pattern of policies followed, as well as many of the specific projects, originated under former administrations. All, too, have been the product of faculty efforts and decisions. Specifically, credit for progress should properly go to:

1. The unique structure of the school of education which permits and encourages the interest and participation of faculty members throughout the university in the formulation of policies, planning, tnd development of programs for the education of teachers.

2. The quality of staff members and administrative officers in the various departments budgeted in the school itself, many of whom were assembled under the leadership of former Dean John Guy Fowlkes, who by both his contributions and counsel continues to add strength to the enterprise.

3. The support, assistance, and encouragement provided by the regents and board of visitors, the president, vice presidents, and other central administrative officers as well as deans of the university, the State superintendent of public instruction and his associates, the advisory council of the school of education which represents various professional and lay groups throughout the State that work in the interests of education, and the Wisconsin school systems and other organizations that have contributed to the support of educational research.

The faculty may justifiably take pride in the advances made in the program provided for prospective teachers, the expansions in, and the amount of support for, educational research and experimentation with new programs, as well as in the cooperative relationships maintained with Wisconsin's elementary and secondary schools. It must be recognized, however, that as satisfying as these gains may be, they represent only levels of productivity from which even greater efforts must come if the university is to do its part to strengthen itself as well as elementary and secondary schools.

I. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS

Program developments during the past 5 years reflect trends and emphases in the preparation of teachers at the University of Wisconsin. The major actions have aimed toward: (1) placing greater emphasis upon, and improving the nature of, the laboratory phases (student teaching, internship) of the work in pedagogy; (2) providing more flexibility to meet the individual differences in abilities, background, time of decision to prepare for teaching, and professional goals of students; (3) strengthening the quality of the total program of preparation for teaching, with particular emphasis on the work in both pedagogy and the teaching field; and (4) making available special avenues for preparation and entry into teaching that are uniquely adapted and challenging to the interests and capacities of academically talented students.

Established policies and procedures which point to the above objectives are outlined below. Graduate program developments in the departments budgeted in the school of education and others which are designed primarily for teaching education, are included inasmuch as they relate directly to the inservice preparation of educational personnel. Leadership for these developments has come from the various school of education departments involved, the graduate school, and a number of instances from other college or divisions of the university.

Undergraduate and preservice developments

General actions: Enactment of policies to establish the block plan of student teaching for prospective secondary schoolteachers.

Reorganization and improvement of counseling services.

Establishment of a postbaccalaureate program for liberal arts graduates preparing for high school teaching.

Cooperation within the university with other colleges and schools to develop an honors-type program for gifted students preparing to teach.

Cooperation with the State department of public instruction and with other colleges of the State to develop a plan to certify able college graduates for teaching on the basis of proven knowledge in the fields of liberal education, subject specialization and professional education as well as demonstrated ability to teach. A similar plan was adopted by the University of Wisconsin for undergraduates seeking to qualify for teaching.

Agreement to cooperate with the Madison public schools to develop the Washington Elementary School as a special research and demonstration school to serve both the city of Madison and the university.

Required professional sequence: Evaluation and improvement of education courses required for certification based on a comprehensive survey of the attitudes of prospective teachers and selected graduates.

Reapportionment of the 18 semesters of required work in education courses for prospective high school teachers by increasing the allocation to student teaching from 5 to 7 semester hours with a consequent decrease in credit hours allocated to foundation courses from 9 to 7.

Agreement to include in the block semester at the secondary level from 12 to 14 hours of the 18 hours in the professional sequence.

Provision of options in requirements in the professional sequence to permit choices from a number of undergraduate or advanced courses.

Reorganization and reduction from 2 to 1, of the introductory courses required for prospective elementary teachers.

Experimentation in the required professional sequence with varied sized classes.

Strengthening of the program of supervision of student teaching.

Reduction of the overload of student teachers in Wisconsin High School.

Experimentation with the internship as an ingredient of the instructional team.

Decision to develop a post-baccalaureate program to prepare liberal arts graduates for elementary school teaching.

Experimentation with the use of television to improve instruction in both academic and professional courses. Closed-circuit television of classes in Wisconsin High School has made group observations by prospective teachers possible.

Specialization in teaching fields: Adoption of policy to strengthen the subject preparation of high school teachers by: (1) reducing from three to two the number of fields in which certification may be sought; (2) recommending to students fields of specialization which support each other, e.g., mathematics and physics; (3) developing related second and/or distributed fields for those preparing to teach subjects such as English, history, and science.

Agreement to develop subject matter specializations for teachers in terms of knowledge required to teach, in particular assignments, instead of relying on the established major and minor requirements of the various departments of the university.

Approval of new specializations for teachers in: Hebrew, and Russian.

Development or reorganization of programs in: health, dance, art, physical education-men, agriculture education.

Graduate programs for teachers and other educational personnel

Art and art education: Establishment of a 2-year master of fine arts degree.

Education: Development of a doctoral program in school psychology offered jointly with the department of psychology.

Development of a master's degree program in rehabilitation counseling.

Planning of a joint program in special education with particular emphasis on mental retardation, emotional disturbance, and the physically handicapped, in cooperation with the Department of Exceptional Education, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Agreement to develop a program of research and graduate work in the field of general adult education in cooperation with the division of extension and other university agencies.

Cooperation with State department of public instruction on new certification program for specialized education personnel.

Physical education: Agreement between the departments of physical education for men and women to develop a joint graduate program at both the master's and Ph. D. levels.

Other projects: Development of an experimental interdepartmental master's degree program for teachers of science and mathematics. This was a pioneer project, with support from the National Science Foundation and leadership from both the graduate school and the college of letters and science.

Cooperation of all departments with the joint staff committee on graduate programs to work out with the State colleges a new type of master's degree program uniquely suited to the educational objectives of classroom teachers.

Development of special summer programs for teachers of science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

Study of 2-year and doctoral interdepartmental graduate programs for educational administration.

Coordination of fifth-year certification programs for liberal arts college graduates with study leading to the master's degree.

Preparations Underway for the 1964 American World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a great deal of hard work has been done over the past several months in preparing for the American World's Fair in 1964 to be held in New York City. A number of interested citizens in New York have been instrumental in organizing the New York World's Fair Corp. and in getting the administration to select New York City as the site for an American fair in 1964.

These efforts have been highly successful. A great deal of work, of course, remains to be done in arranging with the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris and with foreign nations to finalize arrangements for the fair. Beyond that, plans must be made for Flushing Meadows, the site of the fair, and the construction of buildings, roads, and other facilities must be initiated.

One of the most gratifying aspects of the preparations for the 1964 fair thus far has been the active participation and assistance of the President and of the Department of State in working with foreign nations, which we hope will exhibit at the fair. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from President Eisenhower to Mr. Robert Kopple, executive vice president of the New York World's Fair 1964 Corp., expressing the hope that foreign nations will respond enthusiastically to the invitation of the New York World's Fair in 1964 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The permanent organization for the 1964 fair is now being set up. Several weeks ago Mr. Robert Moses was named to head this organization. Many of those who have worked long and hard on the fair up to this point are now stepping aside. I want to commend them for the fine work which they have done. Mr. Thomas Deegan, chairman of the fair corporation, and Mr. Robert Kopple, executive vice president, merit special praise for the efforts which they have devoted to this endeavor.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I wrote to Mr. Kopple praising him and the officers and members of the fair corporation for the energy which they have devoted to a 1964 American World's Fair in New York City also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Mr. ROBERT KOPPLE,
Executive Vice President, New York World's Fair 1964 Corp., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KOPPLE: The World's Fair to be held in New York in 1964 can be a powerful instrument for peace and friendship in freedom.

There is no greater force for good will on this earth than for people of all lands to meet face to face and become better acquainted with each other. This simple but basic truth has been reinforced in my own mind by my travels around the world and my visits here at home with leaders from many nations.

Ignorance of one another can lead to misunderstanding and conflict. The only way to correct this unhappy state is through first-hand knowledge, personal contacts, and a fruitful exchange of ideas.

I hope that all nations will respond enthusiastically to the invitation of the New York World's Fair in 1964. This will be a fine opportunity for their peoples to grow in mutual respect and friendship.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

U.S. SENATE,
March 24, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT KOPPLE,
Executive Vice President,
New York World's Fair 1964,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR BOB: The efforts which over the past few months have been devoted to a 1964 American World's Fair in New York City are now coming to fruition.

The job is by no means over. It is just beginning. The President's invitation to foreign countries to participate in a New York World's Fair in 1964 marks a beginning and a challenge—a challenge to fulfill all of our aims for a successful 1964 World's Fair promoting peace through understanding.

I commend all of the members of the New York 1964 World's Fair Corp. for the fine work which you have done. You may be assured of my continuing interest and cooperation in all of your future endeavors.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Unification Is Still a "Must"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Unification Is Still a Must," in the March 31 issue of the Washington Daily News. The editorial describes a unification plan suggested by Mr. Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr., an "angry man who quit his post as vice president of the Convair Division of the General Dynamics Corp. because he thought the Government wasn't doing enough in the defense field."

I heartily support Mr. Lanphier's suggestions. I made recommendations for a similar functional reorganization on the floor of the Senate on August 28 of last year. Mr. Lanphier proposes that we unify the services and that we create an integrated retaliatory force, an integrated limited war deterrent force, an integrated home defense against submarine and air attack, and an integrated logistic force to support the foregoing.

These suggestions are not new. They have been made before Mr. Lanphier and I made them. Yet the administration has failed to implement this or any other plan to eliminate the duplication, the waste motion, the inefficiency in our defense organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFICATION IS STILL A "MUST"

In all the criticism of how the Defense Department has been run during Dwight Eisenhower's terms as President, one charge seems less challegneable than the rest:

Little headway has been made in furthering real unification of the armed services.

The discouraging record prompts the question: If a man of Dwight Eisenhower's military prestige and knowledge could accomplish so little toward a goal to which he was dedicated, can anyone get the job done?

The answer remains, as has been the case since need for unification became so apparent after World War II, it must be done.

With the Defense Department spending half of each Government dollar, it obviously is of utmost importance that its billions be spent with greatest possible efficiency to get the "most bang for the buck." And it also is obvious that this can't be done with overlapping of service functions and the continuing interservice rivalries.

An interesting new unification plan has been put forth by Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr., an angry man who quit his post as vice president of the Convair Division of the General Dynamics Corp. because he thought the Government wasn't doing enough in the defense field. (The Government was his company's biggest customer.)

Proposes Mr. Lanphier: Unify the services with one promotion list and create an integrated retaliatory force; an integrated limited war deterrent force; an integrated home defense against submarine and air attack; and an integrated logistic force to support the foregoing.

We don't know whether Mr. Lanphier's plan is the best that can be evolved, but we do agree with him when he says "unification of the services * * * is urgently required if time, money and perhaps, our way of life is to be saved."

We hope the 1960 presidential nominees will give Mr. Lanphier's plan study and, if they don't agree with it, come up with specific programs of their own.

Real unification of the armed services is still a must.

Truth About Finance Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The States Shirk Another Duty." The editorial was published in the Denver Post of March 29, and supports my bill which calls for truth about finance charges.

I also submit, in the same connection, an article which was published in Newsweek for April 4.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 29, 1960]

THE STATES SHIRK ANOTHER DUTY

Strong support is developing in Washington for the bill sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, to require credit merchants, including automobile dealers, to tell their customers how much they are paying for merchandise and how much extra they are paying for interest, insurance, fees, etc.

"Dollar-down-and-dollar-forever" purchasers have long been victimized in many parts of the country by high interest charges and hidden supercharges for such things as insurance which will guarantee that the merchant gets his money even though the customer dies before completing the time payments.

All too often a buyer will sign a purchase contract and then learn, after he goes home and does some simple arithmetic, that he is being seriously penalized because he did not buy for cash.

Senator DOUGLAS would require installment merchants to furnish their customers readily understandable statements so they will know in advance how much they are paying for the credit they receive.

The Association of Better Business Bureaus, Inc., has endorsed this "truth about credit" bill. It also has the support of the Federal Reserve Board, although the Board would like to avoid the job, which Senator DOUGLAS would give it, of policing the bill.

The control of shady business in the installment credit field should be a State function, we believe, but when States fail in the job of rendering proper services to their people we must, inevitably, expect demands for Federal action.

Here is another example of the reason for the growing power and authority of the Federal Government. State governments constantly fall farther and farther behind in the matter of meeting modern problems.

Some States have tried to deal with installment credit rackets. A year ago a law similar to the bill Senator DOUGLAS has introduced in Congress was passed in Colorado. However, according to W. Dan Bell, head of the Denver Better Business Bureau, complaints regarding "hidden charges" still make up a high percentage of the cases reaching his agency.

A weakness of the Colorado law is its failure to provide for policing except through complaints made to local district attorneys, who are reluctant to prosecute except on a type of evidence which the ordinary installment buyer is unable to furnish.

Whether Senator DOUGLAS' bill is passed or not, he has succeeded in calling attention to a problem which must be solved. And he has served to remind those who harangue the loudest about States' rights that they could save themselves a lot of breath if States would take their duties as seriously as they take their rights.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

BUSINESS—BORROWING MONEY IN THE DARK

If John pays $7.50 interest for a 1-year, $250 loan, what is the interest rate? Any fifth grader knows the answer is 3 percent. Yet interest, like so much else, seems vastly more complicated in real life than it does in the fifth grade. After a recent survey of installment credit, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan said credit was the first subject it studied on which college-educated people were as badly informed as the rest of the populace. Muddled by installment payments, "discounted" interest, and extra charges, 39 percent of the consumers polled had no idea how much it cost them to buy their cars on time—and the 61 percent who had an answer guessed anything from under 6 percent to more than 13 percent.

Last week, a Senate Banking Subcommittee began hearings on Senate bill 2755 that—hopefully—would protect the Nation's bumpkin borrowers from themselves by making credit costs as simple as ABC. Subcommittee Chairman Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, Democrat, who wrote the bill, described it as a truth-in-lending bill aimed at enlightening consumers who, he said, are "deceived or misled" about the high interest costs of bank or finance-company loans, time purchases of autos and appliances, or retailers' charge accounts. The facts themselves, DOUGLAS clearly implied, might discourage enough borrowers to put a healthy crimp in consumer credit, which has swollen from $5.7 billion to $52 billion in the last 15 years—not including home-mortgage debt, up from $18.6 billion to $131.2 billion.

FACTS AND FIGURES

To get at the facts, and to cut through the confusion of figures that disguises the true cost of borrowing, DOUGLAS' bill would: Require banks, loan companies, auto financers, and other purveyors of installment loans to compute interest rates on the unpaid balance, rather than on the principal. (A buyer paying off a "6-percent" loan in 12 monthly installments is actually paying close to 12 percent for his money. He only has full use of the loan for 1 month. Each month he reduces it by the amount of his installment. Yet the 6 percent is calculated on the full amount.)

It would also require lenders to compute service charges, insurance costs, and other extras as part of the interest figure. (By padding extras, some dealers easily bypass usury laws, which limit only pure interest rates.)

The subcommittee heard a dossier full of horrible examples to boster DOUGLAS' case. Among them:

A Maryland loan company quoted a 6-percent rate for a loan where the actual cost—after allowing for service charge, insurance fee, discounting of the interest from the amount loaned, and the usual installment payments—was 22½ percent.

An unfranchised used-car dealer charged $187.65 on a loan of $300—11 monthly payments of $15 each, plus a final payment of $322.65. Simple annual interest rate: 62½ percent.

A 67-year-old Floridian can't afford to retire because he is faced with 17 more years of payments to finance a home-improvement bill. Cost of the improvements: $2,650. Total cost, including financing: $5,482.50.

Much of this springs from bait advertising that trumpets "no money down," "no carrying charges," or "name your own terms," while concealing a mare's nest of costly gimmicks, according to witness William Hussong, general manager of the 27,000-member Navy Federal Credit Union. "The housewife shopping for a dress looks at labels and compares prices," said Hussong. "Isn't a person shopping for credit entitled to the same protection?" President Harold Rosner, of Robert Hall Clothes, suggested that all merchants be required to display separate cash and installment price tags on their goods. This would discourage unhealthy credit, help prevent another recession, said Rosner. (It would also, presumably, help Robert Hall, which sells only for cash.)

IN REBUTTAL

Speaking for the consumer-credit men—the commercial banks and finance companies who have yet to testify—Chairman Thomas Boushall, of the Bank of Virginia, made it plain that the charges hurt. How, he asked at an American Bankers Association meeting last week, could the credit industry attack a bill that calls for honest disclosure—that seems, in fact, to approve of motherhood and disapprove of sin?

Yet the industry had some solid arguments. Translating extras into a simple interest rate would be an immensely complex task that would raise the cost of making loans—and the industry insists that borrowers care only about dollar costs, not interest rates, in any case. The industry also argues that merchants required to label their true installment costs could lower these to make them look good, then make it up by simply boosting prices.

But even if consumer-credit men are, as they claim, being roasted for the sins of a few unscrupulous fringe operators, they aren't likely to get much support in Congress, for good and political reasons. The outlook for S. 2755: No action before Congress adjourns, but a good chance for passage at the next Congress.

Wisconsin Program of Delinquency Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I had in my office a delightful group from Wisconsin—teachers, students, youth workers, and other participants in the White House Children and Youth Conference.

We have 62 million children in this great Nation today. I therefore believe that the White House conference is a constructive effort to promote opportunities for our children and youth to realize their full potential for a creative life in freedom and dignity. As stated by the President when calling the conference, the radically changing times in which we live makes it absolutely essential that we do everything we can to plan ahead in order to prepare today's children well for life in tomorrow's world. We must not be guilty of letting go to waste the talents of our greatest national asset—our children.

The visitors in my office yesterday were examples of the finest in Wisconsin citizenry. Oftentimes we become so concerned about our problem children and youthful offenders that we forget that

the great majority of our youth is devoted to the pursuit of positive values—to self-improvement the betterment of education, and the fuller exploitation of our human, material, and spiritual resources.

In this connection I should like to call attention and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent report by the Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare describing the extensive Wisconsin programs dealing with prevention and control of delinquency.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR ON THE STATE WELFARE PROGRAM

(By Director Wilbur J. Schmidt)

A. JUVENILE TRAINING SCHOOLS IN WISCONSIN

The program and philosophy of the training schools in Wisconsin is based on the premise that delinquent behavior and emotional conflicts in children are caused rather than inherited. The primary requisites in a positive program of rehabilitation for the delinquent child are sufficient skilled staff and a sound operational philosophy which may be summarized as follows: To provide a healthy environment in which antisocial, disturbed adolescents can grow in physical and emotional stature with the counsel of those who understand the fears and needs of youth and have the knowledge to help them work out a better way of facing life's problems. In order to achieve the objectives of training and treatment in a juvenile training school, we feel that it is essential that we have a trained dedicated staff, adequate physical facilities and create an institutional environment conducive to positive training and treatment of the individual child.

The three State training schools for juveniles or delinquent children are as follows: The Wisconsin School for Boys, Waukesha; the Wisconsin School for Boys, Wales; and the Wisconsin School for Girls, Oregon. These training schools are institutional units of the division of corrections of the State department of public welfare established for the purpose of providing residential care, treatment and training for boys and girls between 12 and 18 years of age who have been adjudged delinquent in one of the counties of the State.

One recent program innovation which is regarded as having considerable merit in improving the treatment program of a training school is the establishment of "cottage councils" at the Wisconsin School for Girls, Oregon.

In this organizational setup of cottage councils, the psychiatrist and psychologist act primarily as consultants to the social workers and the cottage staff. Problems of personality, functioning and intelligence might be referred to the psychologist by the social worker for selected testing of the youngster's concern. The psychiatrist is consulted to analyze the dynamics of certain behaivor patterns and to give advice as to the approaches of these difficulties. Depending on the time available, the psychologist also sees the youngsters for therapy individually and in groups. They aid staff training and development by participating in conferences at the request of the council concerned.

Numerous benefits have already been realized from this system of cottage councils as it has brought about a truly integrated treatment program for each girl.

In effect, the eventual goal at the Wisconsin School for Girls is not to have an institution in the traditional sense for about 200 girls, but rather 10 group homes run in accordance with the needs of the individual students housed therein and the ability and skill of the counselors involved. The economic advantages of having a relatively large institution with professional skills available can be preserved, but at the same time some of the disadvantages of regimentation, blanket rules and policies covering all contingencies can be eliminated. Although there must be some general policies as a framework in which to operate, each cottage will be operated on the basis of the needs of the group.

B. WISCONSIN DIAGNOSTIC CENTER

The Wisconsin Diagnostic Center concentrates a considerable amount of its efforts toward doing consultation work for the juvenile courts throughout the State. It is available for study of any child or adolescent referred by the juvenile court judges. The referrals from this source may be of a variety of types, ranging from the small child, age 5 and 6, who has shown up as grossly disorganized in kindergarten, to the teenager who has been involved in some type of well-organized acting out in the community. Even though these children are all referred by the juvenile court judge, they certainly cannot all be considered as delinquent. Therefore, the center plays a significant role in prevention of deliquency as well as in the evaluation and treatment of the delinquent.

In an effort to be more available to the community agencies, namely the juvenile court, an increasing amount of outpatient psychiatric consultation is being offered in order that the court can have at least the type of psychiatric study as additional information which can then be used in making the decision as to disposition of the child whom they are concerned with.

There are semantic difficulties in defining delinquency. Assuming that by delinquency is meant behavior by children which is against the laws or mores of a community, it is apparent that skillful diagnosis is the first essential in an effective program of services for delinquents. The overt and obvious cases of mental illness and mental retardation may be selected out and excluded from this group in a rather gross fashion on some occasions, and this is important. Ideally, a treatment program should be able to sort out these various factors involved and direct their treatment efforts in the direction which is appropriate for each of these boys.

C. COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC SERVICES

Chapter 317, Laws of 1959, provides for the establishment of a program of community mental health clinic services in Wisconsin, with State subsidy and State assistance in development and operation of preventive and treatment services for mental health. The intent of this legislation is to meet not only the needs of children, but an ever-increasing coverage of the total mental health needs of the community which each clinic will serve. The part which these clinics will play in the prevention of delinquency is inherent to the movement of all child guidance clinics which focuses not only on the individual child, but also the counseling services rendered to parents in case situations. There are already some 17 child guidance clinics, developed over the years largely through local initiative, in operation throughout the State. Numerous other counties are intently studying the need for and possibility of developing such services.

D. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES RELATING TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The department has many responsibilities relating to community activities in the juvenile area. The Department of Public Welfare has the responsibility to provide certain community services focused on the prevention of delinquency. The responsibility is carried on by the Division for Children and Youth through community services staff specialists located in the central office and six field consultants located in various district offices. The specialists include consultants on juvenile courts, juvenile law enforcement, recreation, education, group work, youth participation, and research.

Delinquency prevention work requires some means of checking the "pulse" of the delinquency problem. Consequently, the Division for Children and Youth, in collaboration with several State organizations, has developed statewide statistical reporting systems on children processed by law enforcement agencies and by juvenile courts. Reporting is not universal and various other factors demand caution in the interpretation of the figures. However, with 60 juvenile courts reporting in both 1957 and 1958 there was a 3 percent increase in the number of delinquency referrals. With 75 law enforcement agencies reporting in both of these years there was a 4.5 percent increase in juvenile apprehensions. At the same time, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that Wisconsin's child population increased approximately 4 percent, so the research staff concludes that "juvenile delinquency" apparently did not accelerate in Wisconsin between 1957 and 1958.

Turning to specific activities aimed at delinquency prevention, a major technique that has been developed is the community survey. These surveys help communities to make a self-appraisal of their own organization and services for the prevention and treatment of delinquency. Staff consultants are active in the factfinding stage, present these facts to citizen committees, and help the citizens to draw conclusions. The citizens, themselves, determine the recommendations to be made in the community. Following the survey itself a field consultant is active in the followup stage, helping the momentum to continue so recommendations can be put into action. Since 1948 a total of 21 community surveys have been completed.

Recently the community services staff have been engaged in two projects for the so-called hard-to-reach youth. These are youth who are not reached by the traditional group work, recreation, or casework programs. They are youth who worry a community and may be on the verge of delinquency or actually commit delinquency. They may or may not be "gangs" in the usual sense of the word. At the request of the Milwaukee Community Welfare Council and County Youth Commission the division for children and youth has been developing the design for a demonstration project for hard-to-reach youth. The design will shortly be submitted to the two organizations, and implementations will begin.

The many other prevention activities can best be summarized by the areas in which special consultants are working:

1. Consideration is being given to developing a statistical reporting system for juvenile detention to get more reliable, accurate information on detention in Wisconsin. Limited information suggests there is a wide variation in the adequacy of detention programs.

2. Juvenile law enforcement: In cooperation with the University of Wisconsin, training courses for juvenile officers have been conducted for a number of years. In the last 7 years approximately 900 officers have attended the 3-day institute. A 2-week course given annually since 1955 has given more extensive training to 96 juvenile officers. The majority of the latter officers after returning to their own communities acted as trainers for officers who could not attend.

3. Recreation: Most of the work outside of community surveys has consisted of consul-

tation to communities interested in evaluating their recreational needs or desiring help in developing recreation programs. The consultant has been used in the inservice training program for counselors at the training school for boys.

4. Education: Work has begun toward the development of school social worker programs in local schools, because schools are a key organization in the early identification and treatment of delinquency and emotional problems. The consultant is working with the department of public instruction and the schools of education and social work at the University of Wisconsin in reaching agreement on the graduate curriculum for social work students who, on graduation, can be certified as school social workers.

5. Group work: Help has been given the various group work agencies (Y's, Scouts, etc.), by assisting in the training courses necessary for volunteers. Major time is spent in providing staff service to the Wisconsin Committee on Children and Youth, a statewide committee with State, district, and county organizations. The committee is developed from the 1950 White House Conference on Children and Youth to implement the recommendations of that meeting and has remained active since that time. It conducts the biennial Governor's conferences on children and youth and is the group through which Wisconsin's participation in the 1960 White House Conference is being carried out.

6. Youth participation: Wisconsin's nationally known youth participation program is carried on through State, district, and local committees, all of which receive staff services from the Division for Children and Youth. The program aims at helping youth to become responsibly involved in community affairs and projects, with active support and encouragement from adults. At district conferences and biennial State conferences youth and adults are brought together to discuss mutual problems and make plans for solution.

7. Research: In addition to the statistical reporting systems and research projects already mentioned, various other research is occurring. Within the Madison community survey a special study was done of the dispositions made by police for all youngsters apprehended in a 6-months' period. The results, which will be published shortly, will give the citizens a picture of the gaps of service in Madison and the difficulties in coordinating efforts.

Eau Claire County is interested in doing a major study on the causes of delinquency. Staff help is being given in designing the project, and the county will be assised in finding resources to finance the project.

8. Other: Various miscellaneous services are given over the State. Currently Division for Children and Youth field staff is working with the Commission on Human Rights in the town of Oneida, where the tribal council is concerned with problems of drinking which are having serious effect on family life. Milwaukee County wanted to develop a demonstration program of protective services for families near to breakdown, but neither State nor Federal funds are available for this initial step toward the county's assuming financial responsibility.

In addition to the delinquency prevention efforts described above, we have a conviction that strong, basic across-the-board public welfare services are equally important in a prevention program, even if less dramatic and more indirect. For example, along with the community services staff the division for children and youth has programs and staff concentrating on strengthening services to families so breakdown will be prevented.

Fish Farming Begins in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the problem of the passage of fish around the high dams of our Pacific Northwest rivers is an extremely complex matter.

As a step toward a solution of this problem, efforts are being made in the West to develop successful fish farming projects. An excellent article concerning one of these projects appears in the March 1960 issue of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin, under the authorship of Mr. Bill Cook.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Fish Farming Begins in Oregon," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH FARMING BEGINS IN OREGON

(By Bill Cook)

Fish farming has arrived in Oregon with the help of the Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative and the interested citizens of Gold Beach.

A 14-acre pond on Libby Creek, 8 miles from the mouth of the Rogue River, lies waiting for the first planting of fall chinook salmon late in March.

The idea of introducing fish farming into Oregon came during the annual meeting of the Northwest Public Power Association in 1958. Milo Moore, Director of Fisheries for the State of Washington, addressed the group, telling about the success of fish farming, especially as practiced in Japan.

The directors and manager of Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative were impressed with the possibilities of the plan, particularly for their area which includes some 100 miles of the southern Oregon coast. They initiated a feasibility survey and information program to acquaint the people of the area with the possibilities.

CITIZENS ORGANIZE

The citizens organized a local chapter of the nonprofit organization, Salmon Unlimited, and carried through the project independent of State aid. Interest and enthusiasm was high, for fishing is close to the hearts of everyone in Gold Beach. For a community of less than 3,000 persons in a 2-year period to build a $22,000 fish farm with an actual cash outlay of approximately $9,000 speaks well for the continued citizen support.

As the group awaits the arrival of the first fingerlings, they have paid off most of the indebtedness and expect to meet the necessary expenses of the fish farm when it is in operation.

The decline of the spring chinook run in the Rogue River is a matter of deep concern for the people of Gold Beach. Sportsmen from all over the Nation journey to this Oregon community for the spring fishing. With a good and continuing spring run, the fishing season at Gold Beach extends almost the year around. It is a needed part of the economy of that area.

FISH FARMING

Fish farming in its simplest form is merely the raising of food fish in impounded waters. In relation to salmon it is the rearing of salmon fingerlings in a natural habitat for a certain period of time and their release into a natural salmon run stream.

This has two advantages over the hatchery method where the fingerlings are kept in concrete pools and are fed. First, the fingerlings when released into the stream are better oriented and able to fend for themselves. Second, the cost of rearing fingerlings in fish farms is but a fraction of that of the hatchery method.

The fish farm method takes advantage of the natural feed in lakes and ponds and the feed can be increased by certain types of fertilization. Since the highest mortality rate of salmon fingerlings is in fresh water as they are going to sea, the hardier the fingerlings, the higher the percent of return of the mature salmon at the end of the 4-year cycle.

The fish farming program has been sparked in both Oregon and Washington by the efforts of Milo Moore. When Moore assumed his duties with the State of Washington, he brought with him the results of 8 years of study and research on fish farming techniques which he had observed in various parts of the world and the United States. He carries belief and enthusiasm for fish farming as a step in the right direction to bring back the salmon runs to the coastal streams of the Pacific Northwest.

As the Oregon group goes into its third year of existence, the futuer looks good. Rollin Bowles, president of Salmon Unlimited, is also on the Oregon State Game Commission. He works closely with Albert Day, director of the Oregon Fish Commission, as well as with P. W. Schneider, director of the Oregon State Game Commission. They believe even closer cooperation can be achieved the coming year.

The people working for these projects, and particularly the interested citizens of Coos and Curry counties believe that salmon and civilization are not incompatible. They feel that through the cooperation of all interested parties a way can be found whereby dams, lumbermills and pulp plants can live side by side with salmon runs. These salmon runs will provide both commercial and sports fishermen with a good livelihood and ample recreation. Through the arrival of the fish farming program, they hope the generation to come can fish in waters where truly are salmon unlimited.

The Automobile in Modern America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the growth and development of America, a major vehicle of progress have been the automobile.

Over the years, the auto has become an integral part of family, business, commercial, and industrial life of our great country.

Over three-fourths of all auto trips are connected with people's jobs and business and professional work. At the same time, over 80 percent of vacationing Americans travel in the family car.

In addition to transportation for a wide variety of purposes, the auto industry—as we learned painfully during such events as strikes—is extremely important to our economy in terms of jobs,

markets for the wide variety of raw-and-finished products that go into automaking, the general business activity surrounding sales and service of the 70 million motor vehicles registered in the United States—and, not to be overlooked, the auto industry, and its workers, are substantial contributors to the coffers of Uncle Sam.

Recently, the Automobile Manufacturers Association, published an informative booklet entitled "Automobile Facts and Figures."

Reflecting the significance of this important industry to our country, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the booklet—outlining the highlights of the industry—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMOBILE FACTS AND FIGURES—HIGHLIGHTS

Motor vehicle factory sales in 1959 totaled 6,728,644 units, including 5,591,243 passenger cars, 1,137,401 trucks and motor coaches. These automotive products had a combined wholesale value of $12,880 billion. Replacement parts sales totaled $2.2 billion.

More than 175 million motor vehicles have been produced in the United States since the industry's birth in 1896.

Ownership of motor vehicles is at an all-time high. U.S. vehicle registrations totaled 70.4 million in 1959, including 58.6 million passenger cars and 11.8 million trucks and buses.

Nearly three out of four families own automobiles.

Multicar households have increased 67 percent in 5 years. More than 18 percent of car-owning families or 13.5 percent of all families now own two or more automobiles.

Motor vehicle travel in the United States set a new record of nearly 700 billion miles during 1959.

The automobile is the leading passenger transporter in the United States, handling 89 percent of all intercity travel.

Of the 81.5 million drivers in the United States, 38.2 percent are women. A survey of car use by women drivers shows that nearly half use their car on a daily basis.

Taxes take 21 cents of the automotive retail sales dollar.

Special highway-user taxes in 1959 climbed to a record $9.3 billion. Trucks alone paid $2.7 billion.

One out of every six business firms in the United States is in the automotive field.

One out of every seven employed persons works in a highway transport industry—a total of 10.4 million automotive jobs.

U.S. automotive companies have a total of about 1.7 million stockholders.

Farmers operate more than 3 million trucks and 4.3 million passenger cars.

THE AUTOMOBILE IN MODERN AMERICA

A BIG COUNTRY ON WHEELS

America is a big country; and Americans are a people to spread out over the land, to go places and to see things. It is this combination of a big land and people on the go that has made the automobile such a vital part of 20th century American life.

Three-fourths of American families today own cars. The family car is woven into every pattern of living—filling daily transportation needs for work, play, and social activity.

EARNING A LIVING

The modern motor car is at the very economic base of life in America today. In cities, the family breadwinner usually gets to work or conducts his business by automobile.

Travel connected with a job, or with business and professional work, accounts for three-fourths of all auto trips in the United States. And the farmer depends on his car or truck to link him with markets and sources of supply.

BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER

It often is said that no other single thing has had a greater part in unifying the Nation and ending the dreariness of rural isolation than the automobile.

Even though friends and relatives live far apart or far off "beaten paths," frequent reunions, parties, and informal visits—with modern roads and cars—are taken for granted in today's America.

A SPORTS-LOVING PEOPLE

Americans are the greatest sports-loving people on earth and modern motor transportation furthers this natural inclination. The Nation's sports enthusiasts drive billions of miles a year.

Common sights in the United States: Cars loaded with skis or fishing gear, fresh-killed game or golf clubs; baseball parks and football stadiums amid fields of automobiles; bowling alley parking lots filled to capacity.

MAKING MORE OF LEISURE

Leisure-time acivity grows each year. Enjoyed to its fullest, it calls for travel—travel to places of interest and recreation.

In 1 year, more than a billion visits are made to U.S. city and county parks. Millions visit State and National parks—primarily by car.

VACATIONING ON THE ROAD

Vacationing is a national tradition shared by all.

More than 80 percent of vacationing Americans travel in the family car which can take them and their luggage from home doorstep to the most remote beach, lodge, or campsite. Many simply go touring, stopping each night at a new place along the ever-challenging road.

COMMUNITY LIFE ENRICHED

The ready mobility made possible by family car ownership has transformed American community life. People in cities have spread out into self-contained suburbs, providing their own transportation. The family automobile takes the children to school, library, or doctor's office; brings the whole family to religious services or community events. Last, but not least, it is often commissioned for the pleasant family chore of shopping.

AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

President, L. L. Colbert.
Vice president, Henry Ford II.
Vice president, J. N. Bauman.
Secretary, John F. Gordon.
Treasurer, W. C. Schumacher.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

J. N. Bauman, the White Motor Co.
Robert F. Black, the White Motor Co.
Ernest R. Breech, Ford Motor Co.
Harold E. Churchill, Studebaker-Packard Corp.
L. L. Colbert, Chrysler Corp.
Frederic G. Donner, General Motors Corp.
Henry Ford II, Ford Motor Co.
John F. Gordon, General Motors Corp.
Edgar F. Kaiser, Kaiser Industries Corp.
William C. Newberg, Chrysler Corp.
George Romney, American Motors Corp.
W. C. Schumacher, International Harvester Co.

Managing director: Harry A. Williams.
Manager, statistical department: Stanley S. Roe.

Our Taxes Buy Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Ralph McGill, entitled "Our Taxes Buy Civilization," and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1960.

Too many people think the cost of survival will be cheaper tomorrow than today, and that survival can, somehow or other, be bought in the bargain basement. Mr. McGill makes effective reply to that attitude.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR TAXES BUY CIVILIZATION—ACCEPTANCE OF TAXES AND ELECTIONS CALLED TWO OF AMERICA'S STRENGTHS

(By Ralph McGill)

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was making out his income tax. A secretary, assisting, commented it seemed unfair for a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to be so taxed.

"I like taxes," said the Justice. "With them a man buys civilization."

His conclusion is a true one.

And the fact very few persons think it out to the point where they like taxes because of what taxes buy doesn't alter that fact at all.

Taxes do, indeed, buy our civilization. And especially do they buy the peculiar American civilization which has seen the capitalist system flourish as it never did in the days of little taxes. It has flourished because of taxes which have provided the capitalist system with a social conscience.

There are always those persons who act as if, and seem really to believe, taxes are taken from them and spent somehow and somewhere without any return. "When," speakers and editorialists solemnly and unrealistically ask, "will politicians find a way to reduce taxes rather than increase them?"

The answer to that is obvious.

They never will find a way to decrease them. There may be reductions here and there, but there will, in time, be compensating increases for the reason there must be—we are buying our kind of civilization, and we are buying it for a steadily increasing population demanding more services.

It is a civilization which provides hospital and medical care for the indigent poor; and it is a civilization which looks after public health so that waves of plagues and epidemics of various kinds do not strike us, killing millions as they did in the old days of man's civilization. Taxes pay for that. It is a civilization which looks after the sewerage systems. It is one which produces pure water so that one does not have to boil it before drinking, as must be done in many nations of the world. It is a civilization which collects and disposes of garbage, instead of leaving it to be reduced by buzzards, rats, and hordes of dogs, as is done in many parts of the world.

It is a civilization which provides roads and highway systems at great cost because the people of our peculiar civilization like to be on the move, to possess great mo-

bility, to drive 500 or more miles to be on the coast or in the mountains for a weekend.

Ours is a civilization which pays taxes for public schools. There are enemies of our civilization who shrewdly seek to discredit those schools. They are always in our midst—slyly or openly opposing bond issues for the needed new schools—protesting we need only the little red schoolhouse idea; attacking teachers—anything to avoid paying taxes which will provide public education.

One of the great strengths of our civilization has been that we accept the results of elections. (We failed to do that just once and paid a staggering price in blood, wealth, and death. We are yet paying for it in wealth and social wounds. The cost of refusing to accept an election was the War Between the States.)

The second of our great strengths is that we have always accepted the fact that we must pay taxes. Many peoples do not. The French have resisted. Few of the Latin American countries, for example, believe in paying taxes. There is none with a truly equitable system. This is one of the basic reasons for their traditional unstability of government.

Here in our country there are increasing voices which seek to make Americans unwilling to pay taxes. They encourage Americans to want services—but paradoxically they raise their voices against taxes. Our population increases. There are more people for more services. Our birth rate is up. Our old people live longer. The very young and the old pay no taxes. We will pay more.

We can insist on honesty. The graft in all cities and in many State governments is shocking. It is abuse of tax money, not taxes, which weaken a nation's will. Public emphasis in the future must be increasingly directed against waste and graft. The tax structure must be remodeled but the need for taxes will continue.

There is no escape. If we want our kind of civilization we must pay taxes. They buy civilization.

Medical Statuary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon is justly proud of Dr. John McLoughlin, whose figure towers over early Oregon history. It is with particular pleasure that I note Dr. Winfred Overholser has referred to him in an article on medical statuary, which was printed in the January 1960 issue of the Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON MEDICAL STATUARY

Among the many statues which adorn our fair city, statues of generals, statesmen, lawyers, orators, and others, at least six are those of physicians. Some of these are familiar to us, their colleagues; others are not. Our readers may therefore be interested in knowing something about brother practitioners who have been memorialized in bronze. Three of the statues are in the open, three in Statuary Hall of the Capitol. Rather than following this distribution, however, let us consider the subjects chronologically.

Benjamin Rush (1745–1813) was the foremost American physician of his day. Born in Philadelphia, he was educated under Cullen at the University of Edinburgh, graduating in 1768. He then entered practice in Philadelphia. He was Surgeon General in the Continental Army and was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was professor of the Institutes and Practice of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania and wrote voluminously, among his works being "Medical Inquiries and Observations Upon the Diseases of the Mind" (1812), the first systematic treatise on the subject by an American. His statue, dedicated June 11, 1904, in the presence of President Theodore Roosevelt, Dr. William Osler, and other distinguished persons, stands on the grounds of the old Naval Hospital at Twenty-third and D Streets NW.

Christian Samuel Hahnemann (1755–1843) was born in Meissen, Saxony, and died in Paris, France. He was graduated in medicine at Erlangen in 1779 and was a successful practitioner. He was a linguist as well and translated many medical works. Rebelling at the polypharmacy and huge doses prevalent in his day, he developed the law of similars, advocating, too, the mimimal dose and the single remedy. These became the basis of the homeopathic school of medicine, the principles of which he set forth in the "Organon of the Rational Art of Healing." His monument, the most elaborate of all the medical statuary of Washington, stands in a conspicuous place in Scott Circle. The seated statue of Hahnemann is placed in the center of a large granite exedra, with four bronze entablatures. It was unveiled June 21, 1900, in the presence of President McKinley. As long ago as that, the cost was approximately $48,000.

Ephraim McDowell (1771–1830) was born in Rockbridge County, Va. He attended the University of Edinburgh for the session of 1793–94 (his only M.D. was honorary, conferred by the University of Maryland in 1832), and then went into practice in Danville, Ky. In 1809 he performed the first ovariotomy in history. The patient survived and lived to a ripe old age. A granite obelisk in his honor was unveiled in Danville in 1879, with Samuel D. Gross as orator. McDowell's statue stands in Statuary Hall. A commemorative stamp bearing his likeness was issued in December 1959.

John McLoughlin (1784–1857) was born in Quebec Province and learned medicine under his grandfather. Early in life he became associated with the Hudson Bay Co. in the Fort William District and later in the Oregon country as supervisor. He was apparently to all intents the Governor and protected the Americans against the Indians. He practiced medicine and surgery in addition to his administrative duties, and founded the first hospital of the great Northwest. He became an American citizen in 1849 and is often referred to as the father of Oregon. His statue stands in Statuary Hall.

Samuel D. Gross (1805–1884) was born near Easton, Pa., and graduated from Jefferson Medical College in 1828. He taught anatomy, pathology, and surgery and gave the first lectures on pathologic anatomy in the United States in 1835. From 1856 to 1882 he was professor of surgery at his alma mater. He wrote treatises on surgery and pathologic anatomy and many articles and translations. So wide was his fame that he received honorary degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh. His statue, now to be seen to the north of the National Library of Medicine, Seventh Street and Independence Avenue SW., was unveiled May 5, 1897, W. W. Keen being the orator of the day. Gross' name is also to be found in the mosaics of the Library of Congress.

Crawford W. Long (1815–78) was born in Madison County, Ga. He attended Franklin College (now the University of Georgia), where he was the roommate of Alexander Stephens, later Vice President of the Confederacy. He graduated in medicine from the University of Pennsylvania in 1839 and returned to practice in his native State. In March, 1842 he used ether an as anesthetic when operating on a patient to excise a tumor of the neck. This was undoubtedly the first such use, but Dr. Long did not publicize his feat until 1849, when he wrote an account in the Southern Medical and Surgical Journal. Thus he did not receive the sort of attention that Morton (a dentist) did 4 years later at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Dr. Long's statue is in Statuary Hall. His face appeared on a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in 1940.

This is a distinguished group indeed of physicians who did much for mankind. It would be pleasant to record that our own fellow member, Dr. William Thornton (1761–1828), the Architect of the Capitol, had been similarly honored. However, his monument, in the words of Horace, is aere perennius, more enduring than bronze. Of him we can say, as in Sir Christopher Wren's epitaph, "Si monumentum exegis, circumspice."

Man of the Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was recently honored by the National Aviation Club. This club has a membership of 2,000 representing all branches of aviation.

The Senator from Oklahoma is one of the leading authorities in the aviation field. His interest in this field dates back to the early days of aviation when he was a writer. As the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Aviation we all look to him as our authority on aviation legislation.

The National Aviation Club recognized the great interest which Senator MONRONEY has had in this field and his leadership in Congress in fostering aviation when they awarded him their Man of the Month award. The Senator from Oklahoma is the first Member of Congress so honored.

Mr. Richard E. Fell, president of the National Aviation Club, made the Man of the Month presentation at the ceremony recently which I had the honor of attending. I ask unanimous consent that the tribute made by Mr. Fell at the presentation ceremony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When it was first suggested that Senator MONRONEY be honored as man of the month, I recalled that this is a political year.

So I consulted several stanch Republicans to see whether our club might be accused of being partisan.

They were unanimous not only in saying that there would be no such feeling but in urging that the Senator be so honored.

Aviation over the years has been fortunate indeed with its champions in Congress. They have been men of imagination matching that of the builders of aviation.

When civil aviation has needed strong champions they were there. When it needed thoughtful champions, it has had them. In Senator MONRONEY it has had one who is both strong and thoughtful at a time when there has been great need for both qualities.

I am not going to dwell upon the Senator's many accomplishments in life or the fact that he is a Phi Beta Kappa, a former newspaperman and an aviation writer.

Some of you may raise eyebrows at that last differentiation but there is a subtle difference.

In the days of the 1920's when the Senator was writing aviation no newspaperman would be caught without a hat on, indoors or out. And no one who flew could be caught with one on.

Those were the days of "The front page," which type cast all newspapermen for the hat industry, and open cockpit, did not lend themselves tailored splendor.

Lest you think the Senator's contributions to aviation on the national scene are only recent or even rigidly partisan, he entered Congress in 1939 and was instrumental in the establishment of what is now Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma City, and the location of the Douglas plants in Tulsa and Oklahoma City.

He led the fight in the House against the Air Force cutbacks in 1949.

He was elected to the Senate in 1950 and in 1955 became the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Legislative results for which the Senator is responsible have been most impressive.

The current Federal Airport Act, permanent certification of local service airlines, the new Dulles International Airport, the act permitting reinvestment of capital gains by air carriers, the guaranteed loan act and the vital aviation legislation of recent years—the creation of the independent Federal Aviation Agency—all have seen the guiding hand of Senator MONRONEY.

I think it is safe to say that never before in the history of legislation on behalf of aviation have so many major bills been passed and signed into law in so brief a period.

(Presentation of award.)

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Minority Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, one of the outstanding addresses given during the recent White House Conference on Children and Youth was given by an outstanding South Dakotan—Mr. Robert L. Bennett, acting area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Aberdeen, S. Dak.

During one of the forums, Mr. Bennett discussed the many handicaps of American minority groups and the responsibilities of the dominant society toward those groups.

Although he is most familiar with the problems of our Indian people, Mr. Bennett by no means limited the scope of his very thoughtful remarks to them. I think it most appropriate that his remarks be called to the attention of the Senate during the civil rights debate in which we have been engaged these many weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's speech, given at forum 18 of the White House Conference on Children and Youth on March 21, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(By Robert Bennett, acting area director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen, S. Dak.)

I am happy to have the opportunity to present for your consideration some points of view developed in the course of almost 50 years of observation and experience as a member of various minority groups—as a member of a minority racial group, as a member of a minority religious group, and finally as a bureaucrat among many taxpayers.

The validity of the points of view expressed here should be measured by you as you evaluate them agninst what you already know—and what you may learn—in the discussions this week, as all of us seek to find out how to provide opportunities by which children and youth may realize their full potential for creative life in freedom and dignity.

If you do not subscribe to these views, then you must determine for yourselves to what views you will subscribe. If you do subscribe to these views, then you must determine what course of action you plan to take in carrying out these convictions.

The masses of people of the world are not as concerned with sputniks as they are with social problems of minority groups. This concern exists largely because social patterns prescribed in the past by dominant groups for natives of newly discovered areas, and later for minorities, were crystallized into legal systems from which subjected peoples throughout the world are now seeking freedom and independence.

There is one such group, well represented here for the first time, whose ancestors met the boat on which most of your ancestors arrived.

INDIAN TRANSACTIONS

The American Indian tribes, like other native peoples of the world, have been subject to legal systems involving treaty-making, ceding of land, and rights of occupancy. In the process of settling the land and bringing vast territories into a federated union of States, now known as the United States, a modicum of legality in land acquisition gave respectability to transactions with separate Indian tribes.

For individuals within the tribes these experiences held no dignity nor promise. From such experiences they found themselves forced into patterns of acceptance and accommodation where they were made prisoners of war, compelled under forced marches to leave localities familiar to them, and refused settlement along with other settlers. The reservation system, though quite legal and useful to territorial settlers, also proved effective in isolating individuals and families of Indians from the mainstream of social and economic development.

Over a long period of time Indian tribes came to look upon these reserves as places of refuge from the "civilization" which threatened to engulf them. Later there began to be a movement of Indians away from these reservations, largely in search of education and new experiences. Now, Indian youth and young adults of all tribes are moving into the dominant group and utilizing structures of that group to establish and maintain a new way of life.

COPING WITH FRUSTRATION

For those who are not able to cope with the frustrations which come about from failure to make an adequate adjustment, those things detrimental to their physical and social well-being become the pattern. This pattern is illustrated by the statistics of one State which reveal that although only 4 percent of the population is of Indian descent, 25 percent of those in the Boys' Training School are Indian, 50 percent of those in the Girls' Training School are Indian and 33⅓ percent of those in the State penitentiary are Indians with an average age of less tahn 25 years.

They are the products of a society that has oriented them for a different world and with their emergence they find themselves caught between two worlds.

In their old world they find there is very little concern for the future—that one lives in complete harmony with nature—that in return nature will provide for their consumption those things essential to life. This is contrasted with the other world where there exists a real concern for the future—where nature is to be exploited for the benefit of man—and where production is the basis of our economic survival.

LIMITED SOCIAL LIFE

For the most part, Indian young people grow up in rural areas far removed from industrial activity and those resources which can contribute to their social development. All the knowledge about the other world is obtained from between the covers of a textbook. Their limited socializing experiences leave them little equipped with the social skills necessary for their satisfactory and healthy personality adjustment.

With a concept of time based upon the present only, they lack orientation to a future-oriented society. They feel the enjoyment of the moment should not be marred by a concern for tomorrow. As products of a society without a concept for time, Indian young people find it difficult to understand or keep pace with their youthful counterparts of a time-oriented society in their frenzied search for security.

Living in the homes of their parents and grandparents does not give them the opportunity to observe as daily examples people who are well adjusted to the society around them. There have not emerged a sufficient number of cultural heroes from their social system to provide images for emulation.

They have a fear of the prejudices in the communities around them and those who obtain social acceptance in those communities do not champion the cause of those who are left behind.

Their educational opportunities have been limited so that only now can it be said that for the first time there is available educational opportunity for every Indian child of elementary school age.

LANGUAGE BARRIERS

Social exchange and communication among ancestors in their various tribal groups were limited by the 200 native languages spoken by the various Indian Tribes. The only common language was the English language of their conquerors.

They come from the most economically destitute minority group with a life expectancy of little more than one-half of the general population. Their instinct for preservation has promoted a very high birthrate and there has been a 50-percent increase in population over the last 25 years with 50 percent of the present population being under 19 years of age.

Their society demands that members share with each other for the benefit of the tribal group. This social obligation has forced parents to deny to their own children many economic and social advantages.

Due to mechanization of agriculture, job opportunity for the unskilled in proximity of their homes has been lost and their economy is based upon a relief program which over a sustained period is resulting in deteriorating personalities.

Finally, spiritual insecurity prevails as their native religious principles and teachings are lost with the death of their elders and the new Christianity is not so understood as to fill the spiritual gap caused by this loss.

SOME TRIUMPH

Out of this background are emerging some, of which there are several at this conference but far too few, outstanding Indian youth. The fact that these few personalities have survived social deterioration gives us hope as well as evidence that with sympathetic understanding and opportunity, this number can be greatly increased. They can become a part of the total community bringing with them the contributions of their heritage to enrich all of our lives.

Their struggle for a meaningful way of life in our society is that of all minority groups in the world who have joined issue with the dominant group to reach an understanding of the values of human life.

What is the challenge of our society in fostering this emergence of Indian children and youth with self-respectful images of themselves.

SUGGESTED GOALS

May I suggest some goals for action which would benefit Indian children and youth in the building of self-concepts of themselves and in leading more productive lives.

Movements to evaluate textbooks material and supplement it where desirable on the concepts of Indians taught to all children would be timely.

Special opportunities should be provided for children and youth on reservations to benefit from leadership training and group participation programs. These programs help children and youth to gain some insight into the attitudes which help them cope with life in the communities around them. This requires financing and this is not provided for in present Federal, State, local, or voluntary programs.

Because of the islands of poverty in which they live where the poverty of social experience is more acute, well-defined programs of summer visitation to families within communities where social experiences are richer would provide beneficial opportunities. This poverty suggests also the need for scholarship and aid programs for Indian students at the high school and junior high school level.

Mental hygiene services, already too limited for all children, are more and more necessary for Indian children and youth in conflict. Recognition and acceptance of responsibility by States is suggested not only for services but also for protection within the legal system used to safeguard all children. A study of reservation Indian children and youth in the American legal system is long overdue and would be most helpful to tribes, the States, and Federal Government.

To these suggestions could be added the relocation of families for educational reasons and other socializing experiences within the social setting of the community in which lies their hope for economic and social betterment.

ERASE MINORITY STATUS

The major courses of action of the next decade with respect to minorities should be directed toward diminishing minority status as a factor in the lives of individuals.

The existence of a minority depends upon the power of one group to dominate another socially, economically, and politically. When this domination restricts the freedom of the minority then conflicts arise between the groups, within the groups and finally within the individuals themselves.

What people will do who come under this kind of domination depends a great deal upon the bitterness quotient generated by the dominant group. This group which may feel a sense of responsibility, if at all responsive to the precepts of freedom and Christianity, nevertheless seeks to relieve itself of this responsibility by seeking refuge behind a self-serving set of values arrived at by rationalizing their position with tradition—if nothing else.

We must therefore set forth a premise that we can build a society in which we begin to diminish minorities and develop a total community identity. Only when this is done, can a capitalistic and democratic society develop to its fullest potential and provide that atmosphere essential for children and youth to have the opportunity to realize their capabilities for creative life in freedom and dignity.

MINORITIES ADJUST

Minorities learn through education, experience and within-group training to develop methods of coping with their minority status.

The Negroes who were immigrated here by compelling invitation accommodated themselves to the pattern set for them and by rationalization seemed almost to accept their secondary role. This role was created by the dominant group, who built an image for the Negro which was designed to be useful in maintaining the power structure of the dominant group. This accounted for the stereotypes ascribed to the Negro race. However, a different image of Negro personality developed by the Negro himself through education and experience is emerging and that image is based upon what the Negro believes himself to be—a human being.

People have in their minds an image of an Indian, a Negro, a Catholic, or a Jew and as this human being moves out from within his own group and emerges it is like immigrating into a foreign land because an image has been prescribed for him that he does not know nor identify as himself. This image bears no relationship to what he actually is nor to his potential as a human being.

It is the experience of minority groups that the dominant group attempts to tamper with their freedom of choice and decisionmaking. Individuals, therefore, develop patterns of making those kinds of decisions which are expected of them, rather than habits of exercising free choice.

They frequently find themselves in a position of acquiesing although they know that in the absence of freedom of choice and of opportunity they cannot achieve the results expected of them by the dominant group. Consequently, there is added the image of incompetence to the stereotype image.

This image of incompetence draws forth in the dominant group the mechanisms of paternalism, an approach which is neither desirable nor desired. However, it is another way of maintaining power under the guise of benevolence. Failure of the minority to have freedom of choice in decisionmaking can only add to the toll of disturbed personalities which are the consequences of a secondary role as a human being—limited by the fate but not the choice of being in a minority group.

PREMISE OF FREEDOM

If we accept the premise of freedom we would grant that every person growing up in this great land of ours would have the right and be given the freedom to discover himself and his potential to serve others not according to what someone else thinks he is nor any prescriptions written for his behavior as a member of a minority group.

He should have the freedom of coming into contact with fellow-citizens and of not having his development restricted by extraneous factors which seek to identify him with what somebody else thinks is his place. If opportunity for development in terms of God-given talents and potential are restricted, then by the same token, the freedom to which we all subscribe as being the natural heritage of all citizens is also restricted.

We may well ask, "Why do we have devices to measure capabilities and talents if the opportunity for development is going to be restricted or determined on a wholly different basis?"

THEY ARE ALL PEOPLE

The mere spatial adjacency of the majority with the minority group does not lessen the width of the chasm which separates them. There must be developed a social adjacency based upon a communication of spirit as well as words and on which depends the society of a free people. The dominant society cannot take action which leaves it socially removed from the very problems created by that society within the minority group.

We need to say, "All of my friends are human beings," and not "You know some of my best friends are Indians." This kind of communication at the feeling level should not be interrupted nor made impossible by compartmentalizing of human beings according to the race, religion, or some other criteria created by the dominant group, primarily as a defense of its own security. The minority assumes that there exists meaningful communication between the members of the dominant group. There is understanding as to their views toward the minority status they are seeking to maintain for others, but in relation to other things there exists a paucity of that kind of communication out of which can grow, among other things, their own security.

When the sophisticated minority finds that this communication does not exist within the dominant group, except as toward the minority, they begin to desintegrate this view about the minority and break up the units of the dominant group. As the views toward the minority are based upon invalid premises, this breakup becomes more evident and the sense of security of the dominant group is shaken and real difficulties appear on the horizon when it has to make the adjustment.

SUBSTITUTE VIEW

The problem now confronting both the dominant and minority groups in various sections of the country is what to substitute for the view that the dominant group had of the minority when that view is no longer tenable.

At this point, real leadership must accept its responsibility or the dominant group may well find itself on the wrong side of issues when its position is evaluated in the light of democratic, Christian, and other acceptable values. Real leadership must accept its responsibility or the minority group may well find itself on the wrong side of the issues as the dominant group seeks to break out of the pattern it has brought upon itself.

Communication can neither commence nor continue if the dominant group has fears that it is not going to be treated properly as it should by the minority as the increasingly favorable position of the minority is accelerated.

COMMON DENOMINATOR

The only common denominator is to recognize, accept, and defend the principle that man is a human being entitled to the respect he earns.

If we recognize this as a common denominator, then the challenge is to develop the means of a deep and abiding and understanding communication. When this is reached, we can out of the richness of all our different cultures, develop other common denominators in social, economic, and other fields.

We cannot use the experience of one to deny to the others of the minority group that opportunity to develop with the dominant group these common denominators which make for a better way of life. Persons, because of character disorders brought upon by the long and futile struggle, who deviate or show up as disorganized personalities present a problem which should not be used as a bar to opportunity for other members of the group.

How we handle ourselves in the dynamic situation of today will test the validity and permanence of our position in world leadership as the greatest Nation on earth. It will profit us little to have peace with other nations when we do not have peace ourselves.

This peace from within grows out of the destruction by both the dominant and minority groups of something within themselves before the new dynamics of thought and feeling unable use to undertake a more peaceful life in our own community. We must turn our back on all prejudice and separate ourselves from all prejudices and attitudes of the minority and dominant groups toward each other.

The attitudes within the minority group toward each other and within the dominant group toward each other likewise must be altered or completely destroyed. For those who have been raised in a tradition of nonassociation or noncommunication with your fellow human beings, who are members of minority groups, can you, after having accepted the fact that he is a human being, be at peace with yourself any longer as a member of a dominant program? Lacking the security of like-minded associates, can you develop the courage and strength to find that peace?

Knowledge, experience, and the hand of friendship can bridge the chasm and you can find a common ground of understanding in all those activities which make up the daily lives of all human beings.

CREATIVE FACTORS

I would say to the youth of this conference, that you are human beings—each with an individual personality. You are also citizens of the United States and finally, you are descendants of a distinguished heritage of which you can be proud. If you think of yourself in a different light, then you will have difficulty of carrying out your main business in life—which is to be a human being. You have all the factors out of which a creative personality can be made.

The elements which go into building that personality are—heredity, for which you are not responsible; an environment, which you cannot control; but for your personal response, you alone are responsible. It is not alone what happens to you but the way you take it that will determine your mastery of difficulties which is all a part of life's business. In distressing situations you must look inward to your own attitudes and resources. How you handle yourselves—not the situation—will make the difference.

CONFRONT YOURSELF

Confronting yourself with the making of your own personality is the beginning of worthwhile living. You must organize your life around some supreme values because the process by which real personality is attained is inward and spiritual. In order not to be torn to pieces inside you must accept heredity, cope with environment, and then say, "Now, I will see what I can do with me."

To pull a person together takes inner resources of power and of a power beyond one's self. This calls for faith—which is not something we get but something we have.

Religion is the basis for hope and a source of power in trying to make the most of what nature gave us and become what we ought to be. He who undertake's the task is on the main road of creation's meaning and is accepting the central trust of life. If nothing else, please remember:

The Lord will not ask thy race
Nor will He ask thy birth.
Alone, He will ask of you
What have you done on earth?

Visit Beyond Berlin—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA

Monday, April 4, 1960

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks, I submit three recent articles from the Washington Post, under three separate insertions.

These articles by Miss Flora Lewis have to do with East Germany, beyond Berlin, and deserve the full attention of all concerned with the future of Germany and the role of the Communist sector. We need to know much more about what is going on there and these articles give valuable insights into the realities of the current situation and their possible significance for the future.

The first of these articles follows:

EAST ZONE REDS' LONG-RANGE PLANS AIM AT UNIFICATION, RULE OF GERMANY

(By Flora Lewis)

BERLIN.—The outlines of a definite and concrete plan to bring all the strength of Germany to Communist power emerge clearly from conversations in the course of a tour of East Germany. It is apparently no secret, although the specific timetable is not laid down for the Western visitor and has to be pieced together.

Here, as East German Communists see it, is the program:

For the next 3 or 4 years, East Germany will continue to concentrate on speedy economic development. Consumer goods will not be neglected, for the political goal requires that the gap between living standards in East and West be practically eliminated. However, basic industrial expansion has also to be continued as the foundation of economic power.

At the end of that period, the East German regime should have achieved firm control at home. Then will come a new and intense campaign directed to West Germans, based on the argument that "we have each done pretty well by ourselves, but think how well off Germany would be if we work together."

If, as the Communists hope and expect, a recession develops in West Germany, the campaign would be timed and shaped to take advantage of it.

The appeal will be strongly nationalistic, offering reunification not just as a sterile buffer state in the center of Europe but as a revival of dynamic nationhood, drawing strength from an alliance with Russia just as Bismarck did. It is unlikely that real elections figure in the plan at any point, but more probable in this scheme would be the offer of a coalition, or national front, which could then be submitted as a single slate for popular endorsement.

Regardless of Nikita Khrushchev's stinging cracks, the East German Communists are not counting on perpetuation of two Germanys nor do they believe that is really Soviet policy. The success they have already achieved in economic development and in soothing away resentments inside East Germany has transformed the dream of taking over all Germany into a firm belief that victory is coming.

This assessment has imposed certain tactical policies on the East German Communist leadership which they do not much like but accept as the necessary means to the goal.

The essence of these tactics is to slow down the real communization of society wherever that is required; to foster illusions about the future; in short, temporary appeasement.

The policy decision to raise living standards rapidly has been the central measure.

Others include accepting what is a snail's pace, compared to the other Eastern European Communist states, on nationalization of shops, artisans, and small private industry. There are still private factories with as many as 200 to 300 workers in East Germany, unheard of in the other satellites.

If the testimony of ordinary workers is correct, a large and possible even predominant number of rank-and-file party members still consider themselves basically Social-Democrats rather than Communists. The East German Party, called the Socialist Unity party, was formed by a merger in which the Communists took over the Social-Democrats.

The leadership in East Berlin must certainly be aware of this sentiment, but has made no vigorous attempt to disabuse its followers. Privately, the higher-ups concede that th's illusion will have to be stamped out—but later.

Twinned to this policy of economic and sentimental concessions is a policy of absolute political toughness. Even those Communist dissidents who badly wanted liberal reforms have apparently accepted that they are not possible.

"Ulbricht," the vastly disliked leader of the East German Party, "has proved to be right," said one of them.

"We cannot allow one iota of state power to be chipped away under any circumstances. Economic concessions, yes. Power concessions, absolutely no," he said.

The timetable is also predicated on the expectation that tensions between Moscow and Washington will diminish considerably, and with them, American strength and fortitude in West Germany.

"Wait 3 or 4 years," East German Communists kept saying, "in 3 or 4 years, the situation can be very different."

Fifty-sixth Annual Health Conference To Be Held in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, New York State Commissioner of Health, last week announced that the 56th Annual Health Conference will be held in New York City from May 23 to 26. Some 2,000 physicians, nurses, health workers, and officials from New York State and surrounding States will attend this conference, sponsored annually by the New York Department of Health to enable participants to keep informed of new developments and advances in the health field.

A great many local and State health organizations in New York are to participate officially in this conference. I am confident that the result will be a sharing of ideas and techniques, as well as the advancement of the understanding on the part of all in attendance of new developments and research in the vital fields of medicine and public health.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement describing this conference and its very fine and worthwhile objectives be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, HERMAN E. HILLEBORE, M.D., COMMISSIONER

ALBANY, March 21.—The 56th annual health conference will be held May 23–26 at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City,

Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, State health commissioner, announced today. Approximately 2,000 physicians, nurses, and other public health workers from communities throughout New York State and adjacent States are expected to attend the 4-day conference.

The meeting, called each year by the New York State Health Commissioner, is sponsored by Annual Health Conference, Inc., a nonprofit organization chartered by the secretary of state; the New York State Public Health Association; Association of School Physicians and School Nurse-Teachers, and the New York State Health Department.

The conference serves to provide postgraduate education for professional persons, and to keep them informed of the many new developments in the health field. In addition to two general sessions, a wide range of public health subjects will be discussed at the various conference meetings.

Among the organizations participating in this year's conference are the conference of county, city, and district health officers; county and city health department public health nurse administrators; Empire State Health Council, Harvard School of Public Health Alumni; New York State Association of School Physicians; New York State Health Officers Association; New York State Public Health Association; and the New York State School Nurse-Teachers Association.

One of the highlights of the conference will be the annual luncheon of the New York State Public Health Association, at which the name of the recipient of the Herman M. Biggs memorial award will be announced. The award, named for a pioneer in public health who was former State health commissioner, is presented annually for achievements in the field of public health in New York State.

Another will be the presentation of the first Empire State award for excellence in medical reporting. The annual award, which consists of a certificate and $500, has been established to promote the further development of sound reporting by daily newspapers of medical and health news in New York State.

Visit Beyond Berlin—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second of three on East Germany which I am submitting for the RECORD today:

EAST GERMAN REGIME GOES ALL OUT TO WIN OVER YOUTH FOR COMMUNISM

(By Flora Lewis)

BERLIN.—The shy, rather wan high school girl in Rostock considered the question a moment and then said, "Yes, I suppose I will join the party when I'm old enough. The state is doing so much for me, it's the least I can do to pay back."

The parents of this 17-year-old East German girl were not Communists, she said, and she brushed aside with some embarrassment the question of whether they approved her views. Her father had been an independent miller in the nearby small town where they lived, but now he and his wife had jobs running a state-owned canteen.

The girl was visiting relatives in the city during the newly proclaimed winter school holiday, a substitute for the shortened Christmas, Easter, and other religious holidays which have been abandoned. She sat at the edge of the enormous swimming pool, part of the new sports center provided by the state for the amusement of young people in Rostock. The entrance fee was about a dime.

Had she chosen, she could have spent the 2-week holiday instead skiing in the mountains with a Communist youth group for a total cost of $7. When she finishes high school, her college tuition will be free, and she will be paid a monthly living allowance by the state until her education is finished. She wants to be a teacher, and she took it as perfectly reasonable that after training her the state will expect her to go to work wherever she is assigned.

TYPICAL OF THE YOUNG

This earnest girl seemed representative of the young people I met on a recent tour of Communist East Germany.

Refugees are still streaming to the West, through the numbers have dropped in the last year or two, and refugees under 25 are still a disproportionately large part of the flow. But the Government has begun to exert itself strenuously to win over the youth—who constitute its future—and with an apparent success that is impressive.

The flight of the discontented, of the unyielding individualists, has hurt, but it has helped the regime, too. The obverse of losing the skills and talents of the bitter critics has been an increase in the docility, even the enthusiasm, of those who stay behind.

The manpower shortage in East Germany is obviously severe, although these seems no way to get a revealing statistical measure. Nonetheless, everyone speaks of it, and the effects are evident.

One result is that there are more responsible jobs available to youth. The regime has gone out af its way to add to these openings by creating special youth enterprises—a new restaurant, or shop, or small factory—launched by the state with the proviso that all jobs, including the top ones, must be given to people under 25. Of course, the top jobs go to those recommended from other enterprises as most promising and, of course, the party cells have a lot to say in defining youthful promise.

TECHNICIANS NEEDED

Another effect of the manpower shortage has been to intensify the need of skilled technicians, because East Germany has to go in for automation wherever it possibly can. Foreign exchange budgets are carefully shaped to allow for maximum feasible purchase of laborsaving machinery from the West.

This has meant a tremendous expansion in education facilities. Dresden's Technical High School, for example, has 11,000 students on its campus and another 6,000 taking correspondence courses, compared with a student body of 5,000 a few years ago.

The students have to work hard, and they have to pass their Marxism-Leninism courses as well as their mathematics, but the state pays for it all. The rector estimated that some 25 percent of entrants failed to finish the 5- to 6-year courses, and he moaned, "that's still too high, we're trying to reduce that figure."

If students fail once, they are assigned free tutors, and can take exams again. If they fail twice, and have a reasonable excuse, they can try a third time. As in other satellite countries, applicants who favor the regime have an easier time, but political discrimination is far less exacting than in the rest of Eastern Europe because the regime needs skills so urgently.

PLENTY OF PROPAGANDA

The youngsters are treated to plenty of propaganda lectures, both inside and outside the school curriculum, but "harmless jazz," as the Dresden bulletin board put it, is provided along with enough other entertainment to keep youthful spirits from feeling too beaten down.

East Germany has its hooligan problem—like the rest of the world—and the Communist regime has found no effective answer.

But there does not seem to be much youthful rebellion, purposeful or otherwise. It is not unusual for 17- and 18-year-old workers, with shock-brigade premiums, to earn as much or more than their fathers.

Nor do many young East Germans show the signs of cynicism, the angry awareness of bleak prospects, that run through Polish and Hungarian, even Czech and Rumanian youth, and that erupted in the 1956 revolutions.

"Things have gotten a lot better already," said a young shop clerk in Leipzig. "I don't see why they shouldn't keep on getting better."

The superficial impression of a visit to East Germany is that the regime has learned a lot about indoctrinating youth from its own mistakes and the mistakes of others, and is applying its knowledge shrewdly.

Anderson Independent Praises Russell Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in its issue of April 1, 1960, the Anderson (S.C.) Independent featured an editorial praising and endorsing the recent address before the Senate by my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] in which he warned that continuation of attacks upon private property by organized pressure groups will result in national anarchy. I concur in the conclusions of this editorial which is entitled, "Senator RUSSELL Lays It on Line in Warning to All Americans," and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR RUSSELL LAYS IT ON LINE IN WARNING TO ALL AMERICANS

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia told his colleagues in no uncertain terms that the planned attacks upon private property rights by the NAACP and its allies will result in nationwide anarchy if upheld by the Ike-Warren Supreme Court.

The Senator's remarks will stand as a milestone in the continuing battle of reasonable Americans to safeguard the liberties of our people.

Thurgood Marshall, the chief of the NAACP's highly paid legal army, has announced that every fine levied against Negro demonstrators at lunch counters will be appealed on up to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Marshall said the NAACP lawyers "are in agreement that use of public force either in the form of arrest by the police or conviction by the courts is in truth State enforcement of private discrimination and is in violation of the 14th amendment."

Senator RUSSELL said that "in the simplest terms, it is claimed that if a person refuses to do business with a Negro, the Negro has the right under the 14th amendment to take possession of the business of such person and he has no legal remedy."

Further, the Georgian pointed out, that under this twisted NAACP interpretation, "if any person undertakes to assert the unchallenged right, long enjoyed under existing law, to do business with whomever he chooses to the exclusion of a Negro citizen, it is claimed that his property may now be taken away or withheld by a group of trespassers. Under this contention, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment denies the property owner any police protection whatsoever."

He wonders eloquently just "how fantastic we can get in groveling before the ever-increasing demands for special privilege asserted by the National Association of Colored People and their lawyers?"

In the "climate of equality" rampant in Ike's Washington, and in view of the Supreme Court's sociological decisions so far removed from the true meaning of the Constitution, it could be that the NAACP view will be upheld.

If that happens, Senator RUSSELL warns, they will have succeeded in having the Court rewrite the 14th amendment so as to read:

" 'No State shall be permitted to protect the property or other rights of a white person contrary to the wishes of a Negro.' "

Further, the NAACP construction "can be used to deny the right of property to any white citizen of this country. Under this construction, no white person can claim equal protection of the laws if any Negro desires to invade his property. Marshall even contends that no policeman can intervene to protect private property rights in cases where they are challenged by a Negro."

If the owner of a property has no right to invoke the police power to protect his property, what are his rights?

"Must," inquires Senator RUSSELL, "the surrender his property to any casual trespassers who might claim discrimination?

"If he is to be denied the police protection that he is taxed to create, what will happen if he employs a guardian to protect his property?

"Under the common law, the owner of property is entitled to use such force as is necessary to repel unwanted trespassers from his property.

"Under the common law, the owner of a business establishment is entitled to do business or refuse to do business with any other person as he sees fit."

What happens if this right is denied?

"This," the Georgia leader declared, "will be a throwback to the Stone Age and the law of the jungle. This means the destruction of the police power of the State to protect citizens who have violated no law. This is what we are told that the Supreme Court should decide our sacred Constitution to mean.

"What a travesty. This is neither equality nor equal protection of the laws. This is special privilege. This is anarchy."

And anarchy it would be.

The 14th amendment—as the Senator reminded some of his colleagues who seem to have forgotten—does not deal exclusively with the rights of Negroes. The words "race" or "color" are not used.

"It may be surprising to some," he said, "to learn that this provision is supposed to protect the life, liberty, and property of white citizens equally with the Negro."

What does this mean? It means that if the NAACP view prevails, any group—white or Negro—would invade any place of business, any industrial plant, any home, or any private property whatsoever—and be immune from prosecution.

Let the citizens of all other States look to themselves at this grave hour. If it is "legal" for trespassers to take over private property in the South, they can do so anywhere in the United States.

"One of the outstanding differences between our system and the Communist is the right of property that free Americans enjoy," Senator RUSSELL pointed out, and he charged that Communists who would change our form of government have seized upon the present "hate-the-South" campaign as a wedge for knocking out all property rights.

Senator RUSSELL called upon all candidates for presidential nominations to take their stands, saying:

"If the people who own property are to be denied the protection of the police power of their States and communities are compelled to restort to the law of the jungle to protect their property, let them be told it now from the candidates for the presidency—one of whom will appoint future Justices of the Supreme Court."

This is a timely and proper demand. The answers will be of vital importance to all Americans. Senator RUSSELL has laid it on the line in no uncertain terms. Let us hear the answers from presidential aspirants.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Would Bring Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a wonderful editorial by the Mobile Register of March 22, 1960. The Mobile Register is one of the oldest papers in our beloved Southland and one of the best, and I think this is really and trully a great editorial about one of this Nation's greatest men, our U.S. Senator, ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, who is chairman of a Select Committee on National Water Resources. What a great speech Senator KERR made in addressing the New York State Waterways Association. Some of his statements are included in this great editorial.

I had the pleasure of entertaining Senator BOB KERR in our marvelous Mobile and showed him there our great water development, our great State docks, our wonderful industries, the beautiful Azalea Trail, the Bellingrath Gardens, that look like heaven, or I imagine that is what it looks like, because heaven would have to really be beautiful, if it were any better than this.

I have known and worked with BOB KERR for many, many long years. He is a great man. I remember him at the Chicago Democratic Convention. I was a delegate, and I wish everybody could have heard this great BOB KERR when he made the nominating speech there, with the thousands of people from every State in this Union. Well, I have a picture of it, a photograph, but I do not need it, because I have a picture of BOB KERR and what he said in my heart and in my mind, and I have often wondered, when I hear of so many people being suggested as President of the United States, why they do not include this great Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

I have visited him out there, and he has been such a success—in business, in politics, in his church, and in all of his undertakings. Truly, I have never met a better or a greater man in the U.S. Senate or the Congress of the United States or anywhere else. He has brains and ability and experience and a wonderful understanding heart; and he has done and is doing so much for his State and his Nation.

I am so glad that my own hometown newspaper saw fit to print what BOB KERR said about one of the greatest undeveloped waterways on earth—the Tennessee-Tombigbee. It will be developed some day, and what a great day that will be. We will have a direct route from Sioux City, Iowa, clear down through all of those wonderful States—Cairo, Ill., and on down to my district at Demopolis, Ala., where it will come on down and meet the Warrior River, the Alabama, the Mobile River and on out to Mobile Bay and the Gulf of Mexico. That will really and truly be a great day, and they should sing then—not "A great day is coming," but "It is already here."

I wish everybody knew what that would mean to so many States, to so many counties, cities, and villages. This development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee, in my judgment, will be greater, so much greater than even the Panama Canal. It is the greatest undeveloped waterway in the world, and our great Representatives in the long years—over a hundred, so the record shows—have been working for the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee, and we in Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee and everywhere appreciate what this great man, Senator BOB KERR, of Olkahoma, had to say in his great speech about the development of these great waterways—not only the Tennessee-Tombigbee, but all of the wonderful waterways all over this Nation.

Senator KERR spent many hours looking over the port of Mobile and the many rivers that run into this great city. He looked at our great Brookley Field there where we have over 15,000 men and women, where this great Brookley Air Force Base has deep water, with ships coming in from all over the earth; where we will have a waterway from the State docks to the gulf, about 30 miles, with a depth of 42 feet, that will take any ship from any part of this earth. Then, we are developing on up at Jackson, Ala., and Demopolis, which has been completed and is such a wonderful development—the Demopolis lock and dam; another great development in ARMISTEAD SELDEN'S district, the Eutaw lock and dam; and of course, you all know, gentlemen, of the great work that has been done on the Warrior, and the wonderful work that is being done in Congressman CARL ELLIOTT'S district and Congressmen ALBERT RAINS' and KENNETH ROBERTS' districts on that great Coosa River that runs down and empties into the Alabama River, and then on into the Tombigbee River.

Both of our Senators, Senator LISTER HILL and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, and our entire delegation have worked and worked hard for the development of

these rivers, and we have made some success, but not nearly enough, and we are so glad to have these encouraging words from a great man, Senator BOB KERR, of Oklahoma.

The editorial follows:

[From the Mobile Register, Feb. 22, 1960]

WATERWAY WOULD BRING INDUSTRY

The important relation between navigable waterways and industrial development is a major argument for linking the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers by canal to serve barge traffic between a broad inland area of the Nation and the port of Mobile.

A noteworthy comment on the value of waterways has been made by U.S. Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, chairman of a Select Committee on National Water Resources.

Senator KERR, addressing the New York State Waterways Association observed:

"A significant fact about the industrial development in the past 10 years has been growth of new industrial plants, facilities, and capacities along our navigable waterways.

"In 10 years we have seen a $15 billion expansion of industrial plants in the Ohio Valley.

At the same time we have seen tremendous developments along the Mississippi River and its navigable tributaries, as well as on the gulf coast.

"This expanded industry along our navigable waterways not only enables our country to grow more rapidly than would otherwise be possible, it feeds a constantly increasing volume of business to the entire Nation, including all other forms of transportation."

A navigation canal connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers would form a steppingstone to much industrial and commercial growth in an extensive region by opening a new advantageous route in inland waterway transportation.

This long advocated needed improvement of the Nation's inland waterway system should be pushed energetically not only in Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, the States currently associated in a joint movement to promote it, but in various other States in which the benefits of the improvement would also be felt.

Senator KERR's impressive remarks on the expansion of industry in territory where navigable waterways exist should help arouse increased activity for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Dollars and Sense Reasons for Final Passage of the Cold War Veterans' Educational Bill; Dallas Times Herald Discusses Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Mr. Herman P. Miller, an official of the Bureau of Census, released a set of statistics to show the lifetime earning power of college graduates as compared to the income of those who for one reason or another did not go to college.

Mr. Miller's study is of particular interest at this time as the House Veterans' Affairs Committee is holding hearings on the cold war veterans' educational bill, which the Senate passed last session. Under that bill, if enacted, it is a conservative estimate that over 1 million veterans will attend college, and perhaps 2 million take some kind of educational training. A great many of those 1 million veterans will never make it through college without aid from the cold war veterans' bill.

What will that education mean to them and to their families? According to Mr. Miller's study, the average lifetime income expectancy at 1958 rates of pay of males who finish college is $435,000 compared to $258,000 for those who only finished high school. That is a lifetime earning difference of $177,000 for each individual who finishes college. This proves that through higher productivity and income, each individual who attends college under the cold war veterans' educational bill would more than repay the costs of the program in a very few years.

Recently the Dallas Times Herald, one of Texas major daily newspapers and one which is consistently offering stronger leadership in the Dallas area, published an editorial on the cold war veterans' bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the March 13, 1960, Dallas Times Herald entitled "Benefits for Cold War Veterans."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 13, 1960]

BENEFITS FOR "COLD WAR" VETERANS

Uncle Sam takes good care of this country's veterans. In fact, a congressional committee, after surveying veterans programs in 38 countries, found that none matches the United States. Our ex-GI's receive such benefits as pensions, medical aid, insurance, housing aid and college tuition.

But there is nothing illogical about the richest nation in the world offering the highest rewards to its citizens who have helped to protect it from foreign enemies. It is sometimes lamented that 7 cents of the Federal budget dollar is a "fixed charge" for financing veterans programs. Yet, who is to say how much the Nation owes to exservicemen who have submitted to varying degrees of physical and economic sacrifice in the Armed Forces?

This is a knotty question, one that has again become current because of a proposed measure that would extend GI educational benefits to post-Korean war veterans.

The best argument against any proposed extension of veterans' benefits is that the Government is hard-pressed for money. Opposed to this is the fact that thousands of men who served during World War II and the Korean war came no closer to actual combat and made no greater sacrifices than did veterans of the cold war era. If one category merits educational aid, so does the other.

It can be argued moreover that, in view of the heightened demand for more well-educated citizens, college tuition assists to the cream of American manhood are in order. It has been estimated that in Texas alone, some 200,000 veterans would be qualified for the proposed bill's benefits. Doubtless many of these would go to college with financial help, who otherwise would not.

Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newsletter under date of April 4, 1960:

An unwieldy and unguided Congress is slowly lumbering through the 2d session of the 86th Congress with the spenders in complete control of both Houses. Strangely enough, however, the leadership is unable to muster sufficient strength to put its centralizing budget-busting plan through either House as an overall program.

The result of this inability has been that the leadership is moving like a shifty football quarterback, taking one bill for an end run, one through the line, one on a backfield lateral, and one on a long forward pass. All this maneuvering is being done while the cheerleaders on the sidelines carry on a propaganda barrage through the newspapers, radio, and television to condition the people of the Nation for the next spending play.

It should be pointed out again that it is the Congress, and not the administration, that is wholly responsible for the spending program of the Federal Government. Congress enacts the laws, the administration merely administers the laws Congress passes. It should also be pointed out again that since 1953 President Eisenhower has had only one Republican-controlled Congress, the 83d. The 84th, 85th, and 86th have been Democrat controlled, and in the present 86th Congress the Democrat majority is almost 2 to 1, with every committee in both Houses controlled by almost 2 to 1. All bills and all legislation are under the complete control of the Democratic Party.

The questionnaire I recently mailed out to each boxholder in western South Dakota indicates that a large majority of the people of our State favor less spending, less Government regulations and controls, balanced budgets and greater economy.

Various groups and organizations have tabulated the votes and records of all Members of Congress. In order that you may know how your Representatives in Congress have been voting on measures that vitally affect you as a citizen and a taxpayer, I am setting out the voting record as tabulated by three of such organizations.

CIVIC AFFAIRS ASSOCIATES, INC.

The first is the tabulation of an independent survey organization known as Civic Affairs Association, Inc., an organization staffed by men formerly associated with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They chose 11 votes out of 87 rollcalls cast in the House last year, which in their judgment were the 11 most basic votes insofar as maintaining the free-enterprise system is concerned.

These votes include: Vote No. 19, to reduce grants-in-aid to States for airport construction; No. 34, sustaining the Presidential veto of bill placing final REA loan authority in Administrator rather than Secretary of Agriculture; No. 39, to eliminate features lessening protection of taxpayers' investment in TVA; No. 49, to eliminate "backdoor spending" for housing subsidies; No. 50, to keep expenditures for public housing at budget levels; No. 69, increasing Federal grants for constructing municipal sewage disposal plants; No. 72, to reduce by 5 percent the public works appropriation bill; No. 102, to curtail Federal preemption of State author-

ity; No. 130, to substitute the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill for the committee bill; No. 164, authorizing President to increase interest rates on long-term Government bonds when necessary to finance Federal debt; No. 174, motion to override President's veto on second public works bill.

In this analysis a "plus" represents the economy vote, a "minus" represents a free-spending vote.

House rollcalls—Key votes

	Airports	REA veto	TVA	Back-door spending (housing)	Housing	Sewer construction	Public works	Smith bill	Landrum-Griffin	Interest rates	Public works veto (2d)
Rollcall No.	19	34	39	49	50	69	72	102	130	164	174
South Dakota (by congressional district):											
1. McGovern (Democrat)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
2. Berry (Republican)	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

The second is the tabulation compiled by the Congressional Quarterly, an independent publishing company of Washington, D.C., whose purpose is to report facts on Congress and to Congress. Since the publication is copyrighted, it cannot be duplicated in full text.

The Congressional Quarterly, however, took 29 rollcall votes cast in the 1959 sessions, the outcome of which would clearly mean an increase or decrease in Federal spending. On these votes in support of moves to limit spending, the percentage was: McGOVERN, 0 percent; BERRY, 83 percent. On the percentage of 29 economy-issue rollcalls in the 1959 session, which were in opposition to moves to limit Federal spending, the percentage was: McGOVERN, 90 percent, BERRY, 10 percent.

ADA COMPILATION

The Americans for Democratic Action, an ultraliberal organization supported in a large part by Walter Reuther, made a compilation of the voting record on issues supported by them. In making their report they point out: "The voting record is offered as a guide for liberals in judging the performance of their Congressman on issues of importance." Then they report votes on nine of the issues they supported.

Vote No. 1—Hawaiian statehood; No. 2—authorize TVA to issue bonds; No. 3—provide direct Treasury financing for public housing and urban renewal; No. 4 for public housing authorization and urban renewal; No. 5—Foreign Aid program; No. 6—reject States rights antipreemption bill; No. 7—reject move to upset Supreme Court Mallory decision; No. 8—against substitution of Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill; No. 9—to establish a food-stamp plan in United States.

Of this a plus vote is a vote which ADA believes to be in harmony with liberal policies, a minus vote is one which ADA believes to be contrary to liberal policies.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
South Dakota:									
1. McGovern	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Berry	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−

Several organizations such as the Committee on Political Education (COPE) of the AFL–CIO, for instance, prints a voting record in every election year showing whether the Member of Congress voted "right" or "wrong" on the basis of what top labor leaders lay down as policy.

SOUND PROGRESS

Sound progress should be the primary purpose of every man's life. Sound progress is a source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing.

As I previously indicated, it is the Congress which controls the purse strings of the Nation. Congress determines all Federal income through the exclusive power to levy taxes and it controls all Federal spending through the exclusive right of appropriation.

On June 30, 1959, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 11205 a tabulation of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar between 1939 and 1959. Of course, his purpose was not to demonstrate this point, but I would call your attention to the fact that in only 2 of the 20 years did the value of the dollar increase. Those 2 years were 1949 and 1955. These are the years following the only Republican-controlled Congresses since 1932. The 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948 balanced the budget and made substantial payments on the national debt. The dollar value increased. The 83d Congress in 1953 and 1954 again balanced the budget and reduced the national debt, again increasing the value of the dollar.

In 1939 the national debt was $40 billion. In 1959 it had climbed to $295 billion, the result of 24 deficits in 29 years. Half of these deficits were incurred during years when we were fighting neither war nor depression.

It may surprise you to know that the greatest increases in this period were not for military or foreign aid. They were in domestic-civilian programs which during the past three Congresses have increased nearly 83 percent.

Subsidies and inflation feed on each other and both of them feed paternalism and centralization of power in a strong Federal bureaucracy. This was the very thing our forefathers fought the Revolutionary War to free themselves from to establish a system of local and State control.

Federal control and spending are the foundation of most of our trouble. Easy money through Federal paternalism, and an economy which is continually doped up with inflation, created by living on borrowed money, will never produce national strength. These things are destructive of character and initiative, both for the individual and his government.

Truman Favors National Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Monday I introduced a constitutional amendment calling for a national presidential primary. On Saturday, former President Truman said he favored a national primary, provided the Government paid for it. My own primary proposal is tied to a commitment to push hard for a strict election-spending law—governing such a primary, if the constitutional amendment were adopted.

Also, Mr. President, I want to go on record against President Truman's proposal and in favor of State presidential primaries—until they can be replaced with national primaries. The gradual disappearance of State presidential primaries in the name of party responsibility is killing the most vital and important duty and right of democratic citizenship—the right to determine who are going to be the only two men, the nominees of the two major parties, with any chance to become President of the United States. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times article reporting President Truman's support of a national primary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1960]

A NATIONAL PRIMARY FAVORED BY TRUMAN

WASHINGTON, April 2.—Former President Harry S. Truman said today that he would favor a national Presidential primary if the Government paid for it.

But as for the kind of primary election that will be held in Wisconsin on Tuesday, Mr. Truman said he still thinks, as he did in 1952, that the results are just "eyewash."

"They are no good," he said. "They're just a waste of time. And sometimes they put a fellow out of the running who should be put out. That's the only use they are now."

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee Democrat, disagreed with Mr. Truman. They appeared on a television program, taped by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan Democrat, for his constituents.

Mr. KEFAUVER said that even though he could not win the party's Presidential nomination through his primary victories in 1952, he thought such expressions of the voters' opinions were worthwhile.

Mr. Truman said the primaries held in 15 States and the District of Columbia had "no effect on the conventions as they meet."

"Now if we had a national primary, the expense of which would be paid by the Government of the United States, then I'd be for it," he said.

Visit Beyond Berlin—3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the third of three on East Germany which I am submitting for the RECORD today:

COMMUNIST GERMANY RAISES THE CURTAIN A LITTLE

(By Flora Lewis)

BERLIN.—As far as Americans are concerned, the touchiest Communist state in Europe is East Germany. Except for Albania, it is not too difficult to get permis-

sion to drive your own car into the other Communist countries and look around more or less unaccompanied. Even Russia permits it now, though routes are restricted.

The East Germans have not gone that far. But they have decided to risk a fair glimpse of their territory, now that they have pulled up their socks economically and have launched an intensive campaign for Western recognition.

My viewing was conducted from an officially provided, shiny black Tatra, complete with leather-coated driver and an amiable escort. The program was packed tightly and no request refused.

EAST BERLIN IS CAPITAL

The slice of land between the Elbe and Oder borders, assigned to Soviet occupation at the defeat of the Third Reich and now named on its own Government's maps as the German Democratic Republic (DDR), is not big—about the size of Tennessee.

East Berlin is the capital, but there are roadblocks and armed guards who demand to see your passport when you cross the city border into the rest of the country. Red army troops used to man the posts, but only green-uniformed Germans were there when we went through.

The way led through flat wooded country, not far from the border of isolated West Berlin, and in that frontier zone soldiers with guns at the ready strolled along the road. Some children were playing in a ravine, dressed up in red cowboy hats and glass-studded holsters—obviously they had relatives who sent gift parcels from the West, or who had made a discreet trip to West Berlin not long before.

Such things are not to be bought in East German shops, but no one seemed startled at the children, no more than at the occasional girl wearing slender, spike-heel shoes in the cities, although everyone knows that the shoes to be bought in East Germany are definitely on the squat and sturdy side.

Still, there are enough shoes to go around, enough perlon stockings, enough plain spring dresses.

There are not as many cafes, not as many movies, not as many tempting frivolities as in West Germany. Going into the one big cabaret in Dresden, the young party member who was with me apologized for the big red propaganda banner on the balcony.

STRANGERS JOIN GROUP

"It's not usually here," he said, "it really does spoil the place. Otherwise, it's very amusing here, don't you think?"

A stranger came up and took the empty seat at our table, just as I was chatting about a local official I'd seen earlier in the day. The people with me glared at the stranger and whispered, "Better not say any names. Just say Mr. R., and we'll know who you mean."

Asked later if he was worried that scraps of the conversation might be reported, the party member made elaborate denials that there was anything to be afraid of. "It's just that some people are ignorant," he said, "and might go around repeating what they hear without really having understood. There's no point saying things in front of people you don't know, they can get the sense all garbled."

But he was noticeably relieved when the stranger went off to ask a girl to dance.

To Western eyes, the only sign of a Soviet occupation in all of Dresden was the lettering, in Cyrillic, on the window of a second-hand piano shop in a back street. Apparently, one of the things Russian soldiers like to take home is a piano.

But the Dresden Communist laughed at the remark that the Russians kept out of sight. "Why you see them all over," he said and he pointed to a couple of broad, pink-cheeked young women who looked no different from the rest of the crowd.

According to Western estimates, there are some 250,000 Soviet troops in East Germany. Driving through the countryside, you pass a camp or a supply depot now and then, and the Red army guard at the gate stamps its nationality. At one point, the road ran on a little embankment so that you could see over a nearby enclosure. Under open sheds, there were long, neat rows of medium-sized field artillery.

The East Berlin guide followed my gaze, as we whizzed by, and said, "Ah yes, an agricultural machine station." I laughed. "Guns," I said, "shooting machine station." He shrugged, and said perhaps they were guns, the Russians were well equipped.

LITTLE FRATERNIZING

There seems to be almost no fraternizing. A uniformed Russian came in to drink at a state-owned roadside inn in Mecklenburg. The East German truck drivers made way for him silently. When he had gone, they mimicked the heavy-tongued pidgin German of the G. I. Ivan. One told a joke whose point was that Russian soldiers can drink more and stronger alcohol than anyone.

It was a shabby little inn, but the shelves behind the bar held scores of bottles, apparently a wide assortment. The waitress, a blowsy village girl, scowled a little when I asked for vodka. "Schnapps," she said, "have some good German schnapps. Why should we carry vodka? Schnapps is our drink."

The Primary Issue of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in my reading of the New Hampshire newspapers over the past weekend, I was impressed by an editorial entitled "The Primary Issue of 1960," which appeared in the Concord Daily Monitor, of Concord, N.H., on Wednesday, March 30.

The fact that the Monitor is not a narrowly partisan paper makes especially significant this editorial which defends the fiscal policies of the present administration. While I do not necessarily accept every statement which it contains, I believe it is a clear and well-reasoned statement which lays bare the naked issues of the coming political campaign. It merits the attention of the Congress and the people.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRIMARY ISSUE OF 1960

The efforts of the administration to stop inflation aren't based solely on innate conservatism in fiscal policies. They are also a recognition of economic pressures operative in the world at large.

If American price levels rise more the present advantage foreign goods have in the U.S. market will increase and foreign goods will become a flood of imports. Exports will decline correspondingly. The balance of trade will go against the United States and our gold will be drained away. It has been flowing out for many months now.

If these results of too much American inflation accelerate under continued wage increases not geared to an increase in per capita production the country will have some choices to make if it is to prevent depression.

It could impose wage controls which nobody wants. It could increase tariffs, but that would only further reduce our own exports. It could impose restrictions on travel abroad by Americans or the taking of dollars from this country by individuals. It could bring home its defense forces.

None of these possibilities is in the long-range national interest.

The best answer is an end to wage increases other than those justified by increased per capita production; in short, an end to inflation. Even if this is achieved at once the competition for markets by other nations would continue to be serious. Foreign producers can already undersell the United States in steel, in heavy machinery, in textiles, and a thousand other things, even in our own market.

Besides the unrealistic pressures of big labor unions for wage increases another continuing inflationary pressure is the demand for more Federal aid to the aged, for school, and for other luxuries.

These are particularly dangerous pressures at this time because 1960 is an election year and the temptation of officeseekers and the parties they represent is to buy votes with such promises, which then have to be kept, if the election year Congress does vote such new spendings before adjourning.

The brakes which can be put on inflation are equally repulsive to those seeking votes. Yet, the time for toying with inflation has already passed.

Of the two major parties the Republicans are the more realistic in relation to the dangers of inflation. The Democrats are the more inclined to try to spend the country out of any situation—and drive it into economic crisis.

Whether the American people will recognize this primary issue of 1960 we do not know. It is primary, because it can affect policy on almost all the other issues—our defense posture, our foreign relation, our economic world leadership, fiscal stability, employment, etc.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John F. Milasich, secretary of the Lake County CIO has forwarded the following resolution which was unanimously passed at their meeting on March 22, 1960.

During these days of inflation and the almost monthly rise in the cost of living during the last 6 or 7 years, it is highly necessary that something be done to increase the minimum wage base during this session of Congress.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage is inadequate to maintain a basic standard of living for the average family in Indiana,

Whereas the workers that are to be protected by a minimum wage law is smaller today than it was in 1938,

Whereas it its an injustice to workers to have no protection over the Fair Labor Standards Act,

Whereas it shows a grave weakness on the part of the national economy to allow workers to make less than the needs to maintain the necessities of life,

Whereas the American economy is known throughout the world as allowing workers to look forward to a better standard of living,

Whereas many through no fault of their own cannot look forward to bettering their standard of living, whereas the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill now before Congress could go far to aid these workers and families,

Whereas in the State of Indiana at least 105,000 low-paid workers would receive wage increases estimated at $38 million dollars a year upon passage of this measure,

Whereas the amount of money would further the growth of the State's economy by increasing the purchasing power of workers,

Whereas there is a moral, social, and economic need for this legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lake County Industrial Union Council, CIO go on record supporting the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill, increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extending the protection of the law to an additional 7½ million workers; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators HOMER CAPEHART and VANCE HARTKE, and Congressman RAY MADDEN; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon union members and interested citizens to write personally to their Senators and Congressmen pointing out the need of this bill for the many workers involved.

LAKE COUNTY CIO,
JOHN TRUCHAN,
President.
JOHN F. MILASICH,
Secretary.

The Farmer's Side of the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is much discussion of the farm problem and I am pleased to invite the Senate's attention to an article entitled "The Farmer's Side of the Case," written by Mrs. Mary Conger of Iola, Kans., who is a farmer's wife. The article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of April 9.

The public often gets a distorted picture of the problems of agriculture from writers who have gotten their knowledge of the farm problem from reading books, and therefore, it is most wholesome to get a report from the farm.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S SIDE OF THE CASE

(By Mary Conger)

My husband Carl and I firmly believe that our farm—a large, beautiful, family-type farm—makes a substantial contribution to the economy and health of our country. Every day of the year the dairy herd on our Triple C Farms produces enough milk to feed 1,000 children their daily quart of milk.

Our 720 acres of land are located in Allen County in southeastern Kansas, an area of diversified crops and livestock. Carl was born in this county, where he has a lifetime knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of weather and soil. To this understanding he has added a college degree in scientific agriculture and a number of years of professional experience as a county agricultural agent and soil conservationist.

Our herd of 200 registered Holsteins—100 cows and 100 heifers—are considerably above average in production. We market grade A milk, for which we receive premium prices. Our farm's gross income ranks in the upper 3 percent of farms in the United States. Our farm is adequately capitalized and highly mechanized for large-volume production.

Supposedly ours is a successful farm enterprise—and it has been. We bought our farm in 1939, making the downpayment with money we had saved for years from Carl's modest salary as a county agent. Since then much of our life, our thought, and our work has gone into building up our land and herd. The only trouble is that since 1952 our farm has made little, if any, profit in good years—and in bad years, such as 1955, we have lost as much as $4,058. By the end of 1958—a bumper crop year—we had accumulated $7,000 in unpaid bills for operating expenses. Last year we just about broke even, so we had to borrow $3,500 at the bank to pay off the most pressing part of that $7,000.

We now are caught in a merciless cost-price squeeze, and each year that economic turnbuckle tightens another notch. Back in 1952 all political parties were in favor of 100 percent of parity in purchasing power for the farmer; then there was no public hint of a national policy to drive down the prices of food. Then we were getting 11 cents a quart for our milk. Now we are getting 8.1 cents.

When that first slash in farm prices came 6 years ago, we doubled our milking herd in an effort to increase gross income so that, in turn, we could meet our fixed charges—such as interest and taxes—and the rising cost of things we must buy. We built a new labor-saving milking parlor—a sort of assembly-line milking system—equipped with a pipeline milker and a bulk refrigeration tank. No expensive labor is wasted carrying milk buckets on our farm. But then came years when our crops were cut by drought, hail, and wet weather, and we fell behind on the feed bill for the cattle. In good years we struggled to catch up. We tripled the milking herd. Milk prices declined further. Costs went on up. We were on a treadmill, always running faster just to keep in the same place.

While we were struggling to meet our expenses, we constantly were reassured by some of our spokesmen for agriculture that "efficient, commercial farmers" were doing just fine. Statistics showed the average per capita farm income to be just half of that for nonfarmers, but these figures didn't tell the true story, the spokesmen said, because they included 2 million small, inefficient subsistence farmers who produced only a minute part of the Nation's food supply. Also, so many people were leaving the farms that the income of agriculture, even though shrinking, was being divided among fewer and fewer farmers. And there were always success stories at the top. These were the farmers who most often were sought out for interviews and publicity.

So it appeared that there was nothing the matter with anyone but us. Still our neighbors kept complaining, asying such things as "If I count a fair return on my investment, I'm throwing in my labor free of charge." And at a recent meeting of the board of directors of the Kansas Dairy Association in Topeka, I stepped into a group of prominent farmers just as George Schumann, of Hiawatha, Kans., was saying, "The thing that has me worried is how we're going to stay out there on the farm with no profit."

T. Hobart McVay, of Nickerson, a nationally known Holstein breeder and president of the Kansas Dairy Association, added, "It just won't figure. I've been farming all my life, and I know it can't be done with the present cost-price situation." He shook his head. "I'm sure I don't know the answer."

This discussion reflects the farmer's feeling of futility. At all meetings of farm organizations I have attended recently there is an undercurrent of despair—and there is a belief that the general public, seeing news stories about the surpluses and the farm subsidies, is not aware of the true farm situation at all.

It was after this meeting that I began to wonder just what was happening to our kind of farmer—to the operator of the modern, bigger-than-average commercial farm. I sympathize with the too small, marginal, or subsistence farmers, but after all, the problem of fitting them into the industrial age, so that they contribute more to the economy and also can improve their own lot, is primarily a sociological challenge. But what is the size of the remaining problem after this particular portion has been set off to itself?

For some answers I turned to the records of members of our State's farm management association, made available to me by Kansas State University. The facts I found there proved I had not just been mumbling to myself as I scrubbed the dairy barn walls—and I do scrub them.

The farmers in this association are above average in their area by almost any yardstick. They own larger farms, have more livestock, keep accurate records under supervision of an association management specialist, and utilize the technical advice the State agricultural college has to offer.

What did I find?

Let me explain that the management association figures farm returns this way: First, operating expenses are deducted from gross receipts of the farm. From this profit is deducted a fair investment return of 6 percent on net working capital and 4 percent on net fixed capital. Then the value of any unpaid family labor—such as mine—is subtracted. What is left—if anything—is the farm operator's wages, his return for his own labor and management of his farm enterprise.

In our own southeastern Kansas, association farms had averaged only $805 per year in labor-and-management income during the past 6 years. Or put another way, the average farm earned a total of only $4,834 in wages for its operator for the whole 6 years. In fact, the farmers had received even less pay than their hired men—and hired farm labor is at the absolute bottom of the industrial wage scale.

However, our particular part of the State has poorer soil than many other areas. So I looked at the records for the State as a whole. I found that the 1958 returns for association farms had been the best in 11 years, owing to bumper crop weather that coincided with a peak in the price cycle of cattle and hogs. And that year the labor-and-management earnings per farmer in the association were $4,120—nothing more than any skilled laborer earns.

But 1958 was the only year in 11 which Kansas association members drew such fancy wages. In 1955, the poorest year, the net labor loss per farm for all association members in the State was $938. Everybody worked all year, received no pay, and went into debt besides. From these figures it was

easy to see that many other good farmers were in the same boat as the Congers.

The fact is that the farmer has been getting a shockingly low return for his labor and skill. Wages lost in industrial strikes are microscopic as compared to the loss which farmers have suffered in the last decade. And I mean the commercial farmer, such as those in our association—the man who runs an agricultural enterprise with a capital investment of $54,800 per worker, about three times as large as the average industrial investment per worker.

The usual farm-income figures, low as they are, don't accurately reflect the situation because they are computed as net income above production expenses and include the financial returns from investments in land and equipment that the farm family may have accumulated over a lifetime of frugality—or may even represent the saving of several generations. The net income per farm also includes the labor of the entire family in producing such income. To this is added the value of whatever food the family may have raised for its own use, the rental value of the farm home—often an old farmhouse that is far from being modern by urban standards of today. On top of this is put any off-the-farm income that some member of the family may have earned. All this is lumped into a thing called the real income of the farm family, a figure that is used to disguise the disgraceful disparity of the actual wages earned by farmers for producing the Nation's food.

The farm-income figures also include any Government subsidies the farmer may have received. I am quite aware that many city people believe that farmers are getting richly paid by the Government for not growing crops, or in artificially supported prices for their farm products. I'm not going to argue that price supports don't cost the Government a lot of money or that Government storage of surplus crops is not expensive—but I do know these things aren't making farmers prosperous. For the record, such Government programs have little effect on the income of our Triple C Farms. We have no land in the soil bank; we need it for our cows. Our milk price is not subsidized. During the war years, when wheat was greatly needed, we usually raised 150 acres of this crop; since then our allotted acreage of wheat has been cut to 61 acres. Wheat produced on that land is eligible for a Government loan—last year it ran $1.98 per bushel. In any case, income from wheat amounts to less than 9 percent of our gross receipts; our major enterprise is dairying.

We also received soil conservation payments last year amounting to $282.30 for the establishment of soil-saving crops, in this case a permanent pasture. Part of the payment, $143, went directly to a dealer in payment for the necessary fertilizer, and the balance, $139.30, came to us to help pay for preparing the land and seeding the pasture. These soil-conservation payments are supposed to encourage the conservation—in fact, the improvement—of the Nation's limited soil resources for the benefit of future generations when, say the population experts, we won't be troubled by surplus crops, but rather will need all the good land we can find.

That is the total of the Congers' subsidy.

The most gigantic subsidy in the United States is not the Federal agricultural price-support program, but the unpaid or underpaid labor that farmers and their families contribute to the production of cheap food for the American people. Even in 1955, that year of crop failure when members of the Kansas Farm Management Association earned less than nothing, the average member produced $9,000 worth of food, or so valued when sold at the farm price level. At the supermarket this per man output of meat, milk, eggs, and bread cost housewives around $24,300.

We farmers don't want sympathy, but we would like better understanding of what we are up against. We don't like to be accused of being greedy or of being tax-eating parasites. We don't like to have our real income misrepresented for political purposes. We know that an urban worker may also have income from investments, may enjoy certain fringe benefits, may live in his own home without paying rent, may raise food in his garden, and members of his family may have other jobs—all without being considered part of his wages. And then, if he is a steelworker, he also gets gross hourly earnings that are 85 percent higher than they were in 1950.

On the battleground of inflation farmers have been hit hard on all sides. The tractor we bought in 1950 for $2,200 must now be replaced at $3,800, but the milk that brings in our income has dropped 27 percent in price. Thus we are helping to pay the bill for the wage-price spiral on one front and are absorbing a part of the consumer's grocery bill on the other.

Now I know that groceries seem higher to the housewife, but that's because the housewife doesn't just buy flour and beans and potatoes these days; she buys more semi-processed foods, such as cake mixes and packaged frozen vegetables that are ready for the pot or oven. The manufacturer is doing more of the housewife's kitchen work for her, and he's charging her for that extra service. Also people are eating more of the expensive foods—more fresh fruits, more meats (and more expensive cuts) than ever before. The truth is that food was never cheaper. People in the United States buy their food with the fewest hours of labor ever required in the history of mankind. Month after month the financial pages report increases in the cost of housing, medical expenses, transportation, and all the goods and services—except food. Food prices hold steady or go lower.

It is impossible to figure exactly how much the Nation's farmers have sacrified to inflation. For example, I wonder what Triple C Farms milk would cost the consumer if it had increased in the same proportion as other living costs—40 cents a quart? Fifty cents? I do know that some economists have estimated that farmers have been shortchanged about $70 billion which they would have earned had their products risen in price at the same rate as other commodities. There is evidence that the farm family has been absorbing about 25 percent of the Nation's grocery bill.

Perhaps it is just our hard luck, and the hard luck of millions of other farmers, to be in this business during a time of inflation, and also in a time when a great technological revolution is sweeping many of those farmers from the land. There are some people who believe the solution is obvious. They say, "If the nincompoops can't make a go of farming, why don't they get a job in town like everybody else?" And thousands of farm families are solving their individual problem in just that way. They are leaving the land.

Carl and I don't see it that way. We can't. We've invested too much of our lives in this land of ours. Rather than let go, we've been trying to grow. Five years ago, when we needed additional space for our expanding herd, we bought a neighboring 80-acre farm. It had been the subsistence home of an old couple and came on the market when the husband, a carpenter and painter, passed away. The only crop on the wornout land was some drought-stunted sorghum.

Carl promptly applied a complete soil-conservation plan to our new land. He bulldozed out old hedges and brush, built terraces, and dug ponds. He spread lime and fertilizer. He plowed up the weedy pastures and seeded them to brome grass and alfalfa. Within 6 months that old farm was under a luxuriant cover of soil-building grasses and legumes.

Statistics recorded one less farm and farmer, but farm production didn't decline. It increased. An inefficient unit had been absorbed into a larger, more efficient one. And so, while people have been leaving agriculture at the rate of 1 million a year for the last 16 years, an exodus that is amazing by any standards, the productive capacity of our farms has been expanding rapidly.

But there is a tragic catch to this process. While we were expanding our dairy herd, improving the output per cow and building up our pastures, so were all our neighbors. Our concerted efforts flooded the local market with a record flow of milk last fall, and the price of milk slipped lower and lower. Collectively we destroy ourselves by individual actions we are forced to follow.

Carl and I will have to stay on our farm and ride out the storm. All our resources—education, experience, finances—have been committed to farming. We have had a busy, happy life on our farm. Our children grew up here and helped with the farmwork and were 4–H members.

Still with us is our daughter, Carleen, a 16-year-old. But gone from home are our two sons, as soon as they came of age, we encouraged them not to stay on the farm but to leave and make their start in the business world without losing time. This they have done. Our son Gordon, 25, is with a construction firm in Kansas City, and David, 21, is a distributor for a bread company. Practically all their classmates have left the country. Very few of the once hopeful veterans who took on-the-farm training after the war now remain in agriculture. They have been forced to find other ways of making a living after losing 10 youthful years in a lost cause. As in so many rural areas, our neighborhood rapidly is becoming a place of old and middle-aged people.

In any case, making a change is not easy. A neighbor of ours, Maurice Wray, 44 years old and farming 210 acres, says, "What would I do in the city? I'd just be unskilled labor." Yet as a farmer he utilizes a whole range of highly developed mechanical and scientific skills—in addition to duties of management and the responsibility of handling his investment in a high-risk enterprise.

As I write this I think back to a winter evening—everyone else in the family has gone to a meeting. I retire early to my favorite cold-weather pastime, reading in bed wth the heat pad turned on. My book is about the difficulties of flight into outer space, but I don't get farther than the first asteroid when there is a crunching of snow outside my window—a sound that may be made by a cow walking close to the house.

I get up and turn on the yard light. It's a cow, all right—the whole herd is out, all over the yard and scattering down the road. It's up to me and to old Queen, our dog, to round them up.

This calls for long underwear, jeans, overshoes, winter wraps. Outside, the crisp air is exhilarating as I set out with Queen trotting along beside me. The stars glittering coldly on the snow reflect enough light to pick out black-and-white cows wandering everywhere. Queen enters the game enthusiastically, barking around the pond, beyond the shelter belt, behind the granary. Rounding up the first few dozen cows is great sport, but finding and chasing all the stragglers begins to be hard work. Even Queen loses her enthusiasm.

My overshoes are beginning to feel heavy as I plod patiently on. There is time for thinking, and my mind is in a resentful turmoil over the latest city newspaper editorial which denounced the pampered farmers and

righteously demanded that agriculture return to a free economy where prices are determined only by supply and demand. Farmers should stand on their own feet and compete on an efficiency basis, the same as other industries.

Indeed, I think, why shouldn't farmers adopt the methods of other economic groups? Perhaps we should start with a 27½ percent soil-depletion allowance for income tax purposes, the same as the depletion allowance granted the oil industry. However, I must admit that income tax relief would be a hollow mockery to the millions of farmers who aren't making enough income to pay taxes.

How about enabling legislation that would extend to farmers the same rights of collective bargaining, without antitrust penalties, such as labor enjoys? Or, if we can't have monopoly, how about a fairly well developed oligopoly—a combination that might act to curtail production and maintain prices? This might even up the odds, as it is oligopoly with which farmers must bargain.

And then there's the strike weapon. How about a 116-day farm strike? Farmers make up 12 percent of the population and receive only 5 percent of the total gross national product, so a booming economy shouldn't suffer much from this little loss. In fact, the Nation could survive on all those surpluses we're always complaining about. Of course, a diet of bread and cornmeal mush might get tiresome—without even cheese or meat to make sandwiches after the first week. But look what we'd save on storage costs.

Of course, if farmers struck for a few months, about 40 percent of the Nation's labor force would have to be laid off—all those engaged in processing and marketing food and those who sell services and supplies to agriculture. Things might get slightly dull, too, for the steel, petroleum and transportation industries with one of their major customers out of business.

On the other hand, the wall-to-walll carpet industry and the central-heating and air-conditioning companies would scarcely feel the pinch at all—except indirectly—since they do only a trickle of farm business anyway.

If we get really hungry, we could appeal for foreign aid, or reverse lend-lease. Maybe some of our friends of the free and twilight world would send CARE packages. Even powdered milk would improve all this mush. But what would other nations have to spare? We could import plenty of wheat, which we already have—indeed we would be having it three times a day. Or there's coffee, although most people soon would be in a mood to drink something stronger. But meat, milk, eggs—the high-protein foods; the sinews of muscle, health and the very essence of the life cell itself—protein is a very scarce world commodity. We could import only the merest fraction of the amount needed to relieve our distress. There is no other land on the face of this earth or several other planets that can pour forth the wealth of food produced by our own midwestern farm States.

It's hard to imagine just what phrases the financial page would use to describe a farm strike after months of referring to steel as the most basic industry. Comfortably overfed as we now are, it's easy to forget that for countless eons of time mankind devoted his entire time and energy to the acquisition of just enough food for survival. Only recently has man been able to produce enough surplus food to enable him to develop his intellect and finally think of such things as steel.

But now the cows are relatively docile after their first wild ecstasy of running free. I round up the stragglers alone. Queen is tired and just politely refuses to help. The sharp air feels like pure oxygen, and my head spins.

How about the immutable old law of supply and demand? Has anyone ever considered whether or not the Nation would like to have its food supply reduced to the precarious scarcity that would be necessary to raise prices to a fair level in the marketplace? If the country wants a comfortable margin of food over and above our immediate daily needs, who should pay for this insurance? Should farmers be expected to carry the entire premium in the form of depressed prices?

While a farmer does not want to become a ward of the Government, there are some suggested remedies that give him the uncomfortable suspicion that he is being told, "This operation is going to be painful, and you may not survive. But it surely will cure what ails you."

Just exactly how "free" is the free economy to which agriculture is supposed to be returned? In a period of recession which is supposed to bring about adjustments, people refuse to buy, yet prices do not drop; there is unemployment, yet wages do not decline. Other parts of our economy seem to have developed some gimmicks that rather effectively prevent a "free" economy from adjusting itself at their expense.

Agriculture already is one of the most competitive of all enterprises. All different foods compete for the limited space in the human stomach. Geographical areas are pitted against one another for a share of the market. Efficiency of production is a relentless pressure within the industry, ruthlessly grinding the less fortunate into the necessity of accepting failure. And then the industry as a whole competes against all other economic groups for a fair share of the Nation's income.

Perhaps we should return the rest of the economy to the competitive status of agriculture.

The last cow walks into the lot at her own deliberate, dignified rate. I shut the gate. Back in the warm house, I am tired. The intoxicating spell of the night air fades, and fantasy is dispelled by glaring light. I return to the practical.

When the Nation's farmers totaled their records for 1959, they found that their income had declined 15 percent from the year before. All predictions now are for a further downhill slide in 1960. Not a single economist forecasts any significant improvement in the farm-income situation in the years ahead. There is every evidence that the farmer has the technical ability to expand production even faster than the population increases for quite a few years to come. The farm surpluses will be with us for a long time.

And there is no sound, unified program to meet this situation. The voice of the farmer is weak and faltering because the several national farm organizations which are supposed to speak for him are deadlocked in uncompromising disagreement on possible solutions. They have taken fixed positions and continue to defend them, come what may, while the situation steadily worsens.

How then, if we are losing money, do we—Carl and Mary Conger—manage to hang on? We have done it, thus far, by the very inflationary force which threatens to destroy us. Inflation operates in strange ways, and while it has put our income in a cost-price squeeze, it has caused a rise in land values. Also, the desperate need to grow larger, for efficiency's sake, has caused farmers themselves to bid up the price of land. Thus our farm, like most others, is worth more each year—on paper—and we borrow against that increased value to meet our losses. We know this is a dangerous process, one that is underway in much of agriculture, one that could engulf us all unless the decline in farm income can be halted.

Meanwhile we tighten our belts. We put off reshingling the roof yet another year. And we don't really need a new refrigerator—the old one has run for 17 years without stopping. We hang on, knowing that for farmers everywhere there will be more debts, a gradual loss of their equity in their land and a widespread fear that someday, unless something is done, the scales will tip too far, and family farms such as ours will be a thing of the past.

U.S. Prestige in Latin America Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in many statements to the House I have stressed the vital importance of meeting forthrightly but firmly the issues raised by the persistent demands of Panama for the exercise of sovereign control over the Canal Zone including the formal display of the Panama flag.

The passage on February 2 of the Selden resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459, by an overwhelming vote, 381 to 12, and the unanimous approval, February 9, of the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill clearly reflects the disinclination of the people of the United States to approve the display of any flag over the Canal Zone except that of the United States.

Thus, I have read with keen interest in the Saturday Evening Post of April 2, 1960, an editorial commenting on the recent visit of the President in Latin America, which emphasizes the importance of the flag issue to continued U.S. control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

The editorial follows:

IKE HAS REVIVED OUR FADING PRESTIGE IN LATIN AMERICA

In the nick of time President Eisenhower came to the rescue of the State Department, whose efforts to avoid acts or statements which stir up anti-U.S. demonstrations in Latin America had verged on the ridiculous. Although the President left a few loose ends dangling in his pronunciamento, it is now de rigueur to frown on Communist efforts to subvert countries in this hemisphere.

In our anxiety to avoid demonstrations and other troubles, we have made some egregious bobbles. Latin America can hardly have been favorably impressed by the action of the State Department in linking the impending execution of a rapist and kidnaper to possible riots in Uruguay, a Red hotspot in South America. The suggestion that the administration of justice in an American community is subject to veto by Communist mobs, whose members riot against the execution of one convicted criminal but accept the murder of millions by Red despots for no crime at all, doesn't improve the American image anywhere.

As to Cuba, our premature recognition of Castro has been followed by much wringing of the hands and doeful speculation as to whether Castro is a Communist or has a Communist brother or is surrounded by

Communists, when the easily demonstrable truth is that his regime is behaving as Communist regimes usually behave. The opposition is throttled; even former companions in arms are thrust into dungeons without trial. Constant harangues against foreign aggressors and local "traitors" fill the air. Property, including that of Americans, is confiscated; and to rub it in, Castro consummates a deal with the Soviet's trader Mikoyan by which the U.S.S.R. buys Cuban sugar at the world price and at almost half the price paid by the imperialist United States. What other arrangements the Soviet troublemaker may have made with Castro is not known.

A key objective in the Communist plan to move in on Latin America—or rather to consolidate the gains already made—is the Panama Canal. Agitators have demanded that the Panamanian flag be flown beside the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone, and official U.S. opinion, including that of President Eisenhower, appears to be that this sharing of flagpoles would do no harm. The President explained that, inasmuch as Panama appeared to have "titular sovereignty" over the zone, it was unrealistic to become too excited about demands to fly the Panama flag along with ours. "Titular sovereignty" is a phrase used by President Taft many years ago, with the explanation that it didn't alter the facts and might quiet the local politicos. The phrase hardly disposes of the fact that, under the treaty with Panama, this country enjoys all the rights of sovereignty, "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power and authority."

The flag may be "just a symbol" to us, but we can be sure that to the Panamanians who are making this demand, the flag is a symbol of sovereign power. To them, and to all Latin America, the equal presence of Panama's flag in the Canal Zone would mean the first step toward the relinquishment of our position there. The Panamanian press is generally in agreement with an editorial in La Nacion, owned by the Vice President of Panama, in which the paper declared that last year's attack by students on the American zone will be followed by other episodes "until all the Yankees are driven out of the Canal Zone and the Canal is nationalized."

There is no sentiment in this country for depriving any Latin American nation of its rights. Propaganda to the contrary rests on policies long repudiated by the United States. But we, too, have rights in Latin America established by treaty or by contract among individuals, which we are bound to protect, not only in our own interest but in the interest of stability in this hemisphere. Our friends in Latin America, many of whom are under Communist-inspired siege, look to us for the word that our security and theirs is not to be frittered away. The President's assurance on this point ought to clear the air.

South Transforms Historic Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able article written by the well known columnist Ray Tucker and appearing in the large list of newspapers he contributes to.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—SOUTH TRANSFORMS HISTORIC FILIBUSTER

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—A scrappy band of 18 southern Senators has transformed an ancient stratagem—the filibuster—into a political and legislative weapon as modern and irresistible as an atom bomb.

As they have organized and utilized it, the blockade and forced retreat of a hostile bloc and an unpalatable bill—to them—amounts to an entirely new technique, even though it was first used in 1941 against financial measures sponsored by Henry Clary, born in Virginia and bred in Kentucky.

Its long-range effect on legislation before Congress and the State legislatures in incalculable, depending on the rules of procedure in the various legislative bodies throughout the country. It means that a small and determined minority can negate or partially frustrate the will of the majority.

MERE AMATEURISH AFFAIRS

In answer to criticism that they have undermined the purpose and principle of the democratic process, the anti-civil-rights strategists reply that the Founding Fathers and their illustrious successors "planned it that way."

Fearing mob rule—Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin had the bloody French revolution of 1789 in mind—they provided that the House should be chosen by popular vote, but that the Senate should be filled by the State legislatures. The upper chamber was designed deliberately to act as a check on a possibly unruly House.

The Constitution empowered each Chamber to make its own rules. With the idea of the Senate acting as a safety valve and safeguard in mind, the House adopted rules for unlimited debate, while the Senate permitted a talkathon that became known as a filibuster.

It remained for today's southerners to demonstrate that yesterday's filibusters, even when they were successful, were mere amateurish affairs.

Their strategy can operate in two directions, however. They have taught northern liberals how to block, defeat, or amend obnoxious measures, even when they are in a minority. The same lesson has been impressed on Democratic and Republican conservatives.

In resentment against Senate obstructionism—the defeat of the Supreme Court packing proposal is an excellent example—Franklin Delano Roosevelt persuaded loyal House leaders to liberalize that body's rules governing committee procedure and authority.

They provided that a majority of the Members—219 today—could force a bill from a committee pigeonhole for debate and a vote on the floor. Consisting of veteran legislators, the major committees are generally more conservative than the full membership. It is not too difficult to obtain 219 signatures for a discharge petition for a popular and vote-getting proposal, such as the Forand medical insurance bill.

OFFENDED RAYBURN

An ultraconservative Virginian on civil rights, social and economic schemes, Rules Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH has offended Speaker SAM RAYBURN on several occasions. The elderly and astute "JUDGE" SMITH has held up bills favored by the Democratic leadership, particularly civil rights.

As a result, there is talk of packing or enlarging the Rules Committee to outflank Representative SMITH and to make it more responsive to the will of the House. This action would remove another check, as has the discharge petition method, on legislation of an extreme character, whether ultraradical or downright reactionary.

Should that happen, the Senate's unlimited debate procedure, which furnishes the field for filibustering, would be the only safeguard against highsounding but ill-advised and dangerous legislation.

Recent political history proves that the American electorate is extremely mercurial and inclined to lean toward the left. In 1936, Franklin Delano Roosevelt carried all but Maine and Vermont on a welfare state platform. Twenty years later, Dwight D. Eisenhower won by a tremendous majority. Two years later, in 1958, they massacred Republican congressional candidates.

Thus, without regard to the merits of the cause for today's delaying operation, and in view of the Supreme Court's present trend, the filibuster still stands as a historic and honorable institution.

Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the national chairman of the Democratic Party, Paul Butler, is at it again. He seems to be determined to alienate the only constant section of support for the Democratic Party dedicated to the true Jeffersonian principles of the party, the South. The party of our fathers has indeed fallen into alien hands.

The following editorial from the pen of Mr. J. W. West, publisher of the Leader-Call, an outstanding newspaper published at Laurel, Miss., we think, expresses the sentiment of a proud southern people. The editorial follows:

[From the Leader-Call, Laurel, Miss., Mar. 29, 1960]

DIVIDE AND CONQUER

Paul M. Butler, national chairman of the Democratic Party, has come up with a new tactic aimed at destroying the effectiveness of southern Democrats.

This new tactic is to divide and conquer.

Butler, attending the 14 State midwestern Democratic conference, is urging southern Democrats to send rival delegations into the national convention to challenge all southern delegates who will not back the party ticket.

The midwestern conference hopes to ram through the national convention a proposed civil rights plank which includes voting, education, housing, and service at lunchrooms.

The general attitude of southern Democrats was summed up by Allen Shivers, Governor of Texas, who said:

"In the dignity of our history and the majesty of our manhood we say to the national party: 'We must see the black and white of the platform and the color of the eyes of the nominees. We offer no blind, debasing, humiliating pledge in advance, to accept without murmur whatever may be handed in grudging charity after we have stupidly surrendered in advance and cravenly thrown ourselves at your mercy.' No, the Democratic Party of Texas, I hope, is to be dealt with in 1952 before, during, and if necessary, after the national convention in July. I scorn the suggestion that 'loyalty' demands an abject, contemptible, unconditional surrender in advance to the whims

or dictates of any absentee overlords of national party.

"The self-governing and self-respecting Democratic Party of Texas, which nurtured the still, small light of the party of Jefferson and Jackson for 50 years during which it was extinguished in darkness in the North and East, does not slink or cower, hat in hand, to anybody's back door to make a blind trade of our heritage for a small handout."

Butler is trying every way in the world to discredit the States' Rights Democrats. Another tactic was to invite the Democratic Governors to a meeting to see what he could work out.

Those Governors who are familiar with his strategy look at anything he does with an anxious eye. Some may even go so far as to stay away from the meeting since they know in advance exactly what Butler proposes to do.

Southerners intend to fight for their rights.

Mississippians, in particular, do not expect to be subservient to absentee overlords.

The Nezperce Railroad in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at a time when many of our railroads are losing revenue and struggling for existence against severe competition, I am happy to invite attention to an Idaho line which is operating on the profit side of the ledger.

This is the 15-mile Nezperce Railroad, located on Idaho's famous northern Camas Prairie. While the line may not compare in size with its more extensive and better known brothers, it makes up in quality and unique operation for any such lack.

The success of the Nezperce Railroad is due to its enterprising owner, Mr. Joe Lux, a well-known northern Idaho citizen.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the magazine News Front of March 1960 describing operations of this unusual and remarkable railroad.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE IS WORKING ON THE RAILROAD—PRESIDENT OF 15-MILE NEZPERCE LINE SETS PROFIT PATTERN FOR AILING RAILS

The president (and principal stockholder) of the U.S. railroad expects his line to make a bigger profit this year than last—and has no featherbedding problems.

He is Joe Lux, successful Idaho farmer, who bought the single track, 15-mile Nezperce Railroad for $25,000 in 1944, at the very moment a salvage crew was standing by to pull up the rails for sale as scrap.

The 22 wooden bridges on the right-of-way were old and unsafe, and the only locomotive was a wheezing steam veteran which the Northern Pacific has since acquired for museum display. Says Joe:

"That first spring we had 13 derailments on one trip from Nezperce to Craigmont (the terminals)."

"It took us 3 or 4 days to make a round trip. There were practically to ties on the roadbed, and no tie plates. Unless the weather was dry or the ground frozen, mud piled onto the pistons of the locomotive.

"People came out from the big cities to learn about railroading because we had so many problems."

One of the most spectacular feats, he recalls, was the replacement of a derailed locomotive (the coal-burning relic had been retired in favor of an oil-burner) without the help of a crane. He states:

"The four of us did it in a day."

The "four of us," incidentally, were the line's entire operating staff: Lux, president; Lloyd Stevens, superintendent; Marvin O'Dell, engineer; and Sheldon Cash, brakeman.

Each can—and does—turn his hand to whatever railroading problem comes up, and that is why, Lux boasts, featherbedding is not one of his management worries.

Since Joe bought the line, all 22 of the wooden bridges have been replaced by steel culverts (he himself) bulldozed most of the old ones out of the way). Faulty rails have been straighten or replaced, and 30,000 cubic yards of ballast and 43,000 ties have been placed in the roadbed.

Today, the line's two diesels (the oil-burning steamer has been retired, too), haul some 1,000 carloads a year between Nezperce and Craigmont, where it connects with the Camas Prairie line, jointly owned by the Union and the Northern Pacific.

Last year, operations went into the black, and Joe began paying himself a salary. He is reluctant to reveal exact figures.

The line taps rich farming country (wheat yield is as high as 60 bushels per acre), and hauls farm products outbound and fuel and fertilizer back.

Joe Lux' revivified railroad has also stimulated local industry. The area's first lumber mill has begun operations.

He calls it the "home-owned line;" local wits add "home-made."

The "Right To Demonstrate"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial by Mr. David Lawrence, which will appear in the U.S. News & World Report in the April 11 issue.

There has been much discussion in recent weeks concerning the so-called "sit ins" in various cities in the South, and the legal and moral propriety of such "demonstration," and I believe Mr. Lawrence has gone far in his editorial to clarify the 'rights" involved.

The editorial follows:

THE "RIGHT TO DEMONSTRATE"

(By David Lawrence)

The difference between a "mobocracy" and a "democracy" is that in one there is no rule of law, while in the other there is respect for law and order—a willingness to submit to the wishes of the majority of the people as expressed in a system of representative government.

To determine what form of government shall prevail is the sovereign right of a community. Where self-government is denied, the right of revolt is recognized as the inalienable privilege of the people.

These are principles that we in America have espoused ever since the days when we rebelled against the tyranny of a king and established our own republic.

The whole world has accepted the doctrine of self-government and self-determination as a basic principle of human conduct, and, when we see it violated as it was in Hungary in 1956 and in Tibet in 1959, freemen everywhere express their disapproval and horror. By doing so, we hope to encourage the downtrodden and the oppressed, though we may not feel an obligation to render them assistance by military force.

For a long time, international law has recognized the right of an outside government to demand respect for the lives and property of its citizens and, if necessary, to take forceful measures by military intervention to protect its own citizens.

To what extent, however, may nations express themselves on what appear to be purely internal matters? The United Nations has been debating lately, through the Security Council, the tragic situation in South Africa. The Government of the Union of South Africa objects to such a discussion on the ground that the recent riots are purely an internal matter relating to the preservation of law and order against mobs.

Our own Government has taken the position that, where a controversy exists as to whether an external or internal situation is involved, there should be full debate on that very point. Great Britain, France, and Italy, while expressing regret over the developments in South Africa, appear to regard them as internal.

What is happening, of course, is that 29 Asian and African nations in the United Nations are expressing their "right to demonstrate." This is a proper expression of opinion and a rightful use of moral force. For, unless we are willing to debate in the court of public opinion any issue—including our won behavior—we cannot expect to make progress toward law and order and the establishment of human rights.

But what of the "right to demonstrate" when public officials are challenged? Did the mob of 20,000 which marched on the police station in South Africa—containing only 25 policemen—have the right to throw stones and taunt and threaten so that the police grew frightened and opened fire? This was an example not of a peaceful assembly but of a mobocracy.

The net result has been the taking of severe measures of repression and the declaration of a national emergency by the South African Government so as to prevent further tragedies. The acts of lawnessness which have taken the form of burning the identity papers required of all citizens, irrespective of race, are indefensible. They are not in accord with the doctrines of peaceful demonstration, but are a defiance of law.

In our own country, the right to demonstrate is likewise being abused. Negroes and whites have a right to gather in peaceful meetings to deplore the separation of the races at lunch counters, but they have no right to create disturbances inside stores which are private property.

Does the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have the right to urge the public, by telephone calls or handbills, to refrain from patronizing certain stores? Secondary boycotts by persons who are not parties to a labor dispute are prohibited by Federal laws that have been upheld by the Supreme Court.

It may be questioned whether marching on a police station or State capitals in big numbers is a wise exercise of the right to demonstrate. Cannot the same points be made and the same publicity obtained by smaller, well-behaved groups? When a large group

is formed to march on a particular objective, the danger is that such a group can readily be converted into a mob by encouraging bystanders to join in demonstrations, which too often become lawless.

The Supreme Court of the United States has frequently upheld the right of free speech under our Constitution, but it has also ruled that it is not free speech to cry "Fire" in a crowded theater. It is the impact of free speech and the circumstances surrounding otherwise peaceful gatherings which must be carefully considered. Certainly there is no right to form groups that defy the police in their efforts to maintain order, nor any right to invade private property or to conspire to destroy anyone's business if he is obeying the laws of the land.

There is only the right to demonstrate peacefully and with proper respect for the lawful rights of others in the community.

Background of South Africa's Racial Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, world attention over the past several weeks has been focused on the Union of South Africa, a land deeply troubled by violent and bloody demonstrations on the part of this Nation's downtrodden Negro majority. These disputes, going on at the same time that Congress is considering civil rights legislation, have served to focus attention on the universality of mankind's ever-constant battle for human justice.

Mr. President, Africa is a long way away. It is a land about which Americans know relatively little. At this time, when developments in Africa are of great international importance, it is worthwhile that we familiarize ourselves with the background and history of the Union of South Africa and of the widely criticized and unfortunate doctrine of apartheid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent review of the background of the current racial disputes in South Africa which appeared in Sunday's New York Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA: LAND, PEOPLE, AND PROBLEM

LAND AND PEOPLE

The Union of South Africa lies in the South Temperate Zone. Most of its 473,000 square miles is plateau country with a climate similar to that of southern Europe. The plateau is fringed with mountains and tropical lowlands. The east, where most of the population lives, is well-watered farmland. The west is arid. South Africa is the world's largest producer of diamonds and gold; it also exports uranium and wool. Industry is developing and now produces one-fourth of the national income.

Of the population of 15 million, about 10 million are native Africans of Bantu stock. Half live in native reserves; the others live on white-owned farms and in urban native quarters, where they provide cheap labor. The European population of 3 million is divided into 1,700,000 Afrikaners and 1,300,000 who speak English. The Afrikaners are descended from Dutch, German, and Huguenot settlers; they speak Afrikaans, a derivative of Dutch, and live mostly in the rural areas. The English-speaking settlers predominate in the cities. The 1,400,000 Cape Coloreds—people of mixed bloods descended from the early colonists and their slaves—have a legal and social status above the Africans but below the whites. There are also 500,000 Indians, brought in as laborers and now important in trade.

HISTORY

Holland planted a settlement at Capetown in 1652, a century and a half after the Portuguese discovered the Cape of Good Hope. The Boer settlers (Boer is Dutch for farmer) grew food for ships trading with Holland's Far Eastern empire. The Cape was only lightly populated by nomadic Bushmen and Hottentots, but, as the settlers moved inland, they clashed with Bantu tribes migrating south. In 1806, during the Napoleonic wars, Britain seized the Cape. Angered by the British freeing of their slaves in 1833, the Boers moved north in the Great Trek of 1835–37. They set up independent republics, landlocked and isolated from Europe. A three-way struggle between British, Boers, and Bantus ended with the British victory in the Boer War of 1899–1902.

In 1910 Britain welded the area into the self-governing Union of South Africa. (It gained full independence with the Commonwealth in 1931.) Three territories—Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland—were set aside as native protectorates under British rule. From the beginning, the Union's ruling whites divided into two major political factions. One, the present United party, was pro-British and took the Union into both world wars; it draws most of the English-speaking vote. The anti-British faction, the present Nationalist Party, favored neutrality in the wars; it gets most of the Afrikaner vote. The Nationalists displaced the United party in power after winning the 1948 election. They won with increased majorities in 1953 and 1958. In the 163-seat House, the Nationalists in 1958 won 103 of the 156 seats elected by the white population. The United party won 53 seats. The remaining seven seats are held by four white elected by the Coloreds and three whites elected by the Africans.

CURRENT ISSUES

The Nationalists came to power with two basic objectives: to ensure white supremacy, and to make the Afrikaners dominant among the whites. Under their doctrine of apartheid (apartness), they have tightened segregation and job discrimination laws. Last year Parliament adopted a plan for the ultimate concentration of most of the Africans in Bantu reserves, including the British protectorates, to which the Nationalists lay claim. The Nationalists have restricted rights of the Coloreds and Indians. To ensure Afrikaner control, they have altered the electoral system in favor of the rural districts. They plan a referendum this year on making South Africa a republic, perhaps outside the Commonwealth, and they have spoken of eliminating English as one of the two official languages.

The United party also supports white supremacy, but in milder form, and is vigorously opposed to Afrikaner dominance. Until recently the Africans themselves offered no widespread resistance. Last year the more militant Africans left the old, moderate African National Congress to form the Pan-Africanist Congress. It was this group that staged the recent demonstrations.

Humphrey Called "Right Too Soon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of great pride and high privilege that I commend to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States another tribute to an outstandingly great American, the senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

In his effort to serve his constituents in the best possible manner, Senator HUMPHREY pioneered many legislative concepts which only recently have been adopted by the President, presidential candidates, the Congress, and legislative leaders. As the champion of civil rights, the longtime opposer of flexible farm supports, and the friend of labor and small business, we might all agree that Senator HUMPHREY was "right too soon."

Because it so clearly indicates the Senator's true character and the high ideals of which he is possessed, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1960]

HUMPHREY CALLED "RIGHT TOO SOON"

(By Drew Pearson)

HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY is the best living example of the sardonic fact that courage seldom pays off with people and politicians. History is littered with skeletons of dead heroes who stick their necks out for what was best for mankind and who are honored in death, not in life.

It is too early, of course, to judge the bestowed niche of HUBERT HUMPHREY, but certainly in this campaign to pick a President he is paying the penalty of being right too soon.

Four years ago he took a stand against nuclear bomb testing, and stuck to the position to which Eisenhower has come around today. Seven years ago he formed a State Department committee to explore ways of halting the arms race—with proper inspection—exactly the position pushed by Eisenhower at Geneva today.

Twelve years ago at the Democratic convention he stood up before bitter southern delegates and demanded that the Democratic Party "get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights." That battle for civil rights has cost HUMPHREY the undying opposition of the South today. Yet Congress and the Eisenhower administration this month will write his several ideas into law.

OTHER CRUSADING FIRSTS

For 7 years he has opposed Agriculture Secretary Benson's flexible price supports, a position to which his chief rival for the Democratic nomination, Senator JACK KENNEDY, has just come around in the last 2 years.

He proposed an International Health Year modeled after the International Geophysical Year and went to Moscow to get Khrushchev's support. He originated the idea of the Great White Fleet which was picked up by Life magazine and has resulted in a mercy ship now calling at southeast Asian ports with American doctors and nurses.

Finally, he has been the consistent champion of labor, a devoted friend of Israel, a

battler for religious tolerance and the most articulate Senate spokesman for small business.

Yet with the exception of the farmers, none of these groups is really in HUMPHREY's corner. Though he risked fanning the flames of southern ire only last year by delivering the main address before the National Association of Colored People, there is no great rush of the Negro vote in his direction.

Though he has gone down the line for labor more consistently than any other Senator save WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the attitude of labor is best described by the remark of Joe De Silva, potent head of the Los Angeles retail clerks: "This time we want a winner. HUMPHREY's all right, but he can't win."

SELDOM FIRES BLANK

Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson reacted differently, but the net result was the same. When Senator HUMPHREY consulted them before he took the presidential plunge, Stevenson said he wouldn't seek the nomination, but wouldn't turn it down if offered. But he was not willing to release his longtime political supporters to work for HUMPHREY.

Truman told the Senator from Minnesota that he would support SYMINGTON as Missouri's favorite son, though he left open the possibility that he might change candidates in later balloting.

Only Mrs. Roosevelt, matriarch of the liberal Democrats, has been in HUMPHREY's corner. "HUMPHREY," she has said, "possesses the spark of greatness." However, with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., now beating the Wisconsin bushes for KENNEDY on the reported promise that he will be Secretary of the Navy in the KENNEDY cabinet, even Mrs. Roosevelt recently has been silent.

Chief criticism of HUMPHREY is that he talks too much. This is true. And sometimes he gives the impression of shallowness because of his glibness. He talks in machinegun bursts, yet seldom fires blanks. Even his enemies admit that he thinks as fast as he talks.

His small, boyish face, likely to pucker into unpresidential expressions, adds to the impression he is not profound. Yet he has an ability to electrify those he meets.

HUMPHREY's mind drives his 170 pounds at such a frenetic pace that he gives the appearance of perpetual motion. He tries to cram more activity into each day than his time will permit. This is the man whose political fate will largely be decided in Wisconsin next week.

Frelsburg, Tex., Families Roll Logs for Magnificent New Rectory; Sigman Byrd Tells the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us know that from the days of the earliest settlers, two of the major things that made our Nation great have been religious faith and a spirit of neighborly cooperation.

There is nothing more basically American than the community quilting bee, or the frontier logrolling to build a home for a new family in a settlement. This is a spirit which, although sometimes overlooked in the complexities of modern living, still prevails in many areas and along many streets of America, literally and figuratively.

One such place is Frelsburg, Colorado County, Tex. Frelsburg, founded in the 1830's, was one of Texas' first German settlements and here is situated the oldest Catholic parish in my State.

Today the 120 families of this parish are constructing a magnificent new rectory. All of the planning and all of the work and all of the materials is being furnished by the parish families. The structure is being built from native stone and virgin cedar all taken from the gently rolling hills of Colorado County.

Recently Houston Chronicle Columnist Sigman Byrd, a feature writer without peer in reporting the life and times of Texans, wrote an excellent column on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his "Byrd's-Eye View" in the Houston Chronicle of March 30, 1960, entitled "Historic Parish Rolls Logs for New Building."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD'S-EYE VIEW—HISTORIC PARISH ROLLS LOGS FOR NEW BUILDING

(By Sigman Byrd)

FRELSBURG.—The 120 families of this oldest Catholic parish in Texas are having a logrolling whose like probably has never been seen in this State before.

They're building a large, modern rectory on the 70-acre grounds of the church of Sts. Peter and Paul, and they're building it entirely of native stone and native timber, all donated by Colorado County property owners, and of course, they're working without pay.

There won't be a finer rectory anywhere when it's finished. Most of the timber is virgin cedar, worth 35 cents a board foot. All of it has been felled on the slopes of the gently rolling hills of Colorado County by members of the parish.

Milling operations are now well along at the Hugo Schuette sawmill, a mill almost 100 years old, on nearby Red Gates Creek. Helping Hugo and his wife, Odilia run the mill are other crews of church members, donating their services for the love of God and for the love of their church and its pastor.

Mrs. Schuette, gray-haired but trim in jeans, works as a blocksetter, and also keeps a record of the runs. "We're missing just 434 feet on the first 5,000 feet," she told me, checking her records. After that, we've got 15,000 more feet to cut. Isn't this beautiful timber?"

The big 75-year-old cedar logs were fine indeed, and the lumber was beautifully marked and colored in reds, yellows, and purples. Mounds of cedar sawdust sweetly scent the air around the live oak-shaded mill, and this sawdust is eagerly sought by poultry growers as an insect repellent.

The history of Sts. Peter and Paul parish goes back to 1836, the first year of Texas independence, when the first pastor, Father E. P. Stehle, arrived here. The present rectory is a frame building about 80 years old, with 12-foot ceilings, picturesque but no longer safe.

The new rectory will have four bedrooms, an office, and a vault. It will be warmed and cooled by heat pumps and will have an electric laundry and electric kitchen. Facing will be of cedar shakes, made at the Schuette mill, and of native sandstone and flint. Even the sand and gravel for the job, donated like the other materials, will come from Colorado County.

Exterior of the building will be rustic in appearance, to match the projected parish museum, which the pastor hopes will one day be worthy of nationwide attention.

"Practically everything for the rectory has been donated right here in the county," said Father Bockholt. "We only have to buy hardware, aluminum window frames, glass, and some bricks. Every stick of wood except the surface floors will be cedar—even the subfloors. We'll never have to worry about termites, ants, roaches or moths.

Pitching in 100 percent on parish projects is nothing new hereabouts. One Sunday recently Father Bockholt asked from the pulpit for volunteer labor to clear some of the church grounds. Every man in the parish came at the appointed time—except one.

He was too sick to work.

But his wife came and worked in his place.

When the pastor decided to build the new rectory a month ago, he drove to every one of the 120 homes in the parish to make the announcement. He came home with unanimous promises of volunteer labor and $3,000 in cash besides. Most of the parishioners are of German or Czech ancestry.

"Our people are far from rich," said Father Bockholt. "But there aren't any more generous people anywhere. Would you believe it, my grocery bill, for two people, since I've been here, has run between $12 and $17 a month, and I've never yet had to buy an egg."

The schedule for the new rectory calls for completion in 3 or 4 months.

The "Broker Government"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the March 24, 1960, edition of the Philip (S. Dak.) Pioneer-Review.

The editor, Robert Garness, has clearly pointed out the fallacy of so-called Federal aid. I know his views are representative of people throughout my district who prefer government at the local level, rather than centralized in Washington with a doubled price tag:

THE "BROKER GOVERNMENT"

An interesting comment on Federal aid comes from the Tax Foundation.

"There's nothing small," it points out, "about the nearly 100 Federal aid programs to State and local governments which will cost $6.8 billion in fiscal 1960, up $2 billion since fiscal 1958.

"Three out of four of these aid dollars (for agriculture, housing, veterans, highways, etc.) represent taxes that made the round trip to Washington and return to the State of origin. Such reallocation of tax moneys results in some States paying over $2 in Federal taxes for each $1 received as aid.

"The designation, 'Federal aid,' is a misnomer in the implication that the Government is the source of such bounty, but it is a handy label. The Government has no money to distribute other than that it receives from the taxpayers. It simply serves

as a broker, as a dealer in money, when its handouts are made. Because it costs money to handle money, the Government has to exact what amounts to a brokerage fee. Thus, it pays out in aid less than it receives. The greater the Federal aid the less the taxpayers get for their money."

And then there are those who want to inaugurate a Federal aid to education program that under its initial year of operation would require an additional appropriation of $600 million.

Dynamic Career of Jarrell Franklin McCracken, Divinity Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the spirit of personal enterprise, which has been a dynamic force in American life is not dead.

Neither is the ingenuity of our youth.

Eight years ago a 22-year-old student in Baylor University in Waco, Tex., launched a small recording company for religious records. Within 2 years the company sold $9 million worth of records. Sales now are about $4 million a year.

The amazing success of this young man and his associates was featured in a column by one of our able Texas writers, Tommy Turner, in the March 26 Dallas Morning News. Because I believe this story is an inspiration for all of us—and a testimony to the possibilities of the American system—I ask unanimous consent to publish this article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL TEXAS NOTEBOOK

(By Thomas Turner)

WACO, TEX.—We wouldn't believe this if we hadn't been there.

Nine years ago we met this young ministerial student at Baylor named Jarrell McCracken. He had a part-time job as a radio announcer while he studied and preached at little churches.

A friend suggested he take the two subjects he knew well, religion and sports, and bolster each with the other. Jarrell did that one night at a meeting, doing a play-by-play report of the "Game of Life"—it had all the sound and excitement of a football game except the players were Christian virtues and their opponents.

It intrigued people. They wanted to hear it again. With the help of some friends at the radio station McCracken made 2,000 records of it, with better sound effects.

That record evolved into the world's biggest religious recordings business. It's headed, naturally by 32-year-old Jarrell Franklin McCracken. His three top aids are all under 33, and his department heads are also considerably younger than the national average.

Two years after that first amateurish record was made, McCracken's Word Records, Inc., did a $9 million business. Sales are still moving along at a rate of about $4 million a year.

They can't build buildings fast enough to keep up with the company's expansion. It quickly outgrew McCracken's efforts to handle it from his one-room apartment—behind a cleaning shop. He moved into a small office, which was almost too crowded the next week. In 1953 it moved into a nice building which was to be its final home. Three years later, despite frenzied expansions, they were hopelessly cramped. So they moved into a new plant designed to last them forever.

Within months the business had overflowed four other buildings. Few days ago Word Records moved into an elaborate $325,000 plant. Now they know they'll have to double it and have already started.

Midway of this fantastic growth McCracken got some good financial backers but he's already bought some of them out. His first financial boost was the loan of $1,500 from a friend, which McCracken accepted fearfully.

Today his company puts out fine recordings featuring some of the Nation's finest religious talent. The list includes the famed Ethel Waters, as well as Dallas' Bill Mann. McCracken has gathered musicians and salesmen and box-packers that are the best in the business.

An international sales organization distributes the recordings to retail stores, homes, and through an album-of-the-month club. The latest costly mechanical brains handle the office records and the mountains of mail. The sales manager has a red-hot phone that only he can touch. It rings constantly with orders from everywhere.

Has the Manned Bomber a Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Sunday Star of March 13, 1960, there appeared an excellent article by Associated Press staff writer, Bem Price, covering a question and answer session with Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the interview with General White in the RECORD:

WHITE TAKES A LONG VIEW—HAS THE MANNED BOMBER A FUTURE?

(By Bem Price)

The present controversy over defense policies involves a fundamental question:

Is the United States running grave risks through its continued reliance on manned bombers as an atomic deterrent force instead of converting more rapidly to missiles?

In a question-and-answer session with this writer, Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, made clear his conviction that the Air Force will continue to rely on manned bombers as a major weapon for the foreseeable future.

Ultimately, the general believes, the U.S. arsenal will contain both intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and manned aircraft—more missiles and fewer aircraft.

As for the present, General White contends that the Strategic Air Command can do its job—destroy any aggressor.

The interview:

"Question. General, I have heard the Air Force's reluctance to give up manned bombers compared to the Navy's reluctance to downgrade battleships before World War II. Is there a reluctance on the part of the Air Force to give up manned bombers and substitute missiles, or is this continued dependence on manned bombers a result of the missile shortage?

"Answer. Well, there is indeed sentiment in the Air Force for the flying machine, but that is not the reason we need them. The basic reason for our advocacy of the manned bombers is that it has some unique characteristics. One of the major ones is that you can control the manned machine after launching; whereas, once an ICBM is launched you cannot bring it back.

"I would go you one further than the analogy to the battleship. I would go back to the cavalry. The horse, I think, was a product of the Eocene age, and I don't think the horse improved its speed or characteristics very much as a fighting vehicle from that age up to the time it disappeared from modern military services.

"On the other hand, the airplane first moved from 40 m.p.h. to the sonic barrier, say about 600 m.p.h.; then we moved through the sonic barrier and we are now able to go out to about mach 2.4 (about 1,800 m.p.h.) where we run into the heat barrier. Now we have the ability to go through this heat barrier and the potential of manned aircraft still appears to be unlimited."

MAGINOT LINE APPROACH?

"Question. I have heard it argued that however mobile the Air Force may appear to be, its continued dependence on fixed airbases and the construction of fixed missile bases represents a maginot line approach to defense. How would you answer such an argument?

"Answer. I would answer it this way: A majority of our intercontinental ballistic missile launchers will be on permanent sites. There is no practicable way, or certainly no economical way, to make the big ones, the first generation ICBM's such as the liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan, mobile. There are advantages to fixed sites that you won't have with mobile sites. One is greater accuracy. Second, you can use a bigger missile with a larger warhead. Third is the matter of economy. While we intend to make the Minuteman (a solid-fueled ICBM) mobile, they will be more expensive than the fixed Minuteman sites.

"To answer your question about the maginot line approach: Whether fixed or mobile, missiles represent a counterattack capability, not a static defense. However, if we go to an all-missile deterrent, the psychological effect of those holes in the ground would be something like a maginot line."

OUR OFFENSE

"Question. The thought has been advanced that the fixed site, even a hardened site (underground concrete firing silos) invites a heavier retaliation. In other words, instead of firing a one-megaton bomb at an exposed soft site, you fire a 25-megaton bomb at a hard site which, aside from the military target, devastates the surrounding area.

"Answer. No. The size of the warhead is more likely to be related to the size of the missile and not to the condition of the target. A hardened site would have to be hit by a surface burst which would devastate much less surrounding area than an air burst of the type suitable for use against soft targets.

"Question. I gathered from a joint Federal Aviation Agency-Air Force announcement late last year that the Air Force was going to set up three low-level bombing ranges for practice by the Strategic Air Command. I am wondering if this indicated a familiarity with Soviet defenses, which might make a high-level attack almost impossible? Wouldn't a low-level attack be subject to the same intense de-

fense? And, along the same line, has anybody ever calculated in terms of the number of planes we have, whether we could actually launch these aircraft and get them through the defenses in sufficient numbers to carry out their mission?

"Answer. I think I can give you an answer that is not classified. We need the diversity of tactics which both high-level and low-level attacks give us. The enemy's defense problem is much complicated by that. For instance, if we were sure he could not make a low-level attack against us, we would not have to worry about many elements of our air defense. * * * The same way with high-altitude attacks. * * * I would point out that just one weapon alone we are adding—the air-to-surface missile—makes high-level attack look even more worthwhile.

"Question. Can you get these aircraft through in sufficient numbers?

"Answer. We have the ability to penetrate the potential enemy defenses. By that I don't mean to say we won't have loses, but the losses won't be prohibitive.

"Question. Does the Air Force still contend a thermonuclear war would be over in a matter of days? I have noticed the Russians do not subscribe to this contention.

"Answer. I feel the decisive phase of general war will be over in a relatively short time. Now, it could be measured in hours, it could be measured in days. It might possibly last a couple of weeks.

"Question. Can you foresee any recovery capability on the part of either nation which would allow them to continue to fight?

"Answer. I can only say that the nation which has the best offense, the best defense and an adequate civil defense program is going to come out relatively better off, but what the relativity is going to be, I could not measure."

EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

"Question. We have gone to considerable trouble to establish a ballistic missile early warning line. Of what value is that early warning system to our counterattack capability?

"Answer. If the only weapon we had to respond to enemy attack were ballistic missiles, and your warning system went out, which it might do from enemy attack or mechanical failure—or natural phenomena—you have only moments in which to decide what is happening and what to do.

"You wouldn't want to launch your counterattack until you were sure you were being hit. So, do you wait until the enemy's missiles land, or do you automatically strike back when your warning system goes out? You begin to see what kind of a box you get in if you rely too much on ballistic missiles.

"Question. What would be your reaction to a single research and development agency, similar to the Manhattan project agency which developed the atomic bomb, in which military services and the civilian scientists would state their requirements for missiles and then leave it to the agency to develop?

"Answer. The single research and development agency idea has some merit that I would not be opposed to looking into. In fact, I have given it some thought. I am not prepared to give a definitive conclusion yet. One of the dangers is that the developers would go off in a different direction from what the people who will have to use the weapon had in mind.

"Question. Do you buy the contention that a limited war, that is, anything short of an all-out nuclear war, is more likely?

"Answer. Certainly, the all-out war is less likely, but it is one that is quickly fatal if we don't deter it. Compared to this threat, all others, however important, are secondary.

AIR FORCE NEEDS

"Question. Department of Defense officials have said the B–70 bomber program was killed because other weapons systems would overtake the B–70 before it became operational. What is your feeling?

"Answer. I can only say there will be a requirement for manned aircraft into the indefinite future. Now what the opposing views are, I will not say in detail or speak for anyone other than myself. The regrettable thing is that many people think the ICBM is going to be the answer to all strategic problems. It simply is not.

"Question. What military systems do you think the Air Force will need to perform in outer space for the next 5 years? And do you think outer space has a military significance?

"Answer. There is no question in my mind that outer space has a military significance. The extension of speeds and altitudes into outer space is going to be a continuation of the things we have been doing in the Air Force for years—flying higher and faster and carrying heavier loads.

"Reconnaissance is something that can be done more readily and more quickly from higher altitudes. Detection systems such as infrared sensors, or a satellite, can pick up heat manifestations anywhere within its cone of observation.

"Communications can be greatly improved by the use of satellites. Weather forecasting, although not strictly military—nor is communication—will have military applications.

"Once unique military vehicles exist in space, then you immediately generate a requirement to defend against them. That means defensive weapons in space. So, it seems to me, the progress of military requirements will follow the same pattern it always has as we have progressed higher and faster."

PRESENT DANGER PERIOD

"Question. For some reason, many are using the target date of 1965 as a sort of cutoff point in our present danger period. If you were looking ahead to 1965, what would you see as the size and shape of the Air Force?

"Answer. First, let me clear up a point: 1965 is not a cutoff point at all. The years after 1965 may be more or less dangerous, depending on what we do now. I am sure the Air Force in 1965 is going to be composed of aircraft in very large numbers. The number of bombers in relation to the number of missiles will probably be lower. In the fighter-interceptor air defense field, I would not say for sure that the manned aircraft might not appear in larger numbers than it does under our presently forecast air defense program.

"Question. What would the reason be?

"Answer. Because the ground-to-air missile can only be used within the environment of a ground warning and control system; whereas, you can mount a self-contained early warning flying radar as well as missiles in your aircraft.

"In the field of tactical air, manned aircraft are going to be in the inventory in considerable numbers. That is because the tactical air forces deal so much with targets of opportunity. They are so closely tied to the land battle that I am sure missiles are not going to replace aircraft in this field as rapidly as they will in the stategic field.

"And, of course, in airlift I do not rule out the possibility that we may move passengers some day by ballistic missiles, or some adaptation of it. The airlift forces, however, are going to be composed of airplanes for many, many years.

"So, we are going to have manned aircraft. We are going to have ballistic missiles in increasing quantities and in increasing ratio to manned strategic bombers, and we are going to have a number of space systems."

The Case for a Social Security Amendment To Provide Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared this morning in the New York Times, and which constitutes one of the most persuasive statements of the case for the Forand bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE PREPAID SICK BENEFITS BACKED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The average number of days of hospital care required by aged persons is almost three times greater than during their earlier years. When no longer employed, most of the aged cannot meet the high costs of hospital care out of their limited retirement income, or pay the excessive premiums demanded at their advanced age for adequate insurance coverage.

The outcome of the present controversy regarding the Forand bill (H.R. 4700), and similar legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide prepaid hospital and surgical benefits for retired persons after age 65, will largely depend upon the merits of the claim that voluntary insurance can accomplish the same objective. In arriving at a decision, this data should be considered.

By 1980, 26 million Americans will be over 65 years of age, of whom 80 percent, or 21 million, will be eligible for social security.

Seventy-four percent of the aged have annual incomes of $0 to $1,000, 11 percent have incomes of $1,000 to $2,000, and 15 percent have incomes of $2,000 or more. (New York Times, Mar. 20.)

PERCENTAGE WITH INSURANCE

Only 35 percent of people over 65 have hospital insurance, most of it with inadequate benefit coverage. Only 20 percent of the aged with incomes below $1,200 a year carry any hospital insurance, and two-thirds of these have individual insurance policies with token benefits. (Wilbur Cohen, U. of Michigan.)

These observations are contradicted by a claim made by the insurance industry through its health insurance council, circulated throughout the medical profession. The council states that 65 percent of people over 65 years of age "who need and want this protection have health insurance protection." This statistic probably includes employed persons over 65 who are still covered by contributory group insurance plans and many hired persons who can afford only a niggardly health and accident insurance policy with inadequate hospital benefits.

The real joker is to be found in the fine print, which reads "who want this protection." In compiling its statistics, the council has obviously excluded two-thirds of the 11 million retired aged on social security who have incomes of less than $2,000 a year and who may not "want this protection" because adequate benefit coverage at their advanced age would take 10 percent of their income.

VARYING POLICIES

According to the health insurance council there are 1,255 companies in the United

States selling health insurance. Each sells a number of different policies varying from token benefits of little protective value up to comprehensive coverage. Almost all these companies also offer variable "experience rates" to insured groups so as to siphon off the preferred risks—the young people who are unlikely to be ill. This means higher costs for groups which include older employees and lower rates if older employees are excluded from employment.

This extremely complicated and confused rate and benefit structure makes it impossible for the 1,255 voluntary insurance companies to earmark reserves during the wage-earning years of the employed population which are needed to meet the much higher costs of their hospital care after retirement. The problem is further complicated by the fact that many workers move from job to job during their years of employment, which involves repeated changes from one insurance company to another, with quite different benefit patterns and costs.

In contrast, the social security mechanism provides a simple method for collecting the required earmarked reserves and also for spreading the risk of higher hospital costs in later life throughout the preceding years of employment.

GEORGE BAEHR, M.D.

NEW YORK, *March 29, 1960.*

America in the Next Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the School of Foreign Affairs of Assumption College, Worcester, Mass., on March 24, 1960:

AMERICA IN THE NEXT DECADE

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the School of Foreign Affairs, Assumption College, Worcester, Mass., March 24, 1960)

Father Desautels, members of the faculty, and the student body of Assumption College, ladies and gentlemen, last September when Father Desautels invited me to address the School of Foreign Affairs, there was some doubt as to whether I would be able to accept because of incomplete plans for business trips to Central America and the Far East. But, like everything else, time has taken care of the situation; those business trips have been completed and I am happy indeed to be with you tonight. I am going to talk to you about America in the next decade.

It has been said that the progress of man can be measured by the number of times he has successfully challenged maxims of previously accepted truth. That is to say, the world was both flat and stationary until the 15th century when Galileo perceived that it was round and in motion—and Columbus opened a new world in offering the final proof.

This philosophy has been experienced in nearly every field. Pasteur uncovered a new world, no less than Columbus, when he discovered antitoxin; modern medicine is almost his monument. Hertz and Marconi performed the same function of discovery of the air waves above us as Galileo, Columbus, and Magellan did for the seas that surround us.

Intellectually and spiritually, the human race tends to live in walls of cardboard, self-erected, and limiting, as if it feared the broader view. Once a perceptive soul has battered down this wall the mass of men enjoyed and, indeed, find it impossible to conceive of any existence except upon the wider plane.

Not every venture results in world-shaking discovery. Indeed, most fail. Yet if no ventures were made, because most fail, man would still be living in his cave, clad in skins and hunting with stones.

This is what I wish to talk to you young men about tonight. I wish to tell you that the currently fashionable axiom that we are living in an unpredictable world of confusion, uncertainty and imminent disaster is, in my opinion, false. Furthermore, I believe that within rough probabilities as, let us say, one can predict that a driver will send a golf ball 200 yards, whereas a No. 9 iron will send it a much shorter distance, the course of history is foreseeable, and foreseeable as it never was before. This involves no magical process. On the contrary, it is based on pure reason. Permit me to illustrate: In 1879 Alexander Graham Bell patented the telephone. There are over 400 million in use today. In 1892 the first automobile patents were taken out. There are over 150 million on roads today, and 7½ million more will make their appearance this year. In 1905 the Wright brothers flew a powered kite at Kitty Hawk. Today more than half the trans-Atlantic passenger traffic is carried by air. Now, does this mean more confusion, as the present philosophy illustrated in its more extreme forms by the beatnik would have you believe? Nonsense, far from confusion, it means far more exacting precision. Thus a jet navigator must have a thousand times more exactitude than Columbus. The reason is he is moving over 600 miles an hour for 6½ hours, while Columbus moved for 2½ months at 3 miles an hour, and thus had more time to correct his errors.

My second point is that this vast expansive movement is in a state of acceleration. It will move faster and require even greater precision and, of course, it will produce many times more than it is now producing. These successful challenges of the 20th century will multiply 10 times over in the next 20 years alone. Further, they will provide you with your personal challenge which to a wholesome, strong young man means opportunity, as never before in the world's history. For example, more than half of the American people earn their livings in industries which did not exist before 1900—and hadn't even been conceived in 1875.

Plastics, electronics, and atomic power reached volume only in the last 15 years. Can one, looking at the record since 1900, believe that the next 15 years will bring less?

As is so often the case, our own American sayings often provide the insight. Recently, a foreign diplomat arriving in Washington was conveyed by taxi to his embassy. As the cab passed our Bureau of Archives the foreign visitor read its motto aloud: "'The past is but prologue.' Very augustly put," he said to the taxicab driver, "but how would you express that in your everyday American language?" "In everyday American language," said the cab driver, "that means you ain't seen nothing yet."

It is my firm conviction that indeed we have not. A vast new industrial, scientific, and magnificent world is unfolding rapidly before your eyes, and the really important questions are—what is the role in it of these United States of America—and what is yours, the individual young man?

I think for the young American these are many, many examples of effective effort by our own history. To Horace Greeley's advice, "Go west, young man," I would add and east, and north, and south, because the industrial frontier is expanding in all directions.

Nor is example lacking in what to do when one arrives. It seems to me the shining light is the life of Benjamin Franklin. He brought to Philadelphia more than a printing press. When he had finished his work there were, among other things, community hospitals, sanitation, fire departments, and insurance companies. There are dozens of communities in this world begging for the arrival of a Benjamin Franklin right now. The modern young American will necessarily have to prepare himself in the ways of a new civilization; but once he has mastered his techniques an anxiously receptive world will be waiting for the skills he can bring.

The rise of a new civilization could be stopped by no nation; on the contrary, that nation will be strongest which most assists and augments it. The United States must exert every sinew to lead both the research and the distribution of the benefits of the new civilization. This, perforce, is all but certain to be done and it will result in one of the most benign, if not the most benign, cycle in human history. American bulldozers will cast concrete roads across deserts and jungles, as the covered wagons once broke trail across our own country. Hospitals, magnificently equipped, will blossom where disease now gathers its ghastly crop as it did in the Black Deaths of 1350. And those hospitals will be blessed for their American cleanliness, their American precision instruments and their American directed and trained personnel.

And American workers will prosper as they never prospered before. American enterprise will expand as it never expanded before—because in supplying the world the basic needs for a material civilization it will be performing the highest possible spiritual service, helping its fellow man.

I have heard a great deal about population explosion as a world menace but I cannot fathom the reasoning by which that conclusion is reached. Are we to assume then that the Sahara and Great Gobi Deserts are to remain deserts forever? Such is the type of reasoning which criticized President Jefferson for purchasing the whole Mississippi Valley for $15 million only a century and a half ago, and also criticized the purchase of Alaska, dubbing it "Seward's Folly," back in 1867. Doubtless it was the thesis in 1803 that 2 million square miles of forests could never support more than a few thousand trappers. And what of the world's most naturally productive areas—the rain-forest jungles? Is it possible to seriously urge that 50 feet of jungle-rich topsoil will produce less than our own magnificent 15 feet of Mississippi Valley earth? Sea water is already convertible to fresh water, at a high price, but what price human life?

Not within the next 10 years but by the end of this century men will have conquered both jungle and desert as certainly as he has already turned sea and air to the use of all, and 100 years from now great and magnificent cities risen in the spots where desert scorpions and jungle monkeys now live will ponder how the shortsighted 20th century ever arrived at the bizarre conclusion that the world had too many people. The actual physical machinery to accomplish these results is already in existence. What it needs and will get is a new concept of finance, whereby the less productive areas can be developed to a point of equal exchange in trade. Does this sound visionary? Again let us look at the actual fact. One hundred and thirty years ago it took eight men engaged in agriculture and transportation to maintain two city dwellers. Today, through modern machinery the ratio is exactly reversed and the products exchanged,

let it be added, are quite beyond the imagination of the 19th century farmer, as any 20th century television owner of a modern electrified farm will testify.

If these premises be accepted the function of the young American in it will not be hard to define. The qualifications of the new era, however, will be much more exacting than the last. A precision age demands precision men; a broader age will demand broader men and, last and perhaps most important, the soaring civilization will require and produce the highest standard of ethics in the men who run it.

Our country has already broadened beyond the concept of the thirties. Trafalgar Square was a marvel of monuments to farflung empire; Australia House, India, Canada, Malaya—all with their representative buildings—were unique reminders to visiting Americans that not every country was able to transact its business within its own 3,000-mile borders, as we were. Now, that has all changed and it changed me too. It will change you even more. Thirty years ago I would have found it startling indeed if a soothsayer had predicted that the paths of commerce would lead me beyond the borders of our own country. But, and I cannot emphasize this too much, the ordinary course of business has taken me from the Rhine to the Congo; from the Orinoco to the Ganges. Three weeks ago I returned from the Far East; I went as far as Bangkok. The jetplane which took me from New York to New Zealand accomplished the flight in exactly 28 flying hours, which is somewhat startling when it is considered that it took Magellan 3 years to do the same thing. One day in 1909 when I was swimming off the banks of the Hudson I had my first sight of an airplane flying above the river. It just happened that it was the historic Albany-to-New York flight made by Glenn H. Curtis, the famous aviator, in connection with Dutchess County's participation in the State Year of History Celebration in New York State, marking the trip Henry Hudson made 300 years earlier up the river which bears his name. I had no idea then that 37 years later I would take my first flight around the world. If this be the ordinary course of business for me, who is somewhat your elder, imagine what it will be for you who are starting your journey.

When I say the qualifications will be higher I am again merely referring to the progression. Fifty years ago it was a highly unusual young man who was lucky enough to go to college. Now it is the rule, certainly for those who aspire to leading positions. The standards will go higher and higher, which means the challenge also and the effort. Frankly, there will be small place on the bridge of the new ship for those who prefer ease, comfort and security. These never were the companions of leadership in any age, and those who seek them must yield the command of others. There was no ease in Washington's headquarters at Valley Forge, small comfort in the trenches in France, and no security in either. But if a man is unable to yield these in the first place he is disqualified for the command of others. This is not in criticism: this is a free world and every man has free will. To accept the challenge means to institute a self-imposed hardship, to train and prepare for the greater responsibility. I am not passing judgment on whether or not a young man accepts the challenge; I am merely identifying the challenge as much more rigorous than ever before, and it is a challenge which must be met from the classroom and lecture hall to the actual decisions to be made.

I have no doubt whatsoever that in unprecedented numbers the challenges will be accepted, equaled and surpassed by tens of thousands of young Americans. From this, I predict that all lines of effort will deepen in research and expand in result. And I predict that young Americans will broaden and deepen with the new civilization they themselves will be creating.

As one of the world's most prolific writer of letters and as one of the world's largest receivers of communications I was aware from my earliest days that while the world described these documents as letters, each was in fact the communication of an idea by one human being to another. Radium itself is no more active than the human mind and it is one of the greatest contributions of modern civilization that the transmitter of the human mind is a letter box on the street corner or a rural route.

Here I wish to do more than advance a theory. I wish to prove a fact. When I was Postmaster General of the United States the Department handled approximately 19 billion letters a year. Today, that Department is handling 62 billion pieces of mail. This means that though the U.S. population has grown only 25 percent its exchange of ideas, its brain and its energies, if you please, are working 300 percent faster. Let the defeatists and the beatniks answer that if they can.

I mentioned earlier that humanity, in its thinking, has imprisoned itself in cardboard walls. Cardboard walls cannot stand up before this rising standard of world civilization, particularly the cardboard walls of hate based on the mud-foundations of differences of race, creed or color. The moral advance of man will follow his scientific advance, and when the last cardboard wall between men is knocked down, as was predicted at Calvary, 2,000 years ago, men will stare not into the faces of an enemy but into the eyes of their brothers. Once men had nothing to fear but fear. In the new era upon us they will have nothing to hate but bigotry and hatred.

And now, let me reach by conclusion. I have just returned from an extensive tour of the Far East. I have spoken to people of every class of society, government, and business. These peoples, these nations, like us, are of every different shade of opinion. But on one thing they are in complete accord. From New Zealand to Tokyo they are certain that to accord—or to even consider according recognition to Red China—is to compromise the very soul of political freedom. A vast new Pacific community of free nations is rising in strength—and for America to in any way recognize the enemy of their freedom would be in their eyes to spiritually desert them in their hour of need. They believe, and I believe, that any weakening of the position of the free world in Asia would create a political vacuum which could and would be instantly filled by Communist forces. Such action by our part would bring about an Asiatic diplomatic catastrophe compared to which the Munich disaster would be regarded as merely a mild mistake.

A great German poet once said, "Pray tell me your convictions for I have doubts enough of my own." I have never hesitated to set forth my convictions, and I do so again, here and now.

The mighty Japanese nation is composed of millions of skilled workers. What these people need, and what they are entitled to have is the raw materials upon which they can exercise their skill, and a fair market in which to sell them. The reason they need them is the same reason we need them. They have to earn a living, even as you and I. There is one big difference between their problem and ours: they do not have the resources within their own borders. We must see to it that the Pacific Ocean is no country's lake but every nation's highway. Freedom of the seas is the lifeblood of Japan.

Japan is more than a freedom-loving nation. She is one of the main bulwarks of liberty in Asia. To abandon our ally, or to force Japan to seek economic deliverance at the hands of the Reds would be as shortsighted as handing Berlin to the Russians—on the ground that it is none of our business. Red forest fires and Red armies respect no boundaries. They respect only the force which can stop them.

Commonsense tells us that to the extent that we help the free nations of Asia to develop themselves that development protects us. When from New Zealand and Australia, to Thailand and Japan there is a strong freedom loving Pacific community then the Asiatic world will know a force far greater than the ancient Great Wall of China. That will be the fortress of freedom built into every man's heart—by the common purpose, common ideals of all freemen—from San Francisco to Kobe and from Melbourne to New York.

Tiros I—Special Pride for Jerseyans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is always good to receive reports of specific progress in this Nation's space-for-peace effort. All Americans, I am sure, felt a sense of pride when they learned of Tiros I, our first weather research satellite. We in New Jersey, as an article and editorial from the April 2 issue of the Newark Evening News explains, have special pride in the national achievement.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Special Pride for Jerseyans" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Tiros I" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Apr. 2, 1960]

SPECIAL PRIDE FOR JERSEYANS

FORT MONMOUTH.—New Jersey could take a bow today for both developing and interpreting the achievements of America's weather satellite, which may help mankind to ward off weather disasters.

The drum-shaped "Tiros" satellite was developed by RCA's Astro-Electronics Products Division in Hightstown.

The main tracking station for the satellite is the Signal Corps laboratory here.

The satellite was launched from Cape Canaveral yesterday. The pictures were relayed from the satellite to the laboratory here and rushed to Washington.

THREE STAGES

The command and guidance system which directed the satellite into orbit was developed by Bell Telephone Laboratories in Murray Hill.

Sidney Sternberg, chief engineer for the RCA division at Hightstown, said the weather spotting system functioned in three principal stages.

Transmission from ground stations to the satellite of electronic instructions for picture taking.

Response of the cameras and other equipment on the satellite to the ground commands.

Transmission from the satellite to earth of the pictures on the completion of each orbit.

[From the Newark Evening News, Apr. 2, 1960]

TIROS I

As the Nation's electronics laboratory, New Jersey can take a special pride in Tiros I, the first weather satellite to be placed in orbit around the earth.

This latest in space vehicles, with its two television cameras on weather-watch, was developed by RCA's Astro-Electronics Products Division in Hightstown. The radio guidance system which sent Tiros I into its 400-mile-high orbit was produced by Bell Telephone Laboratories at Murray Hill.

The overall project, representing the most comprehensive cloud study ever maintained from space, is under the technical direction of the Army Signal Corps Research and Development Laboratories at Fort Monmouth. There, as well as at Kaena Point, Hawaii, Army scientists will "command" and monitor the cameras by which Tiros I will scan cloud patterns around the globe.

Through this application of space for peace, a new dimension will be given the science of weather forecasting. By relating the space photographs to ground observations, meteorologists hope to penetrate ever further into the mysteries of weather fronts, including such phenomena as hurricanes and tornadoes.

From the peaceful scanning of cloud cover, of course, it is not too great a step to military photographic reconnaissance from space vehicles. Thus Tiros I also plays a role in national defense.

By any standard, Tiros I may be considered a national achievement toward which New Jersey has made a significant contribution.

Platform for Both Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram of March 27, 1960, by the distinguished American historian, Mr. Will Durant:

NEEDS OF GROWING NATION

(By Will Durant)

The following confession of prejudices is made by one who for the last 30 years has so buried himself in the past that he has small right to speak on current affairs. But he has challenged himself to stand up and be counted on living issues. This done, he will run for his life back into the 18th century.

EDUCATION

Every people, if it is not to be left behind in a rapidly developing world, must spare no effort, cost, or devotion to train each new generation in health, character, and intelligence. Education has become a national, not local, responsibility; and Federal funds should be added to raise educational standards and results throughout our country.

We suggest that these standards and goals be determined, and periodically revised, by a committee of educators, scientists, clergymen, businessmen, and Governors, chosen by the presidents of our 10 best accredited universities.

HEALTH

The first responsibility of education and government is to train and guard the health of our people. Education in health should receive an hour a week in every school year from the lowest grade to college graduation, and should be provided in evening schools for the adult population.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be empowered to prevent the pollution of the air, and to stop the sale of products which have been impartially and competently judged injurious to health. Insurance plans should be extended to guarantee medical care to all the people.

MORALS

We adults are the senile delinquents responsible for moral deterioration. Many of us have been criminally negligent in giving moral example to the growing generation. Too often we have shown the young that we judge success in terms of possessions and that we are ready to sacrifice honor and honesty for material gain. We have offered to our children, day after day, spectacles accustoming them to crime and violence, in order to sell our products.

We have pretended to a moral code favoring premarital continence, while we have surrounded the young with every simulus to sex; we have given them the example of seeking sexual excitement in a hundred forms and 10,000 places of entertainment; and we have showered publicity, acclaim, and rewards upon those who provide this entertainment, and who have shown the least regard for the stability of family life. We have disordered the lives of our children by the hasty breakdown of our marriages. We have created a public opinion that almost completely defaults in its normal and vital function of encouraging decency and discouraging vice.

In education, in morals, and in business practices we have carried liberty to a neurotic excess; and in psychology we have taught the young that self-restraint is a disease.

A greater measure of discipline in the home, the school, and the marketplace would make for a healthier, stronger, and more adult America, ready and willing to meet the tests of national cooperation and international competition.

CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

We need not fear the competition of other ways of life. It is by that competition that all economies are improved. We have successfully combined the virtues of capitalism—the stimuli of rivalry, free enterprise, private property, and variable remuneration—with the acceptance, by all our political parties, of our collective responsibility for the health and education of our people, and for that wide distribution of wealth without which our remarkably productive economy cannot work.

It is a virtue of our economic system that it cannot function unless the people progressively increase their power to buy what investment, management, science, and labor increasingly produce. The organization of labor, and the extension of social security, are indispensable to this spread of purchasing power.

Consumers, too, should organize to protect themselves from abuses of power by the producers or distributors of goods.

DEFENSE AND ARMAMENT

As the test of the rival ways of life takes increasingly an economic form, both will be impelled to devote more and more of their wealth to improving economic methods rather than military establishment.

It is clear, however, that until some international order develops the ability to protect national rights, no nation can rely upon international agreements to preserve its independence and security; disarmament, therefore, can proceed only in the measure that external danger is demonstrably reduced.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We believe that every American should have equal rights in voting, schooling, and law; and we believe that the great majority of the white population in our Southern States accept this principle, and will implement it in time. We recognize the difficulty of changing long-established ways of life and thought; we favor a gradual and patient method of effecting the change; but in a world increasingly interdependent and predominantly colored, we cannot afford to be found wanting in understanding the inescapable processes of our time.

TAXES

If statesmanship can organize a greater degree of international concord, it should be able, without reducing the welfare activities of the Government, to lower the taxes that now discourage economic incentive in management and labor alike. The stimulus to invention, economy, and work is nullified at the point where additional income would be punished by a higher rate and bracket of taxation.

It should be possible to revise tax schedules on profits and income so as to create, instead of destroying, incentive.

Representative Holifield of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the most recent issue of the Atlantic Monthly appears an article entitled "HOLIFIELD of California." The article is about one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives; and it was written by Warren Unna, one of the outstanding members of the Washington press corps.

Mr. President, Representative HOLIFIELD and I came to the Congress together in 1943. I have watched him with a great deal of interest, because of the many significant contributions he has made, not only to the welfare of his district, his State, and his country, but also to the welfare of the free world, through his membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By the same token, Mr. Warren Unna, who is one of the outstanding reporters in the Nation's Capital, has recently returned from more than a year of travel throughout the countries of the world, where he has been studying neutralism in those areas. He has returned with some concise and very worthwhile reports which I recommend most highly.

For some years before his latest trip overseas under a grant from the Institute of Current World Affairs, Mr. Unna had covered the Atomic Energy Commission for the Washington Post; and during that period of time he had come to know very well our colleague, Representative HOLIFIELD, the vigorous, popular, and exceedingly capable Member of Congress from California.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article,

about an outstanding Congressman, written by an outstanding reporter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLIFIELD OF CALIFORNIA

(By Warren Unna)

(Warren Unna has recently traveled for more than a year on a grant from the Institute of Current World Affairs, studying neutralism in countries that are not allied with either the Soviet Union or the West. Previously, Mr. Unna had for 3 years covered the Atomic Energy Commission for the Washington Post and during that period had come to know CHET HOLIFIELD, the vigorous and popular Congressman from California.)

Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD did not bother to go home to campaign in California's last primary: he thought his constituents knew enough about his work in Washington during the preceding 16 years and did not have to be told. They justified his faith in November 1958, when they voted 134,000 to 26,000 to return him to Congress for another term.

HOLIFIELD is a senior member and one of the most active participants in two key committees, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Government Operations Committee. As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he is also one of the few Congressmen to have a third committee assignment. HOLIFIELD pushed hard for the development of the H-bomb, drew up the legislation creating the General Services Administration, served as one of the two House Representatives on the second Hoover Commission, initiated the fight to squelch the Eisenhower administration's now abortive Dixon-Yates power contract, has plugged for years—unheeded—for an adequate Federal civil defense program, and conceived and chaired the first full-scale investigation of radio active fallout.

CHESTER EARL HOLIFIELD, the 56-year-old Los Angeles Congressman, was born in Mayfield, Ky. His family stayed there only a year and then moved to Arkansas. After his mother died and his father remarried, HOLIFIELD at 15 made a permanent break with home and high school in favor of Kansas wheatfields, Oklahoma oil diggings, the rails, and the hitchhiker's road. He was not surprised to find himself in California: "I'd read of the romance of the forty-niners and, as a boy, wanted to go out there. Then, like 10 million other people, I went."

HOLIFIELD's first job was as a presser in a Pasadena cleaning and dyeing shop. Before he was 19, he had married Vernice Caneer ("Cam") and started his own cleaning and pressing business in Montebello, one of the many subcommunities in central Los Angeles.

By 1927, with the boom in full swing, HOLIFIELD borrowed $1,750 and converted his pressing business into a men's wear shop. Within 4 years, he had a double reverse. He was hunting wild goats on Catalina Island with a friend when a stray shot—origin still unknown—shattered his leg bone. That stray shot from nowhere kept him bedridden or in a wheelchair for 4 years.

The store was HOLIFIELD's second reverse. Soon after his hunting accident, in 1931, the depression reached the West, closed his bank, and made worthless the checks he carefully had made out to his creditors. HOLIFIELD mortgaged his five-room house and finally lost it. When he was finally able to get back to work, he found that his liabilities were about twice his assets.

It was then that Haberdasher HOLIFIELD started to turn political philosopher. "I realized that, regardless of a man's personal ability, economic depression could take away all of his gains through years of hard work." He began to read and speak out. He became a close friend of Jerry Voorhis, a man HOLIFIELD came to look upon as "the ideal public servant," and managed Voorhis' successful campaign for Congress. Following the 1940 census, southern California had such a population increase that a new 19th Congressional District was carved out, part from Voorhis' area, part from an adjoining one. At Voorhis' suggestion, HOLIFIELD decided to take a flier in the 1942 election. He beat out 13 other Democrats for the primary nomination. In the general election, he managed to defeat his Republican opponent, Max Ward, a Huntington Park newspaper publisher, by a vote of nearly 35,000 to 20,000.

HOLIFIELD has won with increasing pluralities ever since, three times secured both the Republican and Democratic endorsement in the primaries, and thinks he could have done this again in 1958 and avoided the bother of the November election. But instead he decided to run only on the Democratic ticket, "in an effort to bring some order out of the chaotic cross-filing situation in California. I was hoping that there would be a clearcut line drawn between the Republican and Democratic Parties in order to give the voters a decisive choice."

Because of his leg, not right to this day, HOLIFIELD was never able to get into uniform during World War II. As second-best choice, when he got to Congress, he sought and gained membership on the Military Affairs Committee. After the war and in the course of committee business, HOLIFIELD came across the May-Johnson bill, a measure jointly sponsored by former Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat, Colorado, and the late Representative Andrew J. May, Democrat, Kentucky, which would have turned the Nation's new atomic energy program over to the military.

"I thought this source of energy should be developed along other than military lines and tried to get civilian control," HOLIFIELD commented. Although this was only 1945 and HOLIFIELD was but a second-term Congressman, he strode into the office of Chairman MAY and thumped on his desk to demand extended hearings. He found MAY's interest confined to what the bill would do for his Kentucky coal miners. The chairman gave him what HOLIFIELD now describes as "summary" treatment and held only a day or two of hearings on the May-Johnson bill.

HOLIFIELD also became aware of tremendous pressure from the Pentagon to nab this new atomic area for the military. Accordingly, he and Representatives Voorhiss, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Democrat, of California, George E. Outland, Democrat, of California, and Andrew J. Biemiller, Democrat, of Wisconsin, publicly appealed to the Nation's scientists to come to Washington and state their case. Several hundred jammed the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, including such renowned physicists as Leo Szilard and Harold Urey. The scientists backed HOLIFIELD and insisted that the great research and development which lay ahead for nuclear physics could not properly be conducted under military discipline.

MAY took a committee vote anyway. All but two of the members of the House Military Affairs Committee, HOLIFIELD and his close friend, MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, voted for military control of the atom.

But the furor engendered by the scientists' meeting did succeed in delaying the vote in the Senate. And then came a jurisdictional dispute in which Senator JOHNSON wanted to claim atomic-energy matters for his Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Senator Millard Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, wanted it for his Armed Services Committee. A year of wrangling followed, time enough for a freshman Senator, Brien McMahon, Democrat, of Connecticut, to introduce a bill calling for a study of atomic jurisdiction. Vice President Barkley, presiding over the Senate, assigned the matter to McMahon under a special select committee, which a year later became the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The scientists by now had organized themselves into the Federation of American Scientists. "This really brought them out from the laboratories and into public life; they became public speakers," HOLIFIELD recalls. And in the end a bill which had been greased to roll through both House and Senate in a matter of days and hand the atom to the military ended up with atomic energy under civilian control.

HOLIFIELD has been with the atom ever since, and in recognition of his vanguard work Speaker SAM RAYBURN made him a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

HOLIFIELD was a strong defender of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, yet he was completely opposed to the decision of Oppenheimer, chairman of the AEC's General Advisory Committee, and of the majority of the Commission itself not to go ahead with the H-bomb. Chairman McMahon appointed HOLIFIELD head of a special Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee to gather testimony from scientists around the country, particularly from those at Los Alamos familiar with the thermonuclear theories of Edward Teller and Stanislaw Ulam. HOLIFIELD found himself in agreement with the majority of the scientists in believing that an H-bomb could and must be made. With the backing of the full joint committee, he and McMahon went to President Truman in late 1949 and told him that he should disregard the advice of his experts, Oppenheimer and the AEC, and go ahead with a project which would cost the Nation $1 billion and absorb most of the fissionable uranium 235 then on hand. Mr. Truman had the National Security Council take a new look at the problem and then, with the strong backing of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the President made his decision.

On August 13, 1953, 9 months after this country had tested its first thermonuclear device, the Soviets exploded their first H-bomb. Says HOLIFIELD, "If Mr. Truman had not made the decision to go ahead, we would have faced a Soviet weapon a thousand times more powerful than the one we had."

Some consider HOLIFIELD to be too much of a militarist. Yet it was HOLIFIELD who first warned of the danger of creating a "fourth atomic power"—in addition to the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain—when the administration sought wide nuclear exchange authority in 1958. HOLIFIELD stubbornly held out against nuclear promiscuity. A majority of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy finally rallied around him. And in the end, the administration had to content itself with a nuclear exchange bill that was pretty much geared to Britain alone—and to congressional check back at almost every stage.

The California Congressman also has been very much concerned with the development of atomic power for peaceful uses. He and Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, have repeatedly introduced bills for massive Government assistance to get this country's atomic power program going. The Eisenhower administration, particularly under former AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, has feared future TVA's in such assistance. The Republicans have been convinced that once the Government set the precedent for constructing, operating, and owning prototype powerplants, the socialistic foot would be in the door. Accordingly, the administration has preferred to let private industry develop atomic power at its own pace.

HOLIFIELD finds this a bit ironic. As ranking minority member (now chairman) of the Joint Committee's powerful Legislative Subcommittee, a group which supervises an

annual budget in the hundreds of millions, HOLIFIELD saw to it that the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—the then-Republican Congress go-ahead to private industry—contained section 261, a no-subsidy clause.

HOLIFIELD remarks: "The sponsors of the act were so sold on the fact that private enterprise would do the job that I told them surely they would be opposed to any hidden subsidies by the Government. I had no trouble getting the clause approved, and my judgment in the minority report on the act was proved right. The act was premature, and the Republicans have been trying ever since to find some means for subsidizing the industry."

Another attempt was a plutonium buy-back provision which the AEC first tried to have inserted in the Government's contract with a powerplant under construction on the shores of Lake Erie by the Power Reactor Development Co., headed by Walker L. Cisler of Detroit Edison. The idea was to provide a Government-guaranteed price to purchase the weapons-grade plutonium which the powerplant produced in the course of its nuclear power operation. When this was stopped by the Joint Committee under the no-subsidy clause, the AEC tried to have a plutonium buy-back provision inserted in this country's aid treaty with the Euratom countries. HOLIFIELD and the Joint Committee Democrats, suspecting a foreign precedent for future domestic action, spiked that one too.

It was also this shrewd Congressman who first found something irregular in the Dixon-Yates power contract. Dixon-Yates involved the AEC, but no atomic power. The proposal was that the Government should financially assist a private utility to build a steam-generating plant which would pump electricity into TVA lines, to replace power the AEC was using at its uranium-production plants. "The whole thing," HOLIFIELD observes, "was a devious attempt on the part of the Republican administration to destroy the concept of TVA by using an administrative means to finance and subsidize a private utility group in the TVA customer area."

HOLIFIELD went before the House with a full-dress analysis of the lengthy contract, citing 18 points in which he thought the Government would be at a disadvantage. The California Congressman's argument was picked up by Tennessee's Senators, GORE and KEFAUVER, and the 2-year fight was on. The Republican majority on the Joint Committee permitted the AEC to go ahead and sign the contract at the end of 1954. But a Democratic majority, returned by the electorate at the beginning of 1955, reversed the action. The State of Tennessee sued, the Government canceled the contract and began picking up HOLIFIELD's 18 points to avoid its breach-of-contract suit from the private utility people.

How does HOLIFIELD sniff these things out? "I'm always suspicious of a lack of frankness, either in the spoken language of a witness or in the text of a bill," he says. "When I read a draft of legislation that is not easy to understand, I usually find on investigation that the very reason for its ambiguity is that it is covering something up, something that its proponent wants to slip through."

Does the Congressman always get his way? HOLIFIELD laughs at that. "Not always. But it puts your opponent in a very difficult position when he tries to justify legislation on the testimony of witnesses' intentions."

There was one occasion in 1957 when HOLIFIELD got his way without argument from either the administration or his colleagues. This was during the 8 days of hearings on the whys and wherefores of radioactive fallout. HOLIFIELD, disturbed by "all this fog of propaganda on radiation," went to Representative CARL T. DURHAM, Democrat, of North Carolina, the Joint Atomic Energy Committee's then Chairman, and persuaded him that there was a need for objective testimony based on what scientists, not politicians, had to say about fallout. The HOLIFIELD hearings which followed were so successful that AEC Chairman Strauss and Commissioner Williard F. Libby complimented HOLIFIELD for his fairness—even though the HOLIFIELD hearings brought out the facts the AEC up until then had failed to provide.

HOLIFIELD's interests often parallel themselves. While the Congressman was chairing a series of Joint Atomic Energy Committee hearings on fallout, through his other capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations he was preparing a lengthy series of hearings on civil defense. His civil defense hearings are practically the only CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject. Senator KEFAUVER held a series in the Senate some years back, but they petered out when KEFAUVER found himself the only Senator in attendance.

In his own hearings, HOLIFIELD not only secured expert scientific testimony on the problem; he persuaded Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson to recommend a $32 billion Federal shelter program.

The Holifield committee's civil defense recommendations contained such a tone of urgency that President Eisenhower appointed the Gaither Committee to look into the matter. The Gaither report, never made public, then proceeded to assess the whole state of national defense in this country. And its civil defense recommendations are believed to have been almost identical with those of HOLIFIELD's committee.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN has seen to it that HOLIFIELD has been given the committee assignments of his choice and single him out as the sole Democratic appointee from the House to the second Hoover Commission. It generally has been assumed that the Speaker and HOLIFIELD, both ardent admirers of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, hold pretty much the same political philosophy. But they part company on at least one issue: the natural gas bill. RAYBURN, of Texas, is not only for freeing natural gas producers from Federal price control; he is considered by some to be the bill's strongest advocate in Congress.

HOLIFIELD has the Santa Fe Spring oilfield, one of California's biggest, right within his congressional district. Another field is within 500 yards of his Los Angeles home. For his white-collar, small businessman constituents, the natural gas bill was not an issue; for HOLIFIELD's oil company constituents, it obviously was. They wanted freedom from Federal price control. So did RAYBURN. And in the spring of 1958 the Speaker turned every trick he knew to get the bill through the House. When the vote came, he called HOLIFIELD up to the Speaker's rostrum and made no bones about what he wanted.

It was the first request RAYBURN had ever made of his younger colleague in the 16 years he had been helping him along through Congress, and HOLIFIELD knew it. Says HOLIFIELD, still squirming with the memory, "It wasn't hard to turn down the oil and gas interests in my own district. But it was hard to turn down the Speaker. I told him I had to vote against it on principle."

Does HOLIFIELD ever aspire to be a Senator? He says "No." One reason is seniority. After 17 years in the House, he will become chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, if the Democrats keep their House majority next year. He also is next in line to succeed the chairman on the House Government Operations Committee. Because of his seniority, he heads important subcommittees, has the leadership's ear, and can get his legislation through the various blockades of hearing, committee vote, and floor vote.

But an equal deterrent to running for the Senate, in HOLIFIELD's mind, is the high cost of getting elected in California. "I represent a workingman's district composed of people in the factories, railroad shops, downtown clerical jobs, and small businesses," he says. "Due to intense campaigning and the fact that the district is 3 to 1 Democratic, I am able to make a campaign on $5,000 or less. It takes $500,000 to be elected to the Senate in California. This means TV time, direct mail, advertising in the papers, in newsreels, and on billboards. I cannot depend upon any of the usual sources of financing in a statewide campaign. There is no strong Democratic Party organization in California."

Big business backing, HOLIFIELD thinks, is out of the question. His voting record has been for his small businessman constituent and against the bills put forth by the large utilities, the banks, and the oil companies. I considered them detrimental to my district."

American Merchant Marine—Address by Alexander Purdon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Alexander Purdon, executive director of the Committee on American Steamship Lines, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D.C., on May 14, 1959:

I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to this group on the American merchant marine. Few organizations have such a brilliant record of constructive progress in analyzing and promoting the development of our transportation water resources.

Over the years, this country has developed the finest transportation system in the world—a network of rivers, rails, roads and airlines which has stimulated our development and helped to bring us to an economic level unsurpassed in the history of the world.

We are now in an age of unusual technological progress and some might assume that the oldest form of transportation—for water transportation surely is that—would have passed its peak and be supplanted in part by the newer transportation modes. Such views are not well founded. Not only do they ignore the lessons of history and the facts of geography but they fail to consider that the very technology on which they base their arguments has also produced weapons of destruction which make it more essential than ever that we consider the consequences if our manmade arteries of communication and transportation are severed.

Accordingly, we must reassess the vital necessity for adequate development of our natural transportation resources. Missiles may be aimed at rivers, harbors or oceans but their effect would not be as calamitous as similar attacks on rails or roads. Those cool, cool waters always heal themselves.

In my view, therefore, the Nation must develop its water resources and its ocean transportation to their maximum potential. To do otherwise would be to waste a priceless asset. Those who viewed the river boat as merely a nostalgic echo of the past have been confounded by the unprecedented development of river traffic. Tonnage increases over a 9-year period have reached phenomenal 5,000 percent.

Parenthetically, I might say the Soviets are not unaware of the desirability of improving and expanding their inland waterway system. They are diligently working to that end. This we must also do and we must join to it a more positive recognition of the vital importance of ocean transportation.

Admiral Burke has pointed out that the "sea reaches all islands and continents on earth where people live, fight and do business. There are no bridges to build, no mountains to cross, no tunnels to dig and the ship can alter its course at will."

Now there are many nations in the world who aspire to build their merchant marines. In some cases, as for example the Scandinavian nations—their merchant fleets are an important and, indeed, a necessary economic asset. In other cases economic questions are secondary to the value of ships flying the national flag. In others, as in Russia, where there is a vigorous program to build both a Navy and Merchant Marine, control of the seas is sought as a means of advancing their political, economic and military objectives. All of these considerations combined have caused a worldwide surge for maritime prestige. Where do we stand in this scramble for preferred position?

During World War II we built the greatest merchant fleet the world has ever known. We built it not only for ourselves but for our allies. We built it at tremendous cost. The traditional maritime nations on whom we previously had depended were either overrun or impotent. They gave us courageous assistance but, not having the resources, had to call on ours.

Just before the war, in 1936 to be exact, the United States adopted a sound policy to insure that we would maintain a merchant fleet adequate for our commerce and defense. Since the war, this policy combining private enterprise with government aid has had an opportunity to demonstrate its worth. Although frequently attacked by the shipping interests of other nations it is not a selfish policy. It acknowledges that we can count—and should count—on our allies but it also recognizes that when the chips are down and the going gets tough we must have a merchant fleet of our own.

The free world is our market and it is an area in which we are meeting increasing competition from friends and foes alike. From an economic standpoint alone, it cannot make sense to assume that we can compete vigorously for foreign markets yet depend entirely on ships owned and operated by our competitors. American business engaged in foreign trade has the right to know that it can rely on American ships whose interest in promoting our foreign commerce is identical to that of the American producer.

From a military standpoint, the problem has been complicated by the differences of opinion among our military leaders as to what kind of war we ought to fight and what kind of defense we need. But I do not know of any responsible military leader who has minimized the role of merchant shipping in whatever kind of war we may have to face. Out of the controversy between preparedness for nuclear or conventional war there seems now to be developing a shift of emphasis and recognition of the need for adequate preparedness against the more probable course of action that falls far below the flashpoint of general war yet maintaining a powerful nuclear striking power as a deterrent.

But the most recent assessment by Vice Admiral Wilson, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics, was that our sea transportation for limited war is adequate but that we have only a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war. He says the Defense Department is "gravely concerned with regard to the posture of our U.S. controlled merchant fleet" and adds that there is an urgent need for an orderly ship construction program.

In this connection, let me say that the member lines of my organization have contracted with the Government to build 26 new replacement vessels in fiscal 1960 as part of a long range replacement program. The budget request however will provide for only 14 ships. We have written to the Congress and reaffirmed our desire to meet our contractual obligations and that we are ready, willing, and able to progress with the shipbuilding program to the extent that the Government is ready to appropriate its share of the construction costs.

Earlier, I spoke of the constant struggle between the maritime ambitions of other nations and our modest aspirations. This is highlighted by a meeting in June sponsored by our State Department to which 14 Western European nations are coming for informal discussions on a number of important policy matters. The agenda provides for discussions on cargo preference, shipping subsidies and "flags of convenience." There have already been international discussions, even repercussions, on the "flags of convenience" issue and it is, of course, a very complicated and controversial matter.

We are told that this is merely an informal session; that the other nations have merely asked for an opportunity to explain their views on our maritime policies which in turn gives us an opportunity to explain our position.

Frankly, I think that our position is well known but I am disturbed by statements from European ship operators which do not wholly support the impression that this is to be an informal exchange of views. One European shipowner stated in a major speech recently that he expected hard bargaining at the conferences in June.

What is there to bargain about? Our subsidy and cargo preference policies are developed because they are necessary to the maintenace of an American merchant marine. They were adopted by the Congress. They are part of the law of the United States.

Explanation is all right, if explanation is required or desired. But, I think this meeting is symptomatic of the constant concern and, indeed, opposition on the part of other nations to this country's maritime objectives. This despite the fact that in time of war our merchant fleet will be at the service of all free nations and that in time of peace their ships have free access to our ports and carry about 83 percent of our ocean-borne foreign commerce.

Instead of merely explaining our maritime objectives and policies, I believe that we should reaffirm our intention to maintain the kind of merchant fleet required for our national survival.

Were the Russians to disappear from the world, or become overnight as tractable as church mice, America would still be faced with the necessity for an aggressive economic program to maintain our prosperity and position as the world's No. 1 trader.

We have had a fantastic growth in production and economic activity. Our gross national product rose 450 percent in 17 years and foreign trade has grown even faster—nearly 500 percent. In 1939 foreign commerce amounted to $5.5 billion; by 1957 the figure exceeded $32 billion.

The more we grow, the more nations come to depend on one another, the more we depend on the sea.

We must have a strong American merchant fleet, whether to serve the growing needs of our growing population or to play a vital role in national defense.

Ancient truths are long truths and words of another age of desperate struggle still ring true today.

"He who would be secure at home must be supreme at sea."

Migratory Worker Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the White House Conference on Children and Youth has taken forum action on many of the issues affecting our young people today. I was particularly gratified to note that the forum on "The Young With Socially Handicapped" has passed resolutions which indicate a deep and extensive interest in the migrant workers of this Nation.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I feel that the subcommittee should take full advantage of the additional national attention thrown on the migratory worker problem by action of the members of the conference.

Among the many fine resolutions passed by the forum are those endorsing Federal action to improve housing and education of migrants. The subcommittee is now considering bills to accomplish these purposes, as well as several others also supported by the conference forum.

The forum stand on education is particularly welcome, because education is certainly one of the bedrock problems facing migrants today. Our studies indicate that more than 50 percent of the estimated 100,000 school-age migrant children in the United States are from 1 to 4 years behind regular students in school.

I shall take the resolutions of the Conference forum as an indication of growing support and interest for Federal legislation in this field of critical human problems.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD those forum resolutions most directly concerned with legislation now before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, as well as those concerned with other existing or potential Federal action.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY FORUM XVIII OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

A. We recommend expansion of Federal and State programs of domestic farm labor recruitment and placement to assure workers more regular employment, farmers a more reliable labor supply, and children of farmworkers a more secure existence.

B. We recommend that long-term, low-interest Farmers Home Administration loans be made available to the farmer for migrant housing.

C. We recommend the adoption of migrant crewleaders registration at Federal and State levels with necessary appropriations for implementation.

D. We recommend that departments of education assume responsibility for the education of migrant children while they are within their State by providing opportunities for uninterrupted education during the regular school sessions, and supplemental summer schools to help them reach their proper grade level; we further recommend

that Federal funds be provided to departments of education for general education and vocational training of migrant children and youth in both farm and nonfarm occupations, for basic education and vocational training of adult migrants, and for teacher training to meet the special needs of migrant children; we further recommend that such funds be allocated according to the density, location, and duration of residence of the migrant population.

E. We recommend that the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act be amended to provide children in agricultural employment the same protection now afforded children employed in other industries.

F. We recommend that communities which depend on migrant labor make positive efforts to provide job opportunities for migrant workers during the months when they are not engaged in agricultural work, to enable the children of migrant families to become permanent residents of communities.

G. We recommend (a) the extension of Federal grants for preventive health services and medical care, public assistance and other needed welfare services, as well as the educational program of the agricultural extension service, to States in proportion to the number of migrant farmworkers and their family dependents, and that no residence restrictions be imposed for such assistance to migrants; (b) the use of such funds for (1) the development of local programs for medical care; (2) the extension of nursing and other professional services in the preventive health field; (3) the upgrading of housing and sanitation including field sanitation; (4) the strengthening of parental and child care services including the provision of day care; (5) the development of programs for parent and child health education; (6) the coordination of services—local, intrastate and interstate—to facilitate continuity; (7) the identification and development of leadership, including leadership by youth, within the migrant group.

Civil Rights Bill, H.R. 8601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 8601, the designated civil rights bill, which passed the House on March 24 and which is mainly to protect and secure the right of all qualified citizens to vote, for the reason that I felt deeply that the referee system provided for therein is very probably unconstitutional and definitely a wrong approach toward such purpose. It gives the Federal Government the power to take over State and local election machinery which I am afraid may do more harm than good toward all of our citizens—colored and noncolored—and will probably defeat the very objective of the bill.

I do not know, of course, what the final version of this legislation, nor what my vote on same, will be, as we have not as yet reached that stage. I am in hopes a good bill can and will be presented for my vote before this session of Congress ends. I most certainly will vote for one that I feel will properly help to so prevent discrimination against our citizens because of race or color.

The debate in the House on this bill up to this time has been overall gratifying to me. Except for a few words that I feel were ill considered and should not have been spoken, the debate generally was dignified and enlightening and I hope and feel beneficial to all our citizens, colored and noncolored.

Highways to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a great many thousands of Americans are going to Alaska. The coming summer bids fair to see an unprecedented rush heading northward both by air and over the Alaska Highway, for it is a regrettable fact that except for some excellent tourist ships, there is no regular passenger service to Alaska by American-flag vessels. That transportation of passengers ceased in 1954.

However, the Alaska Highway beckons invitingly. From the 48 lower States one may drive either to Anchorage or Fairbanks and to southeastern Alaska by way of the so-called Haines cutoff to the port of Haines at the upper end of the inside passage, from where the ferry will transport your car to the 49th State's capital, Juneau, perhaps the most beautiful capital of any of the 50 States.

Highway travelers to Alaska, however, will greatly profit by the advice given them in an excellent article appearing in the April issue of The Lion, the official monthly publication of the Lions International. The article entitled "Highway to Alaska" is written by Herb Hilscher, longtime resident of Alaska and the author of two excellent books on that great northwestern area, "Alaska Now," published in 1948, and "Alaska U.S.A.," published last year.

I ask unanimous consent that Herb Hilscher's article "Highway to Alaska" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAY TO ALASKA
(By Herb Hilscher)

A million people have the Alaska fever—bad. They just can't wait to head north to the 49th State. The wide open spaces. The gold nuggets waiting for their shovel. The rainbow trout 2 feet long. The fertile homesteads that will make them landed barons—the easy way.

To these 20th century pioneers, statehood has conjured up visions of opportunities unlimited and jobs for everyone. To them Alaska is the promised land—the new utopia.

The rush north is growing day by day. We Alaskans are powerless to stop it. We wouldn't if we could. But we plead that these good people know what they are getting into before they burn their bridges behind them and, on arrival here, expect the bounty of nature and the big heart of the new State to bless them with abundance, wealth, and happiness.

Opportunities are unlimited in Alaska—for the right persons. Many young couples have hit the jackpot up here much sooner than they would have in the lower 48. But they have hit it the old-fashioned way: by hard work, long hours, personal sacrifice, and a special brand of stick-to-itiveness. Not by a 40-hour week, jobless insurance, and unemployment compensation.

Out of our years of experience in Alaska, we sourdoughs have a few suggestions we'd like to pass on to would be Alaskans before they quit their jobs in the other States and start north.

1. Before taking off for Alaska, have a round-trip ticket in your pocket and at least $500 in travelers' checks to cover expenses while you give the 49th State the once-over lightly. After seeing Alaska you may say, "I don't want any part of it."

2. If you like Alaska, see all of it before you decide where you want to settle, to put down roots. Let the wife do a lot of the deciding on where in the new State you will make your home.

3. If you are planning on getting a job in Alaska, write to the State of Alaska Employment Office, Juneau, and get a copy of the bulletin, "Job Opportunities in Alaska." Get this booklet before you start north. It can save you a lot of heartaches. Don't come north with the idea of making a pile in a year or two and then going back where you came from. Those days are gone forever.

4. If you decide to settle in Alaska, come properly prepared. A rockbottom minimum to tide you over until you get your stride is $5,000. Living costs are from 19 to 55 percent higher than in the Pacific Northwest, and going into business up here usually takes more capital than you had planned.

5. If you are planning on driving to Alaska, start with a good car. You are inviting nothing but trouble if you load up an old jalopy and a trailer that is past its prime.

This word of advice is seconded by Canadian officials who, through sad experience, have played unwilling host to many broken-down cars and abandoned trailers—all because the owner was attempting to pull a load too heavy for his motor.

After taking care of scores of these Alaska-bound Argonauts who were stranded without funds, the Canadian Government has adopted a strict Alaska traveler code: The driver of each car must have $250 and a valid gas and oil credit card, and each passenger must carry $100 when bound for Alaska. In addition, a trailer code specifies the size car required to pull a certain size trailer, and if your car is of ancient vintage, you'll have to post a bond on it.

Despite restrictions, about 40 percent of the people coming to Alaska today drive over the Alaska Highway. Some of them figure that, by going by car, they can make the trip on a shoestring.

This is wishful thinking. Many an ill-prepared and ill-financed traveler has blamed the dangers and perils of the Alaska Highway for his misfortunes enroute, and has given the highway the reputation of being a man killer.

Actually, we Alaskans feel the only legitimate complaint that any driver could make about the Alaska Highway is that it is pretty long, and that the Canadian section of the highway is graveled rather than paved.

The Alaska Highway proper does not officially start until Dawson Creek, British Columbia, almost 1,000 miles north of the Canadian border. And driving to Dawson Creek is only the warmup for your trip to Alaska.

From mile zero at Dawson Creek to Fairbanks is 1,520 miles, and from Dawson Creek

to Anchorage is 1,640 miles. You cannot drive to the Panhandle communities of Ketchikan, Petersburg, Juneau, Skagway, or Sitka. They are not connected by highway with the big part of Alaska. The only southeastern town that can be reached by the Alaska Highway is Haines, and it is accessible only by a branch road kept open during the summer. During that period ferry service connects Haines with the capital city of Juneau.

The Alaska Highway is by no means a Pennsylvania Turnpike or a California Freeway, but it is a wide, well-maintained road. Twelve hundred twenty-one miles are in Canada, and most of this section is hard-packed crushed gravel, but black-topping is starting to work its way northward from Dawson Creek. The last remaining section of the unpaved portion of the highway in the State of Alaska is now being black-topped.

Roadhouses, gas stations, cafes, and motels dot the highway on an average of one for every 30 miles, and accommodations are being upgraded every year. In the main, they're clean, warm, and sufficient to serve the needs of the traveler.

Of course, if you're looking for deluxe motels with heated swimming pools, barbecue pits, and dancing girl revues, we don't have them—yet. Right now, the highway roadhouses tend more to the "bath is down the hall" variety.

But even that's a big improvement over a few years ago when most roadside stops were memorable for the "ladies" and "gents" out back—a never-to-be-forgotten experience during mosquito season or at 20° below.

Garages en route can handle both major and minor repairs and fix flats while you're having lunch. If you're camping out, there are plenty of places along the highway selling groceries, so it isn't necessary to load your car with staples. There are a sufficient number of public campgrounds on both sides of the border, with toilets and outdoor cooking facilities.

How long does it take to drive to Alaska? That depends on how you drive. College boys have made it from Seattle to Fairbanks in 3 days—driving fast around the clock, burning up the gravel, their tires, and sometimes themselves. Highway patrolmen say that next to excessive speed, most accidents on the Alaska Highway are caused by drowsy drivers and drivers falling asleep at the wheel.

Most travelers find they can drive comfortably between 300 and 400 miles a day on the Alaska Highway. The speed limit is posted for 50 miles per hour, and if you have any respect for your tires—and for your life—you'll keep to it or under it. The faster you drive on a gravel road the hotter your tires get, and the danger of blowouts mounts with the heat. When you come to a ridge of loose gravel, slow down.

After all, the scenery on the Alaska Highway is magnificent, and you can't enjoy it if you're breaking all speed records. If you want to get to Alaska in a hurry, take a plane.

Although most travelers drive to Alaska in the summer months, the Alaska Highway is a year-around road. Many Alaskans prefer driving in the winter when the ground is frozen and there is just enough snow on the road to cover the gravel and turn the highway into a white paved boulevard. But at this time of year it is necessary to put on your woolies, have your car winterized, and carry emergency gear.

How much does it cost to drive to Alaska? That depends on your appetite and the amount you want to spend—whether you dine on T-bone steaks or the blue-plate special, whether you camp out or stay at roadhouses, and whether your car is a foreign model that gets 33 miles to the gallon or a fin-tailed giant that gets you all of 14. Also, whether or not you can resist the blandishments of the ever-present Alaskan curios and souvenirs.

On the basis of averaging 300 to 400 miles of driving per day from Great Falls or Seattle to Fairbanks or Anchorage, the trip will take you from 7 to 8 days. Meals for two adults will average about $85, lodging $80, gas and oil $85—a total of about $250.

But don't start out on an economy budget. If you have a blowout and have to buy a new tire, or have car trouble, your cash funds will disappear very rapidly.

Cars of every description, make, and model have traversed the Alaska Highway. As one newsman put it, "You see as many varieties of foreign cars in Anchorage as you do in Palm Springs."

No matter what the make or model, it's a cinch to spot a car that's just driven over this northern road. Like birds of a feather, many of them carry luggage racks on top and/or trailers behind, are well supplied with stickers that say "Welcome to Canada," and have mesh bug catchers shielding the front, and their headlights and bumpers are taped against flying gravel.

Authorities estimate that in 1960 almost 150,000 persons will drive to Alaska over the Alaska Highway. If these people are enthusiastic emissaries for the trip by car to the 49th State, it won't be long before the road to the last frontier will be built up like any stateside highway.

But so far the Alaska Highway can claim one distinction over thoroughfares in the "old 48." Where else can you drive for almost 1,500 miles without running into a red and green traffic light?

A White Fleet Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, mail continues to come into my office in connection with the proposal to establish a great white fleet of mercy ships to help other peoples in times of disaster and distress, and I am sure many of the supporters of this idea were cheered when the prototype vessel for the fleet was chartered last month.

It was my privilege to attend the charter party on March 13, when title to the SS *Consolation* was transferred from the Navy Department to the People to People Foundation, and the ship is being rechartered the "SS *Hope*."

I have received a number of enthusiastic letters supporting the great white fleet from a fellow Oklahoman, Mr. Rudolph N. Hill, a lawyer-poet of Wewoka, Okla. Mr. Hill, who believes that poetry could be used to help publicize the aims and purposes of the great white fleet, has kindly offered the use of one of his poems in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, this poem is entitled "Red Cross Nurse,' and Mr. Hill has added a "L'Envoi" to the poem as it originally appeared in the New York Times and in his book "Star of Peace on Trail of Cibola. I should like to insert this poem, with "L'Envoi' added, in the RECORD at this point:

RED CROSS NURSE

With Kremlin walls and Coliseum dust,
And all the Rhineland's castles crumbled down,
Some hour, beyond this day of battle lust,
Will not some hand the Queen of Mercy crown?
All robed in white, with countenance serene,
As Florence Nightingale once might have passed
The soldiers' candle-lighted tents between,
While some would kiss the silhouette she cast.
My friend, you ask me: "Does He walk again
This troubled earth—the Man of Galilee?"
Ah, yes, as long as there is one in pain,
You have his guardian angel you here see.
Nor would she ask one simple word of praise,
Her glory lies in lengthening man's days.

L'ENVOI

The Red Cross nurse, on globe-circling trip
Of the great white fleet, bearing drugs, food, and clothes,
Would be a true Queen of World Fellowship,
Causing man's love for man to bloom like a rose!

Commuter Passenger Service in Urban Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Congress is showing a very pertinent interest in the fate of commuter passenger service in our large urban areas. Some legislators believe that definite action is needed to:

First. Amend the Transportation Act of 1958 to slow hasty discontinuance procedures authorized under that act.

Second. Advance a long-range program to assure that mass transportation facilities will be saved and even increased to meet new demands.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Daily Home News (New Brunswick, N.J.) of March 30 describes one plan to deal at least with a part of the long-range program.

Another editorial from the Tuesday, March 29, issue of the Atlantic City Press describes the consternation of one community which is apparently faced by discontinuance or sharp reduction of passenger train service.

Both editorials will yield new facts to our deliberations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Home News, Mar. 30, 1960]

FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT BILL

New Jersey's Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., has introduced in Congress a metropolitan mass transportation bill which would extend strong assistance to State and local governments in improving mass transportation in metropolitan areas.

The bill represents a modification and expansion of a proposal by the rail industry

and the American Municipal Association, representing 13,000 cities and towns in the Nation. The bill has the full backing of the association.

The bill is concerned both with planning and with loans.

It would permit current Federal planning grants to be used for determining transportation needs of metropolitan areas, for planning integrated and economical use of existing mass transportation facilities, for coordinating transportation planning of all public bodies in metropolitan areas, for studying the interrelation between metropolitan area growth and the development of a total transportation system.

In the field of loans, it would make available long-term low-interest loans to coordinate construction of rail, highway, bus, and other transportation facilities in metropolitan areas; to finance acquisition, construction, and improvement of equipment and facilities in mass transit and commuter service.

A significant departure of the Williams bill is that it would provide for administration of the mass transit program by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, instead of by the Commerce Department. This is a logical departure. Today the Housing and Home Finance Agency, engaged as it is in redevelopment and urban renewal, giving grants for planning assistance in many urban fields, is already as close to a Department of Urban Development as can be imagined, and is more deeply engaged in the urban field than any other Government agency.

The bill introduced by Senator WILLIAMS seems to hold great hope for the future of mass transportation in the Nation. In WILLIAMS' own words, it is "important recognition on the part of the Federal Government that it, too, has a tremendous interest and stake in the survival of our metropolitan areas—a survival that will in no small part depend on the establishment of good, modern mass transportation systems."

And the chances of the bill becoming law seems particularly good because of the impressiveness of the sponsorship of it. Joining with WILLIAMS in sponsoring the bill are Senators CLARK, JAVITS, KEATING, ENGLE, HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, MORSE, HARTKE, and YOUNG of Ohio, a truly representative bipartisan cross section of Senate leadership.

[From the Atlantic City Press, Mar. 29, 1960]

RESIST FURTHER TRAIN CUTS

Reports and denials are again current concerning the imminence of discontinuance of passenger train service between Camden and shore points.

The latest statement on the subject was attributed to Joseph A. Fisher, president of the Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines and the Reading Co. He was interviewed after a recent panel discussion on mass transit problems before the Delaware Valley Council in Philadelphia.

Elaborating on remarks made at the meeting, Fisher is reported to have declared: "The entire PRSL service is costing so much right at this point that we are determining action to discontinue the entire passenger service. The PRSL can no longer continue."

Commenting on the report later, a spokesman for Fisher branded it as premature and added: Something drastic will have to be done to cut losses, but that is not to say the service is to be dropped.

This is not the first time around for such reports and denials. The feeling is that where there is so much smoke, there must be some fire.

The latest rumor of cutbacks followed by a day the news that local commuters were going to contact PRSL officials in an effort to bring about a restoration of a midnight train from Philadelphia to Atlantic City. It was obviously a coincidence, and not to be regarded as a diversionary tactic.

In view of the fact that the PRSL has been cutting back its shore passenger train service to a disturbing extent in recent years, any indication of further curtailment must be viewed with genuine alarm by resort interests. South Jersey seashore communities cannot thrive without adequate transportation facilities.

City officials and representatives of resort hotel and business interests should waste no time in letting the Public Utility Commission know where they stand in the matter. The burden of proof in any abandonment case rightly belongs on the railroad.

Any effort to further reduce shore train service should be resisted to the utmost.

Gentleman of Achievement: President Alberto Lleras Camargo, of Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, President Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia is a welcome guest in our country. It is a honor to us that he has accepted the President's invitation to be his official guest.

In June of 1957, shortly after Colombia had thrown off Dictator Rojas Pinilla, I had the privilege of visiting in Colombia where I met and talked with many fine men. One of them was Alberto Lleras Camargo whom I consider to be an outstanding democrat.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article about this great Colombian leader which appeared in the Dilplomat, April 1960:

MOST INFLUENTIAL MAN IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Scott Seegers)

The bony little man on the 12th tee of the Bogotá, Colombia, Country Club was lining up his drive one day in January 1956, when a rifle shot reverberated in the thin Andean air. A bullet ripped into the turf near his feet. The other three members of the foursome dropped to the ground and frantically urged their companion to take cover.

"Ridiculous," he commented coolly. "Why would anybody shoot at me?" He waggled his club once more, then whacked his ball down the fairway and played out the hole.

Only after several more bullets had whispered past him on the next tee could the little man's companions persuade him to abandon his game.

The golfer, Alberto Lleras, was rector of the University of the Andes at the time, and about to lose his fight to stay out of politics. A couple of years later he was reelected President of Colombia—the first man in his country's history to be elected with support of both major parties.

Lleras (pronounced Yeras), who will arrive in Washington on April 5 as the official guest of President Eisenhower, has often been called the most influential man in Latin America. His specialty is unobtrusive achievement of the spectacular. In the 17 years that I have known him he has, without getting out of breath or out of sorts, brought peace to a nation shattered by a decade of undeclared civil war; overhauled his country's devastated economy; invented a unique system of representative government and made it work; remodeled one international organization and made it work. The Rio de Janeiro Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, the 1947 mutual defense agreement uniting the American nations, is largely Lleras' work. As well as President and educator he has been a successful writer, editor, publisher, cabinet minister, and ambassador.

Far from the least of his achievements is that he has remained alive and universally respected in a political atmosphere that has produced many a violent demise.

Accomplishment of such Bunyanesque scale are at first hard to credit to this frail-looking man with the pixy grin, who might weigh 130 pounds with his pockets full of rocks. You have to know Lleras for a while before suspecting the rare quality of the intellect that lurks behind the alert brown eyes and the high sloping forehead. But Lleras' small frame is packed with a nice admixture of courage, energy, idealism, and practicality. He combines a working newspaperman's reverence for facts with a dispassionate, omnivorous mind, and a rare ability to apply logic to any situation.

In matters of principle Lleras is as unyielding as granite. As Colombian Foreign Minister during the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco in 1945, he opposed the Soviet-backed veto provision. In the backstage bargaining, the great powers compromised one by one and agreed to abstain when the issue came to a vote. But Lleras stood firm.

"My government is opposed to the veto," he said. "How can I abstain?" Colombia and Cuba cast the only votes against the veto, behind which Russia has since shielded so many abuses of captive nations.

A stout defender of U.S. policy, Lleras once said, "What some call the mistakes of the United States are precisely the virtues of a new-type, reluctant empire that prefers * * * friends to accomplices, good neighbors to subjects, and partners in the building of a better world."

Alberto Lleras' childhood was, he recalls, "of the most unrelieved poverty." His father, who operated rented ranches, died when Alberto was 11. His formal education ended at 18, with his graduation from the Ricaurte Military Academy. For a year he worked as a reporter for Bogotá's leading Liberal newspaper, El Tiempo. Wanderlust took him to Buenos Aires, where for 2 years he was a reporter for El Mundo and La Nacion. He returned to Bogotá and at 21 he became El Tiempo's managing editor.

Unlike most newspaper writing of the time, Lleras' stories and commentaries were clear and simple, edged with biting wit that quickly captured the irreverent bogotano public and attracted the attention of President Alfonso López. Soon he was writing speeches for López "in flawless Lopese."

Lleras married charming Berta Puga, daughter of the Chilean Minister to Colombia. Soon afterward he ran for Congress, and at 26 became President of the Chamber of Deputies. At 27 he was appointed Minister of Government, the youngest in the country's history.

In 1943, López sent Lleras to Washington as Ambassador. He tackled the job with his usual concentration, and he also turned his scalpel-like intelligence upon the Pan American Union, then such a sepulcher of routine that one frustrated official called it "the marble curtain." Lleras worked out an entirely new structure, giving it more authority and broader functions.

Political and economic disturbances forced López to resign with 1 year of his term to go, Lleras, elected by Congress to fill out the term, at 39 because Colombia's youngest President. He promptly named three Conservatives to his Cabinet. To Liberal outcries he replied, "Neither party has a monopoly on ability or responsibility."

A Liberal Party split gave the 1946 election to the Conservatives. Many Liberals urged Lleras to declare a state of siege, nullify the elections, and stay in office. "No," said Lleras. "Colombia is a constitutional democracy. In a democracy, the man who gets the most votes gets the job."

He went happily back to newspapering, this time by starting a lively new weekly news magazine called Semana.

This happy period lasted less than a year. Then Lleras was drafted as Director General of the Pan American Union. He appreciated the honor, his telegram of acceptance noted, "* * * but I will not venture to comment on the judgment of those who have chosen me."

Their judgment was all right. At the Inter-American Conference in Bogotá in 1948 the Organization of American States evolved from the Pan American Union, which remained its permanent secretariat, with the OAS having all the increased powers proposed by Lleras. Perhaps the most important of these is the authority to arbitrate international clashes within the Western Hemisphere. This has been so effective that several instances of what started out to be wars were held down to border skirmishes. In each case the OAS went on to probe into the matter and to say publicly who started the trouble. Because of this one Lleras innovation, war between American nations may well have become a thing of the past.

Lleras is one of the few men I have ever met who seem to be without personal ambition. Unlike most men who have known real poverty, he appears to have no interest in money. In 1954, after 7 years of directing the OAS, he left the $20,000-per-year, tax-free job (which also included a free house, automobile, and chauffeur) to become the unsalaried president of the then new and unendowed University of the Andes in Bogotá. His only income was the small pension drawn by every ex-President.

The university was an unlikely experiment in higher education, completely free of Government influence or support. It had too few teachers, too little money, and inadequate equipment and buildings to handle the students clamoring for admittance. Its symbol of a goat teetering precariously on an Andean peak was appropriate geographically, financially, and academically. Its only certainty was hungry but resolute independence, and this attracted Lleras.

Conscious of his academic shortcomings, the new president devoted himself to raising money. He got grants and outright gifts (one man sent $106,000). He wheedled equipment, buildings, and even building materials. But most important for Colombia, the new post brought Lleras back to his homeland.

Meanwhile, Colombia had become submerged in an orgy of political violence. Liberals and Conservatives traditionally hated each other so single-mindedly that no Colombian third party has ever attracted more than a handful of voters. Political reprisals that began soon after the 1946 Conservative victory exploded into widespread guerilla warfare after the 1948 assassination of Liberal Jorge Eliécer Gaitán in Bogotá. Until the end of his term in 1950, President Mariano Ospina Pérez ruled by martial law. Leonine, Liberal-hating old Laureano Gómez won a one-candidate Presidential election and intensified the persecutions. Political killings degenerated into banditry, with rape, murder, and mutilation at the fearful mortality rate of 20,000 Colombians per year.

After 3 chaotic years, Gómez was overthrown by General Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, who promptly set up shop as a worse—and more stupid—dictator. Families were dispossessed of their land, and those who were not slaughtered fled to the cities—where there was no work for them. These quickly overwhelmed the social welfare agencies and lived, perforce, on the streets. Children became separated from their parents and lived in packs, begging and thieving. In Tolima, where statewide violence was worse, an estimated 320,000 persons, 42 percent of the state population, were forced from their land.

Agricultural production dropped sharply. Commerce went down in proportion. People quit building homes and factories. The peso, at 1.75 to the U.S. dollar in 1946 when Lleras left the government, skidded to 8.10 to the dollar under Rojas. Each year's national budget carried less for education, more for the armed forces.

This was the demoralized and outraged nation for which Alberto Lleras was trying to build a nonpolitical university. But government brutalities continued to increase. Armed police fired on demonstrating university students. Only a few months later they attacked with guns and clubs thousands of defenseless bogotanos attending a Sunday afternoon bullfight. The crowd's sin was booing the dictator's daughter.

"Afterward bodies were stacked like cordwood in the arena," a witness told me. Lleras could remain on the sidelines no longer. He attacked the dictatorship in a public speech in the capital city. On February 24, 1956, he resigned from the university.

Working with the Conervative firebrand Guillermo León Valencia, Lleras spent nearly 2 years organizing the resistance on a nationwide basis. Meanwhile, eluding police and narrowly escaping assassination, he and his colleagues worked out a unique system of government. This called for automatic 4-year alternation of the Liberals and Conservatives in the presidency. Moreover, all government jobs, from cabinet ministers to janitors, and including representatives and senators, were to be split 50–50 between the two parties.

Laureano Gómez, discredited and in exile in Spain, still retained the fanatic loyalty of many Conservatives. Lleras decided that his support was necessary to peace in Colombia. He made two trips to Spain to talk to Gómez. Finally the old warrior urged all Colombian Conservatives to unite with the Liberals to overthrow Rojas.

Now Lleras was ready. On May 6, 1957, he passed the word for a meticulously planned general strike in Bogotá. The next morning it was as if the city had died. No business opened its doors. No buses or streetcars ran. Radios were silent and no newspapers came from the presses. Bakeries offered no bread for sale and no one came to buy. Laborers stayed in their homes. Even the churches were closed.

The raging dictator sent his tanks and armored cars rumbling through the streets. The armored cars bumped to a stop, tires shredded by the thousands of carpet tacks and broken bottles with which hard-working children had sown the streets. Thirty thousand troops patrolled the city, but there was no one to jail, no one to shoot, no meetings to break up.

The strange paralysis continued for 3 days. Rojas' anger turned to fear. At 5 a.m. on May 10 telephones all over Bogotá began to ring.

"The tyrant has fled." The inaccurate message flashed through the city. Men, women, and children poured into the streets, shouting, weeping with joy, singing the national anthem. Instead of firing on the celebrants, thousands of the soldiers and police dropped their guns and joined the celebration.

At 10 a.m. Rojas did indeed flee, leaving four generals an admiral in charge of the Government. Word soon reached Lleras and Valencia, who, following the only route left free of tacks and broken glass, drove to the palace, where they walked sedately through the ranks of armed guards to confer with the military junta.

Lleras, as always, knew just what he wanted—an end to armed oppression; a plebiscite to ask the nation's permission for his proposed change in government; elections and return to constitutional government. The junta, sick of bloodshed and chaos, agreed.

The plebiscite, held December 1, 1957, produced the biggest vote in Colombian history—4,250,000 voted "aye" for the change, only 250,000 against.

Lleras had no wish to be President, but the Conservatives could not agree on a candidate. Also, Laureano Gómez, back from Spain, insisted that his ex-enemy was the only man for the job. Reluctantly Lleras agreed to run. Elections were scheduled, but the danger was not over. Some of the disgruntled military officers had secretly planned a counterrevolution to return Rojas to power.

At 4 a.m., 2 days before the election, Lleras was awakened quietly by his night watchman. "Military police are everywhere," whispered the terrified man. Reconnoitering from the windows, Lleras saw more than 50 military police surrounding the block. The telephone rang.

"There's been a revolution," said an urgent voice. "They've captured all the junta except Admiral Piedrahita. They're coming to get you."

"I believe you," Lleras replied. Calmly he bathed, shaved, and dressed with his usual meticulous care. As he adjusted his necktie the front door shook under a heavy knock. Lleras opened the door.

"Good morning, gentlemen," he said formally to the two armed lieutenants blocking the entrance. "Shall we go?"

He was taken under guard to join the four captive members of the junta. Word of the coup flashed through Bogotá. Loyal army units had gone on the alert. As the jeep sped past the presidential palace a loyal army officer stopped it.

"Which one do you have there?"

"Lleras," replied the driver. "We're taking him to the prison."

The army man pretended to be a conspirator. "No, no," he said, "Lleras is to be brought here."

The confused military police saw their prisoner escorted into the palace. Lleras headed for the radio and told the nation what was going on. Admiral Piedrahita eluded his would-be captors and joined him. For hours they took turns at the microphone. Under the intense public scrutiny resulting from the Lleras-Piedrahita barrage the revolution evaporated. No blood was shed, and captive junta members were freed, and Lleras won the election by a landslide.

After his inauguration in August 1958, one of his first acts was to lift the almost continuous 10-year state of siege. He kept emergency controls only in the five states where violence was concentrated. Even there he abolished press censorship, restored civilian government and most civil liberties.

The Cabinet meetings of those first months lasted from 12 to 16 hours. "It was a rare meeting that broke up before dawn," one of his Ministers told me.

"He never cut a discussion short," said another. This thorough talking-out produced a large percentage of unanimous decisions.

The President listened calmly through the lengthy sessions. When Liberal and Conservative tempers rose he restored peace, usually with a gentle witticism. Slumped like a teenager in the huge presidential chair, listening, considering, improvising, Lleras had one rule against which all suggestions were measured: "We have to do what

we can with what we have." His mere presence in the government sent the anemic peso up 70 points during the first 25 days of his regime.

The supposed irreducible minimum of $40 million per month of imports was slashed to $25 million by forbidding the import of luxury and nonessential items. Desperate Colombians began manufacturing their own nylons, kitchen utensils, typewriter ribbons, wool textiles, glassware, cosmetics, and the like.

Gradually, some of the estimated $350 million that prudent Colombians and resident foreigners had cached in U.S. and Swiss banks began trickling back—people wanted to get in on the ground floor of what was to be the country's biggest building boom.

Rojas had left many half-finished public works. Now these contracts were dissected and scaled down to what the country could afford. Then Lleras ordered the pace of construction stepped up, so that investments might begin paying off. He established a department of rehabilitation and drafted José Gómez Pinzón, a millionaire construction contractor, to run it. Gómez Pinzón and Lleras worked out a widespread program of building simple roads, bridges, small airports, and telegraph stations in the wildest areas. These projects offered employment to anyone who would work.

As roads penetrated the wilderness, modest rural schools and vocational training centers were built. Polivalente (multifunctional) teams of doctors, nurses, engineers, agronomists and social workers went into devastated areas to begin the long job of rehabilitation. At first regarded with suspicion, they refused to talk politics, crime, or punishment, and gradually won the confidence of the wary hill people.

Homeless thousands in the cities were returned to lands from which they had fled. Men came back to work the coffee plantations, the fields of rice and cane. With agonizing slowness the curve of production turned upward. For refugees in the cities who had no land to go back to, low-cost housing projects were started. By the end of 1959 more than a hundred million pesos had been invested in rehabilitation. More than 8,000 families had been returned to an orderly life, and the simple mountain roads had opened new areas for many thousands more. This year a colonization program will begin for those who, for whatever reason, cannot return to their native regions. Congress renewed the rehabilitation act for 2 more years.

Colombia today is well started on the road back. Thanks to hard work and austerity, gold reserves have risen from $85 million to more than $210 million. The $498 million commercial debt is down to $60 million, and payments are made on time.

The last year Rojas was in office his Education Ministry received only 72 million pesos. For 1960 the congress has earmarked 195 million for education.

Some violence persists, as a hangover from 10 years of indiscriminate slaughter. Most of this is committed by youngsters in their late teens and early twenties. Lleras considers these two or three thousand young savages Colombia's worst problem. "They graw up knowing nothing but robbery and murder," he points out. "As the rehabilitation program spreads we shall be able to salvage some of them."

Lleras considers Communist agitation a potential danger. "They concentrate their efforts among the university students and the labor unions," he said. "Time will prove that they do not deliver what they promise, and improving conditions will give them less to talk about. But meantime they try to convert any incident into a national disaster."

All-night Cabinet sessions are no more. Lleras now sees his ministers and other dignitaries during the day. About 5 p.m. he gets down to writing his message to congress and his lucid public speeches.

"I worked on morning newspapers too long to get much done in the daytime," he quipped. Often the rattle of his typewriter echoes in the palace until 3 a.m.

Lleras' appearance in public is greeted by applause and the spontaneous waving of handkerchiefs. The reverent people press close and he make no effort to keep them at a distance. He will not have a bodyguard, and drives his own car except on state occasions.

A few months ago Lleras showed up suddenly on the campus of the University of the Andes. A gardener, recognizing his former boss, greeted him cordially.

"How are you doing in your new business?" he inquired.

"Frankly, Jorge, I'm not doing too well at it," replied Lleras. "Sometimes I think I should have stayed here."

He could get an argument on that point. Recently a conservative leader was asked privately to suggest the best man his party could name to follow Lleras. After some thought, he replied, ruefully:

"Alberto Lleras."

David Lawrence, Widely Respected Columnist, Speaks His Mind on Retired Officers and Conflicts of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, the nationally known and highly respected syndicated columnist, has written a very knowledgeable and penetrating piece on the current discussion of retired officers and their relationship to the Defense Department after they leave the Pentagon.

His article approaches the subject from a very analytical and objective position.

As with everything he writes, David Lawrence has again made a fine contribution to the problem which the House will have to decide when pending legislation comes up for disposition on Wednesday.

Here is Mr. Lawrence's article, to which I fully subscribe:

DEFENSE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST—BILL TO CURB PENTAGON SALES CONTRACTS BY RETIRED OFFICERS UP FOR HOUSE VOTE

(By David Lawrence)

In these days of payola and accusations of conflict of interest with respect to members of Federal commissions or agencies, it seems strange, that a big question mark isn't getting much attention generally.

This is in the Department of Defense, and it concerns some of the many generals and admirals who have retired from the armed services but who draw big salaries from defense contractors and nevertheless maintain their own sales contacts at the Pentagon.

A House committee has held hearings and uncovered an unhealthy and questionable relationship between former military officers and the bureaus in the Pentagon that award contracts. The House of Representatives will vote Wednesday on a measure that would prohibit any officer for 2 years after his retirement from making any sales contacts with the Pentagon.

House Members generally are agreed that the practice should be discouraged, but some of them want merely to limit the penalty to a loss of the retired pay. Other Members say that it would mean nothing for a retired officer to give up 2 years of a pension at $10,000 a year when he is being paid a salary of $50,000 or more by a defense contractor during each of those same 2 years.

Instead, Representative HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, who has been leading the fight against the so-called munitions lobby, is sponsoring an amendment to the pending bill so that it would be a violation of law, subject to criminal penalties, if a retired officer during the 2 years following his retirement engaged in any form of selling at the Pentagon.

This is in line with other existing law which forbids any attorney employed in the Internal Revenue Service from practicing before the Treasury Department for 2 years after he has left the Government. There is a similar statute which forbids attorneys from pressing monetary claims for clients before the Government within 2 years after being employed in the Department of Justice.

Many of the military officers, while on active duty, have a voice in recommending the appointment of their own successors in charge of important defense projects. Naturally, it is inferred that there might be an obligation of some kind felt by the incumbent if his predecessor appeared before him later as a sales representative of a defense contractor.

Conflicts of interest are difficult to legislate upon, and there is no way to instill honesty where it is absent, but the Government can take some steps to discourage conflicts of interest. One method embodied in the pending bill in the House calls for publicity of the names of all former officers who are employed by defense contractors. Such an enrollment would be posted and distributed inside the bureaus at the Pentagon and kept up to date.

There have been provisions from time to time in appropriation laws, ever since 1896, aimed at those who retire from the armed services and take jobs with defense contractors, but these statutes do not remain in permanent form in the law. The present effort is to enact a broad statute that will stay in effect continuously and bar retired officers from becoming salesmen at the Pentagon for at least 2 years after their retirement.

The House committee, which recently carried on an investigation of the whole subject for more than 2 months, found that there are 2,000 former officers now employed by defense contractors, and that of this number 260 are engaged in some form of selling at the Pentagon.

There is no objection, of course, to the employment of former officers by defense contractors. The knowledge these servicemen have is valuable and can be of great help in developing the proper weapons and improving the Nation's armament. But there is a difference between duties that are confined to consultations held inside the defense contractor's own offices where advice is given to associates, and a direct contact by such a retired officer on visits to the Pentagon.

There are other evils which have not yet been remedied but are under study by House Members. These concern the activities of civilians who resign from active posts in the Department of Defense and immediately be-

come highly placed executives in companies that are engaged in many billions of dollars of defense work. No bills have as yet been pressed on this issue, but steps to deal with it are in the making.

There are upward of $50 billion of defense contracts each year, and the existence of a "munitions lobby" has been mentioned by President Eisenhower himself at one of his press conferences. Much of the missile gap propaganda is believed to have had its origin among officers of defense contractor companies.

It would be a tragic thing if Nikita Khrushchev were able to get any support for his constant cry that disarmament is being blocked in America and armament is being increased largely as a result of a "munitions lobby." It is essential for the sound development of an effective defense program that America be rid of any practice that could cast doubt on the integrity of the Department of Defense and thus weaken the confidence of the American people in the judgment of the men who disburse the public funds for the armed services.

Storing Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing concern among those of us representing predominantly urban districts that the farm programs are claiming far too big a share of the city dweller's pocketbook.

But one of the most depressing aspects of the whole cumbersome, outmoded but burdensome business of farm subsidies is that even the long-time advocates of price fixing and production control programs admit the framer is not benefiting very much.

This is pointed up by an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal. The editorial, very appropriately entitled "Storing Insanity," points up the breakdown of storage costs per day for the various commodities supported by the Federal Government. Farmers get little if anything of these dollars.

I am more than ever convinced that worn-out political answers to the economic problems facing agriculture must be replaced by a sound program that increasingly gets the Government out of the farm business and gets it off the backs of farmers and consumers alike.

I include the editorial as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

STORING INSANITY

Would you care to know how much it costs the taxpayers every day for storage of commodities Uncle Sam has on hand because of the farm program's high price supports?

Let's ease into this with two low ones; honey and tobacco. Uncle Sam pays out only $131 a day for honey and only $238 a day for tobacco, which, if it indicates anything at all, suggests that people smoke nearly all the tobacco that's grown here and that the bees aren't nearly as busy as the peanut farmers.

The peanut storage costs come to $6,000 a day; flaxseed and rye costs come to $7,000 each a day. Oats cost the taxpayer $15,000 a day for storage; rice, $17,000 a day; soybeans, $23,000; milk and butter fact, $29,000; barley, $64,000 a day and cotton $76,000 a day.

But even these are peanuts compared to the big boys. Have a good look:

Grain sorghums cost $262,000 a day for storage.

Corn costs $444,000 a day for storage.

And wheat costs $579,000 a day for storage.

That's every day. None of these costs include what was paid by the taxpayers, through their agent, Uncle Sam, for the stuff. It's just storage costs.

Total cost of storage for all these commodities comes to $1,547,000 a day or better than $550 million a year—and that, in anybody's book, is a lot to pay for storing up our harvests of insanity.

Can United States Buy Respect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another of the Nation's leading businessmen, Mr. Sterling Morton, chairman of the board, Morton Salt Co., warns that many of our foreign policies are leading us into trouble.

The following are Mr. Morton's views on this subject as presented to the directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association:

A QUICK LOOK AROUND

(By Sterling Morton)

This short talk will cover merely the highlights of certain important matters as they appear to an ordinary citizen—but one who has been around a long time and who has done much traveling abroad. So, hold your hats for a roller-skate trip to a few European countries—then we'll settle down for some comments on home affairs.

WEST GERMANY MAKING REAL PROGRESS

We shall look first at Germany, that miracle of recovery from a terrific punishment. But, like genius, this miracle is based mainly on hard work. The Germans have always been hard workers. Immediately after the war they seemed almost frenzied in their efforts to regain their premier position in Europe. In my opinion, they have attained it, financially and industrially, but that excellent habit of hard work persists. German factories, modern, efficient, well managed, are capable of competing with the very best we have. Their export figures are eloquent. Perhaps they now realize that their challenge to the world must be on the battlefields of peaceful trade, not those of war. They are a determined as well as an industrious people, so we should be well content to have some German divisions and some Luftwaffe planes taking their places in the defense pattern for Europe. Germans are intelligent and resourceful fighters. The West Germans know communism all too well; are divided by it from their eastern provinces, so are, undoubtedly, less tainted than any major Western nation, including our own. Probably less than 5 percent are possible Communists. I'm glad the Germans are now on our side.

FRANCE AT CRITICAL STAGE

France: Now under the benevolent dictatorship of a great, if difficult, man—a Frenchman to the core, a statesman who has abated the hatred, hundreds of years old, between France and Germany. Perhaps his dreams of "glory" are unrealistic, but they appeal to the French temperament and give the people a rallying point. France is a great country, a rich country, the most nearly self-sufficient in all Europe—and growing more so. For over 20 years it has suffered under Governments which had no respect, no leadership, no confidence. Now, De Gaulle gives the French all three. He is the most realistic of all Western heads of state in dealing with the Moscow gangsters. Granted a solution to the Algerian question, the country should continue prosperous—if it can stop that cancer of "social benefits" which is also draining its lifeblood and, parenthetically, erodes the economies of most Western nations. The Communists, an official political party, have, roughly, a third of the votes. I should estimate that at least another quarter or third of the population is so infiltrated with extreme socialism that it could easily cross the faint line between these two "isms" to cooperate with a Communist takeover. France is at a critical stage. We should, most fervently, hope for the "big fellow's" continued good health.

Let us deal with France on the basis of mutual benefits and mutual obligations, forgetting sentimentalism. Lafayette has, long since, been paid off—with compound interest.

ITALY AND COMMUNISM

Italy is hard to appraise, as conditions differ so from north to south with Sicily as a third factor. There is prosperity in the north and things are better than they were in Sicily and the south. Italy is full of Communists, but, perhaps, not too many are of the Moscow type. True, those of the north are "factory proletarians." But, southern Communists are, I feel, mostly poor devils trying desperately to wrest a living from a semibarren country. They would welcome any change, feeling it could hardly be for the worse. The Italian "right wing" parties hold power only through uneasy coalitions. But, so far, so good. At an estimate, perhaps over 60 percent of the Italians could be expected to go along with a Communist regime; that is, until they find out what it really means—then, it's too late to change.

BRITAIN HAS FIRM POLICIES

And now to the United Kingdom, considered our firmest ally. I wonder. We speak the same language (within limits), we share a common heritage of freedom, literature, and law, but we look at many things quite differently. They are a small island, dependent on trade for the very food they eat, we have vast food surpluses. They are old as nations go, we are approaching middle age. Their population is extremely homogeneous, ours perhaps the most heterogeneous in history. No British political party has to "balance" its local tickets with names denoting various racial stocks. There are no "hyphenated Englishmen." The royal house provides a banner around which they rally, we lack such a "standard." As peoples, we are quite different one from the other as well as quite similar. All in all, I feel we should make a mistake to count on their complete support in every emergency. Korea was a case in point for us—Suez a great shock to them.

It is axiomatic that Britain has no permanent allies and no permanent enemies. Britain has firm policies and tailors its alliances and its wars to further these policies. Right now, there are strong efforts to carry to success one old and steadfast policy—to again be the "third force" in Europe. A cynic once said, "The strongest continental power is always Britain's enemy, the second strongest is always Britain's friend."

So, it is not surprising to see Britain flirting with the Soviets, not only for the fancied, glittering opportunities for trade, not only as a check on us, but to insure her own survival should war between the two giants come. Remember, our bombers cannot take off from our bases there unless cleared by the Prime Minister.

Churchill has lived to see most of that "liquidation of the Empire" he decried so eloquently. Kipling was a true prophet when he wrote:

"Lo! All our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!"

But, the British are smart, able, and experienced, so we can learn much from them—about a Socialist government, for instance. And about shipping and banking, about diplomacy, intelligence, and education, and, above all, about high standards of public service. While we hope they will always be on our side, we should never be too sure. They will be with us when it is to their advantage—period.

And this observation on self-interest applies to all countries. It would be, indeed, most dangerous to assume that any other nation would come to our defense. NATO is today giving way to nationalism. We must be prepared to defend ourselves and, if necessary, by ourselves. It is sheer folly to expect to bribe alien governments to help us or to hire alien soldiers to defend us. Have we forgotten those Hessians?

CAN UNITED STATES BUY RESPECT AND FRIENDSHIP?

Now, for a look at our own country. The world, in general, seems to hold us in less and less respect. This is distressing but quite true. And perhaps with just cause. Respect comes to those who deserve it. Have we deserved it? Our airplanes are shot down, our soldiers are imprisoned, our citizens are killed and their property confiscated, while our Vice President is insulted and spat upon. Yet, we confine ourselves to mild "diplomatic representations." A bearded Communist murders and pillages a hundred miles from our coast. We gave him support which we denied to his predecessor, who, whatever his faults, was on our side. How can such actions create respect for a nation? Some of us still remember Teddy Roosevelt and hang our heads in shame when we contrast his militant protection of our rights with the shilly-shallying doubletalk of today. Panama threatens the canal, our lifeline, even after successive generations of Panamanian politicians have extorted millions from us.

We should say, in unmistakable language (and with a few marines), that the canal is ours, that we intend to keep it and that any who challenge our rights there are likely to get hurt. From time immemorial, men have been willing to go into battle for their country's good, yet our President says that literally nothing (except direct, armed attack) now would take us to war, big or small. No wonder that other nations take us at our word and feel safe in harassing us—that dime-a-dozen despots dictate to us. We try to buy respect and friendship. But we get neither—nor will we unless and until we take firm stands—yes, even risk war or wage war. Greece, Turkey, Quemoy—all proved that a firm stand brings results. War may be "unthinkable," but a United States of America on its knees is "inconceivable."

SOVIET PROPAGANDA AND PROGRESS

The visit of the head gangster gave him an outstanding propaganda triumph which, undoubtedly, strengthened him at home and brought dismay to freedom-fighters everywhere. But, he's a smart fellow, and it stands to reason that he learned a lot. The cool treatment at the start, climaxed by the wonderful going-over he got from the mayor of Los Angeles, made him show his true colors to millions of our people. The warming up afterward could not erase that picture of a cruel, intolerant despot. I am sure his sharp, little pig-eyes saw much to give him sober thought. The trip won't make him a good Indian, but it should make him a more cautious one.

On the other hand, let's not fool ourselves over the extent to which communism and socialism have penetrated this country. Am I wrong in my estimate that a quarter of our people would welcome one or the other? There must have been large numbers of spectators who wished to cheer Khrushchev—but felt it healthier not to. Even though the voices of most who actively fought communism here have been muffled, if not stilled, by official action, the reaction of the (literal) "man in the street" might have been very violent.

It is hard to understand the reports on Russia we get from our own returning travelers, except on the premise that they are usually uninformed as to the state and rate of industrial development at home. When they praise the great progress of recent years, many do not realize that in czarist days Russia had excellent engineers and technical people as well as many skilled workers and artisans. There were many, many Russians who were neither exploiting nobles nor ox-like peasants. The Bolsheviks killed off most of these, so they had to grow an entirely new crop of good brains. Now, that crop is ripening and, I surmise, giving the bosses in the Kremlin plenty to worry about.

UNITED STATES VERSUS SOVIET EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

We have heard much recently about Russian education. Many say it gets better results than our system. If so, the reason lies in three words—hard study—discipline. Our educators experiment, desperately seeking some system which will educate our youth by a sort of osmosis, letting them soak up learning without study or application. Life adjustment looms larger than arithmetic, social graces are more to be desired than ability to read readily, and athletic prowess seems worth more than ability to construct a simple sentence. Our professors come back starry-eyed from junkets (usually at the taxpayer's expense) to the Soviet Union and bubble over with enthusiastic envy at the high status of educators there. But, how many of them would accept the iron discipline, the absolute conformity, the complete lack of academic freedom which is the other side of the coin? Would they enforce those long hours on students, would they flunk a student knowing it meant immediate transfer to the labor or Armed Forces and an inferior status for life, would they spy on and denounce their colleagues, sending them, possibly, to the execution cellars? Let's get a little commonsense into these discussions of education in Russia. Our educators can't have their cake and eat it too.

UNITED STATES CAN WIDEN GAP—IF

No well-informed person can believe that the Russians will soon catch up with us economically. In many departments, they will have to increase their pace even to keep the present gap from widening. We can leave them farther and farther behind if we have the will, determination and strength of character. To continue to progress, we must change our taxation so it does not stifle initiative, must bring the labor barons under control before they destroy the real gains labor has made. We must recreate the spirit of loyalty and careful workmanship at all levels—blue collar—white collar. Above all, we must quite soberly decide whether expense-account-paid conferences at fine resorts (in reality golf outings), cocktail parties, customer entertainment, and, above all, complacency-breeding pension plans are slowing down our business leadership. The ship of business has picked up a lot of barnacles, too. We can keep well ahead, but only by real work, not talk. We must have decent, honest, economical government at all levels. Now, the waste is appalling. Above all, we must rekindle our traditional dedication to equal opportunity, to free, competitive enterprise and to a patriotism which is as critical of our country's faults as it is proud of its greatness.

Yet, there are those in our country who are so muddle minded that they see only our faults, only our weaknesses. They skim over the real facts of our national life—the world's highest standard of living, the world's most tolerant and liberal legislatures and courts, they forget that emigration to the United States is still the heart's desire of millions. How many wish to move to a Communist state?

IS LESS GOVERNMENT AND MORE FREEDOM OUR ANSWER?

What, of late, has brought about the deplorable letdown in our national spirit—yes, even in that primary urge for self-preservation which is the first law of nations as well as of individuals?

What has come over this great country that we should be so terrified by our enemy? Should the odds be against us, which any reasonable person must doubt, they are small, indeed, compared to the odds against the Colonies in 1775 or the infant Republic in 1812. Have we gone soft that we should constantly retreat before a foreign enemy, that we should accept shameful compromises such as that in Korea, that we should appease a bloodstained murderer and treat him as an honored guest—even while he refuses to deliver up or account for our missing flyers?

Why are we so frantically seeking high-level meetings with the Soviet? Agreements resulting from such meetings in the past have been broken contemptuously by the Soviets in practically every instance. Why even talk with such untrustworthy scum? Do our representatives feel we are inferior to our enemy? We most decidedly are not.

Yet, our enemy does lack our hesitations, our confusions, our temporizings, our willingness to concede. We seem to have lost the drive which inspired our forefathers and built our Nation. Are we drifting, prematurely and leaderless, into that lethargy of age which foretells the doom of a Nation? Has not our Government already too much power—the kind of power which Jefferson feared, the power which throttles a country, the power to "lay taxes which eat out our substance." If so, should not all of us strive for less government and more freedom—except for Communists.

Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, health insurance is especially important in meeting the high cost of medical care for older persons living on restricted and limited incomes. The future possibilities are discussed by James R. Williams, vice president of the Health Insurance Institute.

This is the fifth in a series of columns written for Ray Henry which appeared

in more than 100 newspapers throughout the country during January and February. In the face of the widespread attention this issue is receiving in the Congress and in the country, I commend it to the attention of the Members:

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

(By James R. Williams, vice president, Health Insurance Institute)

During the 1960's virtually all of the older people in America will have available one or more forms of protection against the costs of health care.

This great social objective can be achieved through the combined efforts of business, labor, the medical profession, insurance organizations, the community and the public as represented by government.

And all organizations and agencies striving to get the job done will, in this first new year of the new decade, intensify their pursuit of the goal.

Lifting the economic barriers of uncertainty regarding medical care will be accomplished in a variety of ways. Many already are being aggressively developed and promoted; others will be initiated in the near future.

The cooperative attack on the problem will move toward two goals:

1. Removing the concern of older people over possible medical expense they cannot pay.

2. Making it easier for older people with limited means to get the type and full share of health care help they need.

Many challenges still face those cooperating to overcome the complex problem. But experience informs us the objective is attainable and the record shows a willingness—even an eagerness—to pay the way there.

Business and labor, for example, already have demonstrated a partnership of purpose in their mutual desire to provide their employees and members with adequate health care benefits.

Their cooperation has provided a large share of impetus enabling 124 million Americans to have the protection of health insurance today, as compared to only 12 million so covered 20 years ago.

With the continued cooperation of business and labor, the next few years will witness a growing number of health insurance plans giving coverage to employees and their families after they reach 65, whether they remain on the job or decide to retire.

For many, this will be in the form of paid-up coverage, too, requiring no more premiums from the employee after 65.

Doctors, medical economists, and hospital people have played a tremendous role in helping the people to understand and use the various methods of offsetting costs of medical services.

Their mounting interest in this part of the overall problem of the aged and aging is indicated by the recent positions taken by the medical profession on the subject of fees for the aged.

Insurance organizations have built the mechanisms—indeed, have provided methods apace of the evolutionary changes in medical care itself—to bring many more millions of older people under the protection of health care programs.

Today, they are using mass enrollment techniques, issuing imaginative new forms of coverage and employing methods unheard of only a few years ago to provide senior citizens with effective coverage.

In the next few years, a sizable majority of all older people will have the coverage they need, when they need it most and at costs they themselves will help to meet.

Community interest in aiding the aged to have the tools and means of assuring this coverage will grow with the decade, and this will substantially decrease the dimensions of the problem.

Consequently, in the early 1960's, the challenge confronting this Nation as regards the costs of health care in the golden years will be of more manageable proportions.

Primarily the challenge will be that of finding and refining the best ways of helping those among the aged who may not have the resources to meet health care costs; those whose available funds may only be sufficient to pay for the necessities of life.

To the end of assuring adequate care for these people, it seems to us the 1960's will witness a strengthening of Government assistance programs where necessary to supplement the effort of voluntary agencies.

The health insurance business does and will support such assistance programs.

Moreover, as a service to the community, the insurance companies will make their know-how and facilities available to assist in the administration of such programs.

They also do and will support a Federal matching funds program to encourage the development of nursing homes. Such facilities, built on the scaffolding of such a program, can be expected to rise across the Nation during the 1960's.

Only full cooperation will achieve the goal of providing older people with the sound and necessary material blessing of longer life.

And the insurance business is certain that all organizations interested in the public welfare will join—as a matter of fact, already are joining—in the effort to provide the greatest possible protection for the aged against the costs of health.

Leader in Conservation Twice Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, C. J. Olsen, retired leader in intermountain forest conservation for 39 years, is being twice honored for his outstanding services: First, by the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committtee on Agriculture; and second, by a testimonial banquet given by a board representing fire conservation-concerned organizations in Utah.

The tributes to Mr. Olsen, by the Forests Subcommittee and the announcement of the banquet in the Salt Lake Tribune follow:

MARCH 22, 1960.

Mr. CHESTER J. OLSEN,
Ogden, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: It has been brought to our attention that you are resigning for health reasons, effective April 1, from your position as Utah parks director.

We regret that the Nation must lose such an able administrator who has dedicated 38 years to forest preservation, the last 7 of which were as chief of the 30 million acre intermountain region, and the last year or two to the establishment of an ambitious Utah park system.

The committee greatly appreciates the fairness you have shown in handling the multiple-use principle of the forests. We have found that the public and all users of the forests are almost in unanimous agreement on your statesmanlike adjudication of the many conflicting interests.

We have been continually impressed by your dedication to the conservation of our Nation's natural resources and your outstanding research on the preservation of watersheds.

In addition to all of this, we have found you to be a real friend and particularly appreciated your hospitality on our trip west.

Our committee joins your family and many friends in wishing for you a speedy recovery and hopes that your health may yet permit many happy and productive years.

Sincerely,

Forests Subcommittee: GEORGE M. GRANT, Chairman; JOHN L. MCMILLAN; LESTER R. JOHNSON; D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS; W. PAT JENNINGS, HAROLD B. MCSWEEN; CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE; HENRY A. DIXON; CHARLES M. TEAGUE; CATHERINE MAY.

P.S.—This letter is written as a result of a resolution passed by the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

BOARD TO CITE OGDENITE ON FORESTRY

LOGAN.—Receiving the annual forest conservation award during Utah Conservation Week will be C. J. Olsen, Ogden, former intermountain regional forester for the U.S. Forest Service, and until recently director of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Olsen will receive the award April 8 at a conservation banquet. The award is annually presented to one who has made an outstanding contribution to forest conservation in Utah.

He was chosen by a board representing five conservation-concerned organizations in the State.

From 1919, when he became a ranger in Nevada, Mr. Olsen held numerous forestry positions including regional forester, until his retirement in 1957.

After his retirement from the Forest Service, Mr. Olsen became the first director of the Utah Park Recreation Council. He is now retired from that post.

He received Utah State University's distinguished service award in 1956.

Privileged Imports: Major Textile Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by W. Ray Bell, president of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, as well as a news article which appeared in the New York Daily News on March 31, 1960.

The article follows:

PRIVILEGED IMPORTS: MAJOR TEXTILE PERIL

(By W. Ray Bell)

The chief roadblock in the way of extended textile industry recovery and the source of direct peril to future progress lie in the always mounting tide of imported fabrics and apparel whose origins now represent over 50 separate nations. Each of them enjoys the waiver by our Government of the statutory working conditions and social standards under which American textile mills are forced to operate. This means a privileged status of low labor costs for

which there is no equalization in existing tariff schedules. Tariff reduction to impotency has long since been accomplished through concessions made in GATT negotiations. Many of the foreign competitors now possess ultramodern textile equipment supplied by American taxpayers and some of them share special benefits of large textile purchases by the U.S. Government either in the nature of off-shore procurement or in the processing of cotton under triangular deals. The crowning discrimination against American enterprise and employment has been the U.S. Government policy of selling American-grown cotton to foreign textile producers at a bargain price, now lower by 8 cents a pound or $40 per bale than the prices American mills are forced to pay for the same raw material.

Under these existing and extraordinary policies of preferential treatment, foreign competitors have been equipped with overwhelming advantages in price competition. Sharing no responsibility for the maintenance of American standards, employment, or taxes, they remain free to flood our markets with the products of ill-paid labor, made under any kind of working conditions, out of the bargain-priced cotton endowed by our own Government or cheaper foreign growths. Over the past 5 years, the records of market experience show an unmistakable trend toward displacement of American goods through their inability to cope in price with the competition especially from Asiatic countries whose wage and labor costs are but a small fraction of American minimum standards.

[From the New York Daily News, Mar. 31, 1960]

HOW CHINESE MILLS BEDEVIL OUR SOUTH WITH DIXIE COTTON

(By John Lewis and Eckert Goodman)

In South Carolina, there are two towns about 30 miles apart. In the first, Spartanburg, homegrown cotton is sold and shipped halfway around the world to a mill in Hong Kong. There the cotton is woven into cloth and shipped back to the second Carolina town, Greenville, where it is delivered to an American buyer.

Despite the cost of transporting the cotton a distance equivalent to once around the world, plus duties and handling charges, the cloth is cheaper to buy than it would be if purchased from a mill in the neighboring town some 20 miles away.

For several years, the American textile industry has been hurting at the hands of foreign competitors, partially as the result of the U.S. Government's cotton subsidy program.

Cotton sells in the world market for about 25 cents a pound. In America, through Government price support, it brings 33 cents a pound. To enable southern cottongrowers to compete in foreign markets, the Government buys their surplus at the established rate and sells it abroad at an 8-cent-a-pound loss.

The higher price which U.S. textilemakers have to pay for their cotton, plus higher wages and employment benefits, has made it possible for foreign mills to flood American markets with fabrics, shirts, brassiers, blouses, handkerchiefs and countless other manufactured cotton products.

Ten years ago, bolts of cotton cloth were being imported into the United States in a mere trickle—under 20 million square yards a year. By last year, this figure had jumped to a quarter of a billion square yards. Five years ago, only 180,000 shirts were brought into the country. In 1959, there were almost 2¼ million.

Japan was once the biggest exporter of cotton wearing apparel to America, but in the past few years the Japanese, who voluntarily limited their cotton shipments, have been nudged out of first place by Hong Kong, with Korea, Pakistan, and India also in the picture.

SAYS TEXTILE IMPORTS ARE VITAL TO UNITED STATES

At a meeting in Charlotte, N.C., recently, Henry Kearns, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, told members of the textile industry: "No one will argue that the textile industry is not an important part of our national economy—it is vital to our everyday living. But by the same token, our country's total sales abroad, our exports, annually exceed greatly the total sales of the entire textile industry—and foreign trade, too, is vital to our everyday living.

"In 1959, the textile mill products industry employed some 963,000 workers. Each year about 4½ million Americans derive a livelihood from some form of foreign trade.

"Pakistan is a country where 90 million tough, industrious people literally are lifting themselves from the depths of poverty—their need for foreign exchange is acute.

"They must export in order that they may buy the food, machinery, raw materials and other items they absolutely need for everyday living.

"The Pakistanis like Americans, but if we don't buy the few lines of products they can export, including textiles, they must look for other customers—and the Soviets are nearby, ready and available."

Kearns went on to warn the group that the United States could not consider import restrictions in a field like textiles, which might mean the loss of export sales in another field. He added that many industries in America were seeking new foreign markets and that the textile industry must find new outlets abroad.

A few week after making this speech, Kearns resigned. Some felt that his resignation was brought about by pressure from the cotton industry, but Kearns remarked in parting that if he were resigning under fire, he would have done so long ago.

IMPORTS IN WOOL MORE THAN DOUBLED

The situation in the wool industry also causes concern. To give our processors and fabricators some measure of protection, the United States—at a world trade meeting in Geneva in 1947—reserved the right to levy a 45 percent tariff on all imported wool fabrics exceeding 5 percent of our own production, based on the preceding 3-year average.

Although the wool industry enjoyed increased sales last year, imports more than doubled 1958's, reaching 5 million pounds, the highest point in 35 years. Japan sent in more than twice as much in the way of woolen products as any other nation, while England led in the export of "tops." Tops is the term for wool which has been scoured, carded, and combed for spinning. The total value of these imports was more than $84 million, compared with about $67½ million the previous year.

With Japanese-made suits already posing a threat to our men's clothing industry, Japan is expected to be exporting 10,000 suits a month, at from $15 to $20 apiece to retailers, before the end of this year.

U.S. manufacturers assert that there is no way in which they can hope to compete with such prices.

Employing 385,000 workers throughout 40 States, the men's clothing industry is one of our most highly competitive businesses. It is composed mainly of small firms whose net profits on the manufacture of suits and coats average 1 percent.

Between 1947 and 1958, the number of workers actually engaged in the production of men's and boys' suits and coats fell from 138,000 to 95,000—a drop of 31½ percent.

THREE THOUSAND PRODUCTION JOBS ELIMINATED

While a good deal of this falling off can be attributed to a change in men's wearing habits, a deluge of cheap suits and coats from abroad could, at this point, be disastrous.

American glove makers, also facing cheap labor competition from overseas, are currently suffering even more acutely than our textile industry. There used to be two major leather glove-producing areas—Fulton County, N.Y., and New York City.

New York has virtually stopped producing the hand wear, and Fulton County's firms have dwindled from 184 to 56.

Fulton County is a typical example of an area dependent for its major support on one industry. The wheels of the tanneries turn in relation to the activity of the glove factories. Local box manufacturers and suppliers of all kinds face a similar situation, and retail activity comes almost to a standstill when glove production slows down.

Today, the county is classed as a labor surplus area—as it has been for nearly 10 years. Between 1947 and 1959, 90 glove factories and 14 tanneries ceased operations in the area, with the loss of some 3,000 production worker jobs.

While Fulton County is considered a high-cost labor area for the glove industry, workers' earnings, which average under $49 for a 34-hour week, are low in contrast with the $81-a-week average earnings of industrial workers in New York State as a whole.

As of last January, 3,712 persons were drawing unemployment insurance in Fulton County, 2,646 of them glove workers. Retail sales in Gloversville dropped 7 percent during 1959, a year during which they climbed 8 percent throughout the Nation as a whole. Building permits granted for residences were only a third of what they had been in 1958.

THEY'VE JUST ABOUT LOST THE MARKET

Said James H. Casey of Gloversville, executive secretary of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers: "We make 95 percent of the ladies' fine dress gloves produced in the United States, but we have just about lost the market. The rate of imports is now 126 percent of our domestic production, and it is increasing every month.

"We are not isolationists and have long known oceans act only as rivers between countries. We have over the years shared a portion of our market with exports from many European countries. In addition, we have contributed our fair share and today, as in the past, purchase 90 percent of our raw materials in foreign lands.

"We think that import quotas are the answer to our problem, not highly-restrictive ones, but quotas designed to give countries with higher living standards a fair share of our market."

Harry Moss, Jr., of Gloversville, executive secretary of the American Knit Glove Association, pointed out that of 44 manufacturers in business in 1947, only 12 remain today and these have drastically curtailed operations.

Perhaps the supreme example of what can happen to an area which loses a large part of its industry as a result of foreign competition is West Virginia. One of our richest States in terms of natural resources, West Virginia has the highest unemployment ratio in the country—almost three times the national average.

A number of West Virginians, including Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, blame imports for much of the State's economic woe.

West Virginia's coal mines, the biggest soft coal producers in America, employed some 123,000 workers 8 years ago. Today, there are only about 41,000 miners still working. Competition from residual oil imported from Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles, and natural gas piped in from Mexico and Canada

helped to make job-eliminating mechanization necessary if the mines were to remain in operation.

HAMSTRUNG ALL ALONG THE LINE

According to Bailey, the West Virginia pottery industry was once the world's biggest. Today, 87 percent of the pottery sold in the United States is made abroad. Forty-three percent of the State's glassworks industry has been lost to foreign makers, and the clothespin manufacturers have been hamstrung by cheap imports from Scandinavia.

One of America's largest dinnerware manufacturers, the Homer Laughlin China Co., of Newell, W. Va., used to boast 4,500 employees. Today it has about 1,000 and is operating at about half capacity through intensive mechanization. Laughlin was forced to the wall by Japanese dinnerware, selling at about half what U.S. manufacturers have to charge. It has driven a dozen other U.S. companies out of business.

"Our people are literally starving to death," said Bailey. "Many of the miners and other workers have exhausted their unemployment and welfare benefits and there are currently some 468,000 people living on surplus Government food.

"There is 67 percent unemployment in the State's coal mining industry. Besides the flow of cheap residual oil from Venezuela, our mines face additional handicaps: For instance, it costs West Germany $4.76 more per ton to mine coal in their own fields than it costs us to mine it and ship it to Germany.

"So what did the Germans do? They put a duty of $4.76 a ton on coal imported from the United States.

"Canada pipes into our country every day 7,600,000 cubic feet of duty-free natural gas. West Virginia coal going into Canada, however, is subject to a tariff of 50 cents a ton."

Asked how he felt about the Government's reciprocal trade agreements policy, which determines what U.S. tariffs will be, Bailey remarked:

"Why, it's been crazy as hell."

The Agricultural Outlook for 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the gloom-and-doom campaign of the Democrat presidential aspirants in Wisconsin has been geared at convincing the farmers in Wisconsin and other Midwestern States that they are close to bankruptcy and that all is lost. This would be tragic if true, but recent news from the farm areas shows the pessimism of the presidential pretenders is out of step with the optimistic outlook of people who really know. Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of wires from important farm editors from all over the country, reporting their views on the bad and good spots in the farm economy. These wires were collected by the Bert S. Gittens Agency, of Milwaukee, Wis., producers of the nationally recognized and highly respected radio program, "National Farm and Home Hour," and are as follows:

WIRE SERVICE FARM BULLETIN

By telegram and long distance phone, editors, economists, and other farm leaders reported to us this week on the agricultural outlook for 1960.

Contrary to recent headlines, high optimism and favorable prospects for a good farm income year sums up the situation throughout rural America.

A few gray spots in the picture appear unlikely to have a major effect on the overall farm economy.

Now here are quick quotes from farm authorities coast to coast and border to border:

CHICAGO, ILL.

Livestock prices currently very close to a year ago. Numbers larger. Ample feed supplies with excellent grazing in prospect. Soil moisture high. Possible delayed spring planting. Winter grains excellent. Corn hog ratio best in 12 months. Prospects good this year and next. Hog price advance brings improved feeling on farm. Efficient producers concentrate on widening spread between cost and sale price. Good farmers never quit.

A. W. MCGHEE,
Director, Corn Belt Farm Dailies.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dairy outlook unquestionably brightest spot in Northeast. Broilers probably darkest. Cutbacks in numbers should improve prospects. Prices will be higher. Central states: Greatest lift probably will come from upswing in hog prices, strong dairy situation. Southwest looks forward to big cotton and wheat crops. Highly favorable moisture conditions. Wool outlook also good. Prospect of lower cattle prices, but not critical. Better future for eggs later in year. Favorable wool situation on plus side in Far West.

VERNON VINE,
Director of Editorial Relation, Farm Journal.

INTERMOUNTAIN.

Downturn in cattle prices will have effect, but not critical net outlook. Well-balanced year if farmers' costs are kept under control. Current trend favorable.

VERNON VINE,
Director of Editorial Relations, Farm Journal.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

Enough corn will move into storage to force prices to redemption level. Soybean market still going away. Grain sorghum prices will advance in line with strengthening feeder cattle market.

HAROLD G. HALCROW,
Economist, University of Illinois.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

1961 will be better than 1960 for those who sell to farmers. Hog prices will be in neighborhood of $18 this summer. Won't fall fast or far this fall as last. Cattle numbers aren't going high or fast as we had feared. No bust—barring severe drought. Egg prices going to be fat this year.

We're at the bottom of the price support cuts this year. Better farmers are cutting the pie in fewer chunks.

DICK HANSEN,
Editor, Successful Farming.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

Hog prices to average equal or above 1959. Egg prices to average well above 1959. Cattle feeding profits only slightly below 1959. Dairy income stable. Equally good corn crop with average maturity should return farmers more, even with lower supports. Other crop prices stable. Iowa gross in 1959 8 percent above 1957, only 7 percent below 1958. High year in Iowa.

RICHARD ALBRECHT,
Editor, Wallaces' Farmer.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Farm market outlook improved somewhat since first of year due largely to quick recovery in hog price. Cattle and broiler prices will be in slight downward trend. Egg prices up. Grain prices will hold steady. Slight downward trend in corn and wheat. Farmers will be in continued cost-price squeeze, but expected to buy moderately well. Purchased inputs being substituted for farm labor. Biggest problem: buildup of feed grains.

PAUL C. JOHNSON,
Editor, Prairie Farmer.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Farm income this area will be better than 1959, not as much as 1958. Hog prices strengthening. Cattle prices should be about the same as 1959. Wheat prices at same support level and moisture conditions for big crop excellent. Too much moisture for early spring work. Corn prices also under support and almost same as last year. Poultry outlook better than last year for latter part of 1960. Dairy outlook one of best in years on gross. Excellent moisture assures fine start for grass, extremely important for livestock. Biggest problem: high cost of production. Best opportunity: cutting costs.

RODRICK TURNBULL,
Editor, Weekly Star Farmer.

TOPEKA, KANS.

Actual livestock count shows 11½-percent cut in sow numbers. Reduction is forced. Spring pig crop likely no larger than 1958, which was one of most profitable hog years farmers have ever known. Another bright spot: milk production. Another slight cut in milk cow numbers. Production per cow likely to continue upward but no faster than popluation increase. Should be stable for the demand. Another bright spot: eggs. Egg prices should be better than last year. Demand for cotton another bright spot. Export demand up. Carryover may be reduced 1,300,000 bales. Another bright spot: beef cattle. After midsummer marketing, prices could increase depending on marketing of cows and gross fats. Big runs could push down prices if moisture doesn't continue to support late summer grass.

DAVID KLINGER,
Editor, Cappers Farmer.

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Brightest spots in Nebraska are heavy snow cover, excellent soil moisture, upturn in hog-poultry prices. Nebraska farm income holding steady, Gross $12,464 per farm in 1959 same as 1958. Knottiest problem: cost-price squeeze. Badly need better legislation.

MARVIN RUSSELL,
Editor, Nebraska Farmer.

TOPEKA, KANS.

Brightest spot: Excellent soil moisture situation and prospective big wheat yields. Superior outlook for all crops. Biggest problem: wheat surplus.

RAYMOND H. GILKESON,
Editor, Kansas Farmer.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Agricultural outlook for all Oklahoma and Texas strong. Beef cattle brightest spot. Good market, large numbers, excellent outlook for grazing. Moisture plentiful. Big problem: finding market for surplus crops so production can be stepped up to capacity. Could double production of many commodities within 2 years, quadruple within 3 or 4 if markets would justify. Strong interest

in supporting research for new uses of farm products and sales promotion campaigns.

F. J. DEERING,
Editor, Farmer-Stockman.

BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Good snow cover makes crop prospects favorable. One of brightest spots our area increase in feeder operations. More ranchers feed cattle instead of selling to feeders in other States. Expect 3-percent increase in calf crop. Feed shortage throughout area. Biggest problem drought last summer.

MIKE CARTER,
Farm Service, Director, Station KFER-TV.

STILLWATER, OKLA.

Beef cattle situation brightest spot along with good moisture for fall planted wheat and grass. Declining income, result cost-price squeeze biggest problem. Delayed spring farming operations due cold, wet weather.

L. F. MILLER,
Economist, Oklahoma A. & M.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

Dry year 1959—better outlook 1960. Tremendous amount of livestock. Lots of hay. Abundant moisture. Expect surge of buying when spring opens. Dakotas building big livestock feed yards. One million acres new irrigated acreage.

VERN LAUSTSEN,
Manager, Dakota Farmer.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Pospects for improvement in farm income 1960 fair. Spending will be influenced by sharp cut income experienced 1959. Livestock and dairy brightest spots. Production supplies should move well.

CHARLES B. SCHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

DENVER, COLO.

Farm market outlook good throughout West's irrigated sections. Farm income our area double national average. Farmers will continue to purchase needed supplies and equipment. Biggest problem: wheat and some feed grain surpluses. Could prove problem late 1960 or early 1961.

R. F. KENNEDY,
General Manager, Western Farm Life.

RACINE, WIS.

Brightest spot in farm picture dairying. Egg production later. Hogs uncertain. Beef cattle prices headed downward over next few years. Lots of feed grain in storage which tend to hold down prices.

RALPH YOHE,
Editor, Wisconsin Agriculturist.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Dairying is brightest spot upper Midwest agricultural picture. Beef also excellent position. Moisture assures getting crops and grasslands off to good start. Rise in hog prices late spring and early summer indicated. Eight percent farrowing cut presages market strength late summer and fall. Material strengthening egg market.

W. H. KIRCHER,
Editor, the Farmer.

HARRISBURG, PA.

Dairy sales outlook brightest. Pipelines, bulk tanks excellent. Also all machinery, feed, seed fertilizers. Poultry weakest, although outlook better.

NORMAN REBER,
Editor, Pennsylvania Farmer.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Potato prices high. Dairymen good shape throughout area. Biggest problem: poultry industry. Seemingly great hope farmer-owned marketing cooperative movement. Generally good year New England agriculture.

DON WATSON,
Editor, New England, Homestead.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Poultry biggest problem in northeast. Represents 15 to 20 percent of farm income. Outlook much better for fall. Outlook for efficient operators is fair to good. Problems will be solved by more efficiency.

Most hopeful situation is dairying. Good dairymen are making money. Dairy income represents 50 percent of our total. Smaller and part-time farmers solving problems by work off farm and growing more sheep and beef cattle.

E. R. EASTMAN,
President, American Agriculturist.

FORT ATKINSON, WIS.

Dairy outlook for 1960 remains strong. Slight production buildup by fall shouldn't dim bright 1961 estimate. Dairy outlook brightest spot on national scene in 1960 and outlook 1961.

W. D. KNOX,
General Manager, Hoard's Dairyman.

EAST LANSING, MICH.

Dairying our big item. Culled cows bringing good prices. Veal a little lower for 1960. Milk prices will hold above 1959. Average prices all farm commodities fully as strong or higher than 1959.

J. N. FERRIS,
Economist, Michigan State University.

MADISON, WIS.

One of the brightest spots in agricultural outlook is price of livestock. Prices for hogs, veal calves, cattle considerably better than predictions. Expected that livestock prices may not go as low during 1960 as November, December forecasts suggest. Biggest problem rising cost of production. Price-cost squeeze still on.

MARVIN A. SCHAARS,
Economist, University of Wisconsin.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Some improvement prices, higher income from hogs, record cash receipts from dairy products, increased income from poultry and eggs, are favorable aspects 1960 outlook. Wheat surplus, tendency some crops to exceed outlets, big problems.

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary of Agriculture.

DALLAS, TEX.

Moisture always major consideration. Most of our area has adequate moisture. Biggest problem shrinking profit margin. Prices will be lower 1960, have been offset by increased efficiency.

EUGENE, BUTLER,
Editor, Progressive Farmer (Southwest Edition).

GREENVILLE, MISS.

Could be no brighter spot than Mid-South's Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana. Unusually bountiful crops cotton, soybeans, rice harvested, reinforced by usual large receipts from cattle, hogs, other crops.

W. C. LASSETTER,
Editor, Progressive Farmer (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi Edition).

NASHVILLE, TENN.

Late snows and cold weather delaying early seedbed preparations. Milk market strengthening as in hog market. Overproduction broilers, eggs.

T. P. HEAD,
Editor, Progressive Farmer (Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia Edition).

RALEIGH, N.C.

Tobacco, dairying, fruit bright spots farm picture. New markets for milk, fruits, vegetables. Grade A dairymen doing well. Low price manufacturing milk causing shift and grade A herds increasing in size. Abundant grain, strengthening prices encouraging hog producers.

JOE ELLIOTT,
Editor, Progressive Farmer (Virginia, Carolinas Edition).

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Beef: good year likely. Best moisture condition in years. Cotton: quality of 1960 cotton should be better than 1959 crop. Better quality and more acreage more than offset lower price. Poultry: loss in volume may be made up by improved prices. Fruits and vegetables: larger pecan crop. Vegetable planting delayed. Georgia and Alabama may be advantageous. Avoid overlapping harvest with Florida. Peach outlook excellent. Hogs: moderate expansion. Tobacco: continued stable prices.

C. B. COPELAND,
Editor, Progressive Farmer (Georgia, Florida, Alabama Edition).

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The year 1959 highest income year our history. Government payments small percent of total. Farm gross will go up as additional land is brought under irrigation.

JACK PICKETT,
Editor, California Farmer.

SPOKANE, WASH.

Farm market outlook good. No particular dark spots.

CECIL HAGAN,
Editor, Pacific Northwest Farm Quad.

Inflation and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, it should be completely understood that inflation has been a principal factor contributing to any economic difficulty besetting our present aged population. Generally speaking a retired individual lives on a fixed income; inflation diminishes the original purchasing power of that fixed income. That is the reason that President Eisenhower and other people who are really interested in the well-being of the aged have insisted that the threat and fact of inflation must be contained.

In the Washington Evening Star for March 29, 1960, Mr. David Lawrence had an excellent editorial comment captioned "The Bill for Past Inflation." Mr. Lawrence observed that while we may have succeeded in the current period in checking inflation, we are now experiencing pressures for increased Government assistance to our aged because of the inflation that has occurred in the past. Savings of noninflated dollars cannot buy as much at inflated prices. The labor chieftans know this but refuse to recognize it in their demagogic preachments.

Mr. Lawrence points out that the labor bosses were largely responsible for the

past inflation and are now advocating legislative programs that would add new momentum to the inflation pressures. One of these programs is the proposal to launch a massive compulsory health care program under the bureaucratic control of the Federal Government. Mr. Lawrence alludes to the fact that a Government program of socialized medicine in the United States would have the same deteriorating effect on the quality of medical services that has attended such national health programs in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, the AFL–CIO union bosses have gone on record in favor of a national health program. These same AFL–CIO union bosses have also gone on record in opposition to any liberalization in the $1,200 earnings retirement test on which social security benefit eligibility is determined. The one pressing problem that most aged persons complain about is money—money that they are forbidden to earn. It does seem a bit illogical to implement a much publicized drive to give these people medical care by amending the same law that prevents them from buying it for themselves. Our aged people are a proud people. They do not want a gift their grandchildren must pay for. They want the return of their God-given right to earn money while they draw the social security allowance they have already paid for. By what right does any democratic government refuse anyone the right to earn money merely because he is eligible to receive a return of money he has deposited with the Government in form of the social security tax.

I disagree with the AFL–CIO union bosses in opposing the liberalization of the $1,200 earnings retirement test, and I have introduced legislation to increase this amount to $1,800. The aged should not be prevented from demanding the honest return of the money they have been forced to deposit in the social security trust fund and to refuse them this money is improper. If those who have reached retirement are capable and willing to earn money after becoming 65, that should be their own business. What these union heads are really advocating for the aged is compulsory retirement and compulsory health care regardless of whether or not the aged citizen wants to retire or needs Government health care. It is my personal conviction that instead of regimenting our aged citizens under Government control, we should be taking steps to safeguard the purchasing power of their incomes, assure their economic independence, and permit the aged the full right of self-determination. This is contrary to the thinking of the labor boss who would dictate to the aged what the aged can and cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include the editorial by Mr. Lawrence to what I have referred:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1960]

THE BILL FOR PAST INFLATION—HIGHER TAXES TO PAY MEDICAL EXPENSES OF AGED TERMED EFFECT OF PAST POLICIES

(By David Lawrence)

Inflation may be temporarily checked, but the bill for past inflation is now up for payment. The American people are about to be asked, for example, to pay in increased taxes the cost of higher medical expenses for the aged.

Naturally, union-labor leaders, who have been in large part responsible for the inflationary wave of prices in the last few years, are sponsors of the new program of medical care to be paid by the Government out of new taxes. But the largest number of citizens who may have to foot the bill is to be found among the self-employed and the farm and city workers who are not members of labor unions.

The union-labor leaders want the social security tax base to be increased from $4,800 a year to $6,000. This means that employers would have to pay an additional $420 million, while workers and self-employed would have to pay $520 million. But there are only 8 million workers with incomes between $4,800 and $6,000 a year, and they would pay about $200 million a year, whereas the 8 million workers with incomes above $6,000 a year would pay an increase of more than $320 million.

This would mean a diminution in weekly take-home pay and, of course, it could result in new demands by the unions for increased wages for those who have to pay the higher tax. Incidentally, under the labor-backed plan, about 57 million persons with incomes of $4,800 a year or less—including most trade union members—wouldn't pay any increase in social security taxes but would eventually receive the benefits, and so would their aged relatives now.

Under the bill proposed by Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, Democrat, however, the social security base would stay at $4,800, but the tax rate would be increased for everybody paying social security taxes. Workers would pay $570 million more, and employers $530 million more, or a total of $1.1 billion more per year. All of the 73 million persons, therefore, now subject to social security taxes and employers of 66 million hired workers would pay more in taxes than at present.

All this is supposed to be for "medical care for the aged." Nobody knows just how much the program is really going to cost eventually but, once the scheme for adding to social security taxes to absorb the medical costs gets going, the increases will come as the medical costs continue to rise.

It so happens that over the last weekend some interesting figures were announced by the U.S. Department of Labor about the increase in the Nation's living costs for the month of February. The reasons given for the rise were twofold: "Higher interest rates and higher medical costs."

Mortgage interest rates have risen steadily since the middle of 1958 as the Eisenhower administration has been forced to compete for funds in the 5-year-or-less category of securities because the Democratic Party in Congress stubbornly has refused to let the law of supply and demand operate to bring interest rates down.

As for the rise in medical costs, these are due to the increased expenses at hospitals and medical institutions which are, in turn, largely due to inflation. Many of the cooperative private agencies that issue insurance policies for medical care have recently had to increase their premium charges because of the higher cost of medical service.

It is not surprising that President Eisenhower has come out against the plan to increase social security taxes and favors instead a plan by which the expenses would be met out of general revenues. The outlays, moreover, would be confined to those who are in need. The administration program is described as a "voluntary medical insurance plan for the needy aged."

The has been some talk about the whole problem becoming an issue in the coming presidential campaign. It should be. For the American people are going to have to decide sooner or later whether or not they want a cradle-to-the-grave welfare program, with certain taxpayers providing the money for everybody, including those who are well able to take care of the medical expenses of their parents and grandparents. The issue, of course, lends itself to political misrepresentation. Already some of the Democratic presidential candidates are trying to make it appear that the administration is opposed to medical care for the aged, which just isn't true.

The administration, to be sure, doesn't want to see a medical program started by the Government that would lead to socialized medicine, with the deterioration in medical service that has characterized such programs in other countries. Actually, at the end of 1958 a total of 17 million persons already had major medical insurance, as compared to 100,000 at the end of 1951. Also, the figures for the year 1959 are expected to show a further big increase in the amount of medical insurance among those who are 65 years or older.

The problem can be handled for the most part by the citizens themselves, through insurance programs at small fees per month. As for the needy, the Federal and State Governments are necessarily obligated to bear the cost. But it will be small compared to the welfare programs being proposed in Congress today to be paid for through various devices that call for increases in social security tax rates.

Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to at least three provisions of our Nation's Constitution with which the refereee plan contained in section VI of the proposed civil rights legislation being considered here may be in conflict. These provisions are article III of the Constitution, which limits the jurisdiction of constitutional courts to the disposition of cases or controversies; the 15th amendment which prohibits the States from denying citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; and the 5th amendment, which prohibits the United States from depriving a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. I would like to briefly discuss these possibilities in order.

POSSIBILITY OF CONFLICT WITH ARTICLE III

A serious constitutional problem is raised by that part of title VI which states that after a court finds that any person has been deprived by State action on account of race or color of his right to vote "the court shall upon request of the Attorney General make a finding whether such deprivation was or is pursuant to a pattern or practice."

The consequence of an affirmative finding is that any member of the race against which the pattern was directed must apply for a court order declaring him qualified to vote. The court must consider such applications for a minimum period of 1 year from the date of its finding and thereafter until it finds that such pattern or practice has ceased. If the making of such a finding and the issuance of such orders were necessary for the resolution of the base before it, it is very possible that an attempt to impose these duties upon the Court is an unconstitutional incursion upon the judicial power. See *Muskrat* v. *United States* (219 U.S. 346 (1911)).

POSSIBILITY OF CONFLICT WITH THE 15TH AMENDMENT

The Supreme Court pointed out in the civil rights cases, 109 U.S. 3, 13 (1883), that the legislation enacted to enforce the 14th amendment—and by necessary inference the 15th amendment as well—should be adapted to the mischief and wrong which the amendment was intended to provide against. In *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U.S. 214 (1875)), sections 3 and 4 of the act of May 31, 1870, were held unconstitutional on the ground that they might be interpreted to reach voting abridgements by States for reasons other than race or color. This holding was made despite the fact that section 2 of the act prohibited only abridgements by State officers because of race or color. There is one provision in title VI of H.R. 8601 which has the same kind of infirmity which caused the invalidity of section 3 of the act of 1870. After a court has found the existence of a pattern or practice of voting abridgements by State officers because of race or color an applicant of the race discriminated against is entitled to a court order declaring him qualified to vote, if he proves the following things: First, that he is qualified under State law to vote; and, second, that since the court finding he has been (a) deprived or denied under color of law of the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote or (b) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. Since the applicant is not required to show that the denial was because of his color, or that he was found not qualified because of his color, some people would be entitled to orders under the statute even though as to them there had been no State action in violation of the 15th amendment. Although there is little likelihood that this provision would be held unconstitutional as applied to an applicant whose voting right had been abridged because of race or color, there is a possibility that it is unconstitutional as applied to an applicant who had been found unqualified for a valid reason, that is, a reason other than race or color. Consider, for instance, an applicant who, after the court finding of a pattern or practice, applies for registration before a State official and is found unqualified because he has not paid his poll tax. Despite the fact that there had been no State action violative of the 15th amendment, under title VI he could pay his poll tax, then apply to the court for an order without any further attempt to be registered by a State official.

POSSIBILITY OF CONFLICT WITH DUE PROCESS CLAUSE

The activities of the court and of the referees it may appoint after finding a pattern or practice of distrimination are clearly designed to result in a determination that certain persons are qualified to be registered as voters. Yet title VI would propose to bind not only registration officers who would presumably be parties to the original suit initiated by the Attorney General, but also those election officials manning polling places who are not likely to be parties to the original suit. Moreover, the proceedings before the referees are to be conducted ex parte and the recommendations of the referees are to be incorporated in orders which purport to bind both registrars and polling officials after very limited opportunities to interpose exceptions to them. While Congress has the power under article III to regulate the entire process of the Federal courts including the power to prescribe rules of procedure, in exercising this power it is limited by the due process clause of the fifth amendment. The right of a fair and open hearing is one of the rudiments of fair play assured to every litigant by the Federal Constitution as a minimal requirement. *Ohio Bell Tel. Co.* v. *Public Utilities Comm.* (301 U.S. 292, 304, 305 (1937)), cited in *R. R. Commission of Calif.* v. *Pacific Gas Co.* (302 U.S. 388, 393 (1938)). It is certainly questionable that the provisions of title VI will guarantee the constitutional minimum of due process.

In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that there is an overabundance of law now in existence to more than protect the voting rights of all our citizens.

Since the days of Reconstruction, statutes have existed making it a Federal crime for two or more persons to conspire to deprive a citizen of any right secured to him by Federal law or the Constitution. This law clearly makes it a crime to deprive a citizen of his voting rights guaranteed by the 15th amendment. I would like to quote section 241 of title 18 of the United States Code in its entirety to illustrate this point:

> If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or
>
> If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured. * * *
>
> They shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Another statute which provides criminal penalties for anyone acting under color of law who deprives a citizen of any of his constitutional or Federal statutory rights is found in section 242 of title 18, which reads as follows:

> Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Let us now consider criminal sections specifically on the subject of voting rights. Section 594 of title 18 provides as follows:

> Whoever intimidates, threatens, coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any other person for the purpose of interfering with the right of such other person to vote or to vote as he may choose, or of causing such other person to vote for, or not to vote for, any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegates, or Commissioners from the territories and possessions, at any election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing such candidate, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Civil remedies, in addition to these ample criminal penalties, have also been provided for the protection of the right to vote. Any person acting under color of law who deprives a person of his federally secured rights, including deprivation of voting rights based on his race or color, is subject to a civil action for redress. Section 1983 of title 42 provides that:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proceeding for redress.

You will note this remedy provides for both legal and equitable remedies. Under it one may bring suit for monetary damages or injunction proceedings for coercion of any type. Anyone who feels they have been deprived by a State official of the right to vote, as guaranteed by the 15th amendment, has complete freedom to file suit in a Federal district court under this section.

This is not the only civil remedy available. Subsection 3 of section 1985, title 42, provides for recovery of damages from two or more persons who conspire to deprive another of his rights, including voting rights. Section 1986 of the same title provides for a civil suit against one having power to prevent a deprivation of rights and who fails to act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that these statutes have been in effect for nearly 100 years. I cannot conceive that this body of law is not effective today in securing the rights of all citizens. Severe criminal penalties are imposed for deprivation of civil rights; damages are allowed the complainant; and traditional equitable remedies are available in these cases.

Despite the existence of these laws, in the Civil Rights Act of 1957 even more laws were enacted on this subject of protection of civil liberties. I quote the pertinent provisions of the law now contained in section 1971 of title 42:

(a) All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such elections, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition or servitude; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding.

(b) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any other person for the purpose of interfering with the right of such other person to vote or to vote as he may choose, or of causing such other person to vote for, or not to vote for, any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, delegates or commissioners from the Territories or Possessions, at any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate.

(c) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of any right or privilege secured by subsection (a) or (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order. In any proceeding hereunder the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

Frankly I have never known of any violation of voting rights in my home State of Arkansas; however, I should like to point out that in this area, as well, ample provisions of law exist to safeguard the civil liberties of our citizens.

The Arkansas Constitution in article II, section 3, provides that:

The equality of all persons before the law is recognized, and shall ever remain inviolate; nor shall any citizen ever be deprived of any right, privilege, or immunity, nor exempted from any burden or duty, on account of race, color, or previous condition.

The only tests of the right to vote are prescribed by article III, section 1 of the Arkansas constitution:

Every citizen of the United States at the age of 21 years, who has resided in the State 12 months; in the county 6 months, and in the precinct, town, or ward, 1 month, next preceding any election at which they propose to vote, except such persons as may for the commission of some felony be deprived of the right to vote by law passed by the general assembly, and who shall exhibit a poll tax receipt or other evidence that they have paid their poll tax at the time of collecting taxes next preceding such election shall be allowed to vote at any election in the State of Arkansas.

However:

No idiot or insane person shall be entitled to the privileges of an elector.

See article III, section 5 of the Arkansas constitution.

Further, article III, section 2 of the Arkansas constitution commands that:

Elections shall be free and equal. No power, civil or military, shall ever interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage; or shall any law be enacted whereby the right to vote at any election shall be made to depend upon any previous registration of the elector's name; or whereby such right shall be impaired or forfeited, except for the commission of a felony at common law, upon lawful conviction thereof.

Article II, section 4 of the Arkansas constitution provides that:

Electors shall, in all cases (except treason, felony, and breach of the peace), be privileged from arrest during their attendance at elections and going to and from the same.

Article II, section 6, of the Arkansas constitution reads:

Any person who shall be convicted of fraud, bribery, or other willful and corrupt violation of any election law of this State shall be adjudged guilty of a felony.

These provisions represent the constitutional law of the State of Arkansas. They are implemented by numerous detailed statutory regulations, typical of which are the following:

Arkansas Statutes—1947—section 3–1414, punishes by a $500 fine any interference or intimidation or other act to prevent any person from voting in a primary election; and section 3–1415 makes it a felony to intimidate, and so forth, any person in any general or special election.

It is made a misdemeanor for an officer to exact from any person more than $1 for a poll tax. The offense is punishable by fine, $100 to $250. Section 3–111 prohibits the imposition of a penalty for delinquent payment of the poll tax. Section 3–112 authorizes the issuance of a poll tax receipt without the payment of property taxes.

These statutes are only a few examples of the legal machinery that the State of Arkansas has provided to protect the right to vote. This machinery in no part discriminates against any elector because of race or color. It disqualifies only infants, aliens, idiots, and felons.

On the basis of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that since passage of this legislation will tend to infringe upon our constitutional rights rather than to protect an area which already has more than adequate protection, it be defeated.

Gates System Settles Defense Differences Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by David Barnett, chief of the North American Newspaper Alliance, and recently released to approximately 130 members of the North American Newspapers Alliance.

This is a particularly timely article in that it analyzes what many defense organization experts consider to be the most significant action taken by any Secretary of Defense since the establishment of that Department in 1947.

I refer to the directive of Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., of December 29, 1959. In that directive Secretary Gates announced that it would be his policy to sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff for consideration of matters in disagreement in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. With this one directive, Secretary Gates has improved the fundamentally sound, war-proven, Joint Chiefs of Staff system; he has made the principle of civilian control a meaningful fact; he has provided the means by which such civilian direction will be knowledgeable of the issues involved; and he has established a procedure that assures that a civilian Secretary of Defense will be an actual participant in the decision-making process rather than a remote observer of defense policy.

Mr. Barnett's article is a brief but persuasive answer to those who would abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff and supplant it with the alien and inferior Single Chief of Staff organization. The reassuring aspect of Mr. Barnett's analysis is that it is based entirely upon a close examination of how the Joint Chiefs of Staff system is actually working at the present time. Also, the article explains how the energetic and effective action of Mr. Gates is making the Joint Chiefs of Staff system increasingly efficient.

This recently instituted policy of the Secretary of Defense has been the subject of commendation by the press, widely recognized authorities in the field of defense organization, and by Members of both parties in the Congress of the United States. Such widespread approbation of this policy is fully justified. I believe that one of the most pertinent observations, and certainly one by an unquestioned authority in matters of defense organization, was expressed by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, on March 3, 1960. On that occasion, in directing his remarks to Secretary Gates, Chairman VINSON commented on the Gates Joint Chiefs of Staff directive by saying:

With this one directive you have left an impressive mark on defense organization. You have strengthened our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and at the same time have dealt a shattering blow to the advocates of a single Chief of Staff system. And—you have vitalized and reaffirmed the constitutional principle of civilian control.

I commend this article to the attention of all Members of the House:

NEW GATES SYSTEM SETTLES DEFENSE DIFFERENCES FAST

(By David Barnett)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Secretary of Defence Thomas S. Gates has proved in the past 2 months that his new system for dealing with disputes among the country's top military officers can work.

Since January 21, Gates has met personally with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 10 subjects about which there were differences of opinion of the 3 service chiefs. Five of the subjects required fast decisions.

In four cases, Gates resolved the dispute "on the spot."

In the other, the civilian Secretary made a final decision within a week.

That record, Defense officials say, justifies the assertion that the new system constitutes the most important step taken in Defense organization since the unified Department was established in 1947.

The change was initiated by a Gates memorandum on December 29 which notified the Joint Chiefs that the Secretary was to be informed when disagreements begin to develop on an issue before the JCS. The civilian Secretary then would sit with the Chiefs when the subject was under consideration.

TOO "CHANCEY"

Early in January, Gates decided the mechanics of that arrangement were too "chancey," that he might not be available at the specific time the disagreements developed. The Department then established a schedule of meetings. Gates now meets at 2 p.m. each Monday with the Joint Chiefs.

The system thus has been—in a favorite Pentagon word—institutionalized.

The directive has brought the Secretary words of unusual praise from Democratic Congressmen who are military experts. Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, told him:

"With this one directive you have left an impressive mark on defense organization. You have strengthened our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and at the same time have dealt a shattering blow to the advocates of a single Chief of Staff system. And you have vitalized and reaffirmed the constitutional principle of civilian control."

Before the Gates memorandum, there was no device in the Defense Department organization by which the civilian Secretary could be kept informed and in contact with top military policymaking.

The Secretary did not get into policymaking until the JCS sent him an agreed position or the members became entrenched in disagreement. Sometimes unanimity among the Chiefs merely represented a position reached by bargaining among the services.

The Joint Chiefs deal with some 850 issues—or papers, as they are called in the Pentagon—a year. Less than 1 percent of them result in so-called split papers, or disagreements, but these disputed matters often are some of the most important the military men have to deal with.

What does the Secretary do at these Monday meetings?

Pentagon officials insist Gates does not attempt to steer the discussion to a unanimous decision.

LISTENS TO LEARN

As one put it:

"The Secretary is not interested in getting lukewarm agreements. He listens, to learn, and he does some probing. He shakes positions by questions. He tries to determine how strongly a service Chief feels and whether the position is the result of 'service conditioning.'

"He moves in at the precise point when the decision becomes one of military policy rather than military technology. If the Secretary got involved earlier, he would be meddlesome; later, he would be too remote to make an effective decision."

Of the 10 matters so far handled under the system, 9 deal with subjects that are classified and cannot be disclosed.

One has been implemented publicly. It dealt with the Middle East Command and has been in dispute among the services for almost a year.

All three services—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—have forces in the area. In simplified form, the problem involved organizing the command to remove overlapping of responsibilities and planning authority.

There were arguments for a completely separate command for the Middle East with headquarters in that area. The Army and the Air Force were concerned that they were being frozen out of planning in the area.

Gates worked out this arrangement within a week after hearing the discussion: the Navy got the component commander, but the area remained under the European command with headquarters in London. The component commander has two deputies for planning, one from the Air Force and one from the Army.

EIGHTEEN OTHER PAPERS

Disposition of the question of the Middle East command started a chain reaction in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Backed up behind the command issue had been 18 other papers upon which action could not be taken until the command question had been settled.

Not all of the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Gates result in such swift implementation. The whole idea is to get the Secretary into areas of disputes quickly.

Three of the ten subjects handled so far were discussed at presentation type meetings. The discussions have not yet reached the point at which the Secretary has to make decisions upon which action will be based.

The other two subjects involved intergovernmental affairs. The meetings were held to develop Defense Department positions on policy matters with which other agencies, such as the State Department, also had to deal.

Representative Chamberlain's Views on Defense Reassuring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Flint Journal for Thursday, March 31, 1960, entitled "Representative CHAMBERLAIN'S Views on Defense Reassuring," is a fine tribute to our colleague and helps to put into proper perspective the discussion on defense policy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the editorial, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CHAMBERLAIN'S VIEWS ON DEFENSE REASSURING

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN is to be commended for once again seeking out the opinions and views of those he represents in Congress.

His questionnaire to qualified voters in Michigan's Sixth District represents a sincere effort to learn directly from the people what problems concern them and what legislation they favor. By knowing their desires, he can do a more adequate job as their Capitol Hill representative.

He further demonstrated his interest in his constituents by acknowledging each questionnaire and personally answering many which asked specific questions. One such letter summed up his own ideas about the controversy of national security. Inasmuch as he is a member of the Armed Services Committee, his thoughts on the issue are significant.

In part he wrote:

"It is certainly no wonder that the American people are confused about the status of our defense program when they read the divergent views expressed through various news media.

"As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have spent a major portion of my workdays in recent weeks listening to and studying testimony in closed sessions with our military leaders, including the Secretary of Defense, the Service Secretaries, the chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"While I readily admit there are many areas for honest differences of opinion regarding our military posture, I certainly want to assure you that from all I have heard from these top military men, I do not share the grave apprehension of those who say that our defenses are grossly inadequate and that our planning for the future is deficient.

"You will recall that last year we were hearing much of the same talk from most of the same people—and what happened? The Congress voted to reduce the President's defense requests.

"While I make no inference that our defense is not a proper subject for public discussion, I regret that the issue has become so political. Neither do I mean to gloss over the areas in which we need more progress. We have many complex problems and it is understandable that brilliant men of integrity would differ as to specific solutions. Yet I have an inherent faith that when all the talking is over, what America needs will be provided.

"As for myself, my policy has always been to resolve all areas of doubt in favor of our security. I would rather provide too much than too little. With this, I feel you must agree."

Few persons are fully aware of the facts and figures of national defense. They are classified top secret. This doesn't prevent many self-styled experts from speaking on the subject in an authoritative tone of voice.

It is reassuring in the midst of the resulting confusion to hear an expression of faith in our defense from a member of the Armed Services Committee, which has the advantage of briefings by military men and intelligence officers on what the U.S. program is and what the enemy's capabilities are believed to be.

And it is comforting to know that we are represented by a man who has at heart not only the interest of his country but that of the people in his district who put their faith and fate in his hands.

Flight Data Recorders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the recent crashes of commercial airliners have caused great concern throughout the country due to the inability to determine, in many cases, the reasons for the disasters. Countless thousands of dollars and possibly hundreds of thousands of dollars are expended between government, the airlines, and aircraft manufacturers in the investigation of the causes of each aircraft accident. Despite this, we still do not know, in many instances, why the crashes occur.

Perhaps many lives and much money could be saved if all commercial aircraft were equipped with crash recorders

which were recording important types of information. Recently, the Federal Aviation Agency issued an order requiring installation of flight data recorders in additional commercial aircraft operating at certain altitudes. The application of such recorders has been extended from pure jets to turbo prop aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest additionally that the Government should extend the number of channels of information required of such recorders. Currently required channels are: Time, airspeed, altitude, directional heading, and vertical acceleration. If we could also obtain information on cabin pressure and airplane bank and pitch we could help determine whether an explosion may have occurred in an aircraft accident as well as additional information which could be extremely valuable.

In view of this, I urge that the FAA give serious consideration to the possible extension of channels of information currently required by existing flight data recorders.

John Volpe on Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, a timely and important address concerning the expanded Federal highway program was made by Mr. John A. Volpe before the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments in Chicago on March 17. Few men are so well qualified to discuss the highway program as Mr. Volpe. As you know, he was appointed by President Eisenhower as the first Federal Highway Administrator under the new program, to serve an interim term of 7 or 8 months until Mr. Bertram D. Tallamy could assume the position. Earlier, Mr. Volpe served a term of several years as Commissioner of Public Works of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by appointment of Gov. Christian D. Herter, now our distinguished Secretary of State.

Mr. Volpe has had long experience as a building contractor, being president of the John A. Volpe Construction Co. of Malden, Mass., which he started in the dark days of the depression more than 25 years ago and which he has built into one of the largest and most successful building firms in the Nation. His attainments as a contractor are attested by the fact that he is now the president of the Associated General Contractors of America, the national organization of general contractors which serves as spokesman for the industry. Active in civic and public affairs, Mr. Volpe is now a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor of Massachusetts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Volpe's address to the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. VOLPE, PRESIDENT, THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, AT THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONFERENCE OF STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS, MARCH 17, 1960, CHICAGO, ILL.

I was delighted to accept your kind invitation to address the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments. It has given me an opportunity to meet many old friends and renew acquaintanceships made during my services as a highway official and as interim Federal Highway Administrator. Today, however, I am wearing the hat of the vice president of the Associated General Contractors of America. Next week, I will be wearing the hat of the president of the Associated General Contractors of America as I will be installed at their convention a week from today. Of course, you know that I normally wear a hat as a contractor—a building contractor and not a road builder as some people think. Of course, next year I hope to wear another hat—that of Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, so you can see that I have been on both sides of the fence and have quite a few hats that have, I believe, given me an opportunity of discussing our national highway problems from different angles.

These various experiences make me very proud of my profession, and, now that I am about to assume the presidency of the Associated General Contractors of America, I feel that this new honor which has come to me will, in a very real sense, enable me to make a further contribution to my fellow citizens.

We general contractors feel our public responsibilities deeply. The position of our industry as the Nation's largest makes it imperative that we do so. The position of the AGC as the spokesman for the construction industry requires that the president of our association assume these responsibilities as part of his job.

One of the greatest responsibilities now facing the AGC and the entire construction industry is the Federal highway program. This is also your responsibility. We share it with you.

First of all, I would like to indicate my concept of the job that has been done by highway officials throughout the country for many years but, particularly, during the past 4 years. You and I are, of course, deeply concerned that there are those, both in official capacities and sideline quarterbacks, who have, in my opinion, unjustly critized the highway program.

I need not dwell on the fact that this long-range highway program boldly envisioned by President Eisenhower and passed by a nonpartisan Congress marked a real triumph for concise planning and orderly programing. Through the efforts of highway officials, the Associated General Contractors of America, and many other organizations and citizens generally, the President and the Congress were convinced that if we were to properly expend taxpayers funds, that we should do so on an orderly basis rather than on a feast-or-famine basis such as was the case in years gone by. Of course, this was a dream program, not only for State highway departments but for contractors, equipment manufacturers, and material suppliers, as well as many other interrelated groups associated with the program. All of us thought we knew just what we could expect during each year for the duration of the program—expected to be 13 years. We, of course, have had a sad awakening during the past 2 years particularly.

All of you are familiar with the problems and there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice to say that all of us were given the go-ahead signal as I so clearly remember when President Eisenhower swore me in as the first Federal Highway Administrator and said, "Let's get the show on the road."

The highway departments throughout the country geared themselves to a program based on specific commitments under this act and proceeded accordingly.

You, and other dedicated highway officials have worked long and arduous hours, very frequently beyond the call of duty, in prosecuting the program.

Based on statistics which I have procured from the Bureau of Public Roads, in the 3½ years prior to the passage of the 1956 act, on the ABC system, the total cost of projects completed amounts to $3.7 billion. In the 3½ years after passage of the act from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1959, the total cost of projects completed amounted to $5.2 billion, an increase of 37 percent.

On the Interstate System in the 3½-year period before the passage of the act, projects completed amounted to $116 million. While in 3½ years after this figure rose to $2.3 billion, an increase of 1890 percent. When these two systems are combined it shows an increase of 94 percent in the two systems.

I have also checked on the volume of contracts advertised and funds obligated for both systems, and find on the ABC system that in the 3½ years before passage of the act, the total amounted to $4½ billion whereas in the 3½ years after the passage of the act the total was $5¾ billion, an increase of 29 percent.

On the Interstate System on contracts advertised and funds obligated, the figure was $422 million in the 3½ years before passage of the act and over $7 billion in the 3½ years after passage of the act or an increase of 1,559 percent.

Combining these totals shows that in the country as a whole, contracts advertised and funds obligated in the 3½ years after passage of the act showed an increase of 155 percent rising from less than $5 billion to over $12¾ billion.

I am proud of this record and I am sure you must be proud of it also.

I am sure that most of you are only too well aware that all of this has been done with a relatively small increase in the staffs of both the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments.

And what has been your reward for this accomplishment?

Now, of course, I mentioned criticism and unfortunately a great deal of it was made without even one witness having been called. Now, I am sure most of you are not unhappy with the fact that an investigation is being carried on but, I am sure that you will agree with me that we are unhappy with the fanfare that developed even before the hearings began.

As an example, I call to your attention a news item which appeared in a Washington, D.C. newspaper of February 9. I quote:

"Hints of far-reaching irregularities preceded opening of House investigation of the multibillion dollar 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System."

The news item goes on to say that the "hints of irregularities" came from a Congressman who is quoted as saying, "Facts now being unearthed and soon to be disclosed could make the highly publicized payola irregularities seem like a child's game of marbles in comparison."

Congressman GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, to his credit, indicated at the Boston AASHO meeting, that irreparable harm could be done to a fine highway program by ballooning all out of proportion unduly publicized mistakes and deficiencies, but failing to point out how few they were.

During the few months that I served as Administrator, I predicted that the highway program had moved into the big leagues. It undoubtedly would attract various interests which would try to rush in and reap profits from it.

There is no doubt that in a program of such vast scope undertaken in every State in the Nation some wrongdoing may be found.

I do not know intimately the highway officials and workings of every highway de-

partment in the country and there may be a small number where politics has entered the scene.

I do know, however, that the large majority of the departments are staffed with competent, honest officials dedicated to the task of getting for their States and the Nation a full dollar's value for every dollar spent.

I believe that the Bureau of Public Roads under the leadership of Bert Tallamy has done an outstanding job of coordinating and directing the overall effort. He and his associates certainly deserve warm commendation from all of the citizens of the country.

While I am on this subject, perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words specifically in answer to the suggestion of a pattern of collusion among contractors to reap undue profits from highway contracts. I am sure you all know that there is no such pattern—that in today's competitive construction world there could be no such pattern of collusion.

Facts prove that exactly the opposite is the true case. The increasingly keen competition for highway contracts is forcing the price of highway construction down, and it has been doing so for some time.

Last year, according to Bureau of Public Roads figures, contractor's bid prices were at their lowest point in 3 years. And State highway departments, as you all know, are receiving, in many cases, as many as 15 bids per project, and these bids run as much as 20 percent below the engineer's estimates. Indeed, it is a rare occasion when a highway contract is awarded on a bid that is above the engineer's estimate.

Now, it occurs to me that these facts indicate that if there is any collusion among highway contractors, it exists in a form guaranteed to give the American public the greatest possible value for its tax dollar.

There seems ample reason to believe that it is in the field of highway construction today that the American taxpayer receives the most for his money.

In view of the above facts, and taking into consideration the importance of the highway program to everyone, as well as the effort and expenditure that has already been devoted to it, it is my hope that many of the current remarks heard about the program will shortly be forgotten.

I trust that some comments about a cutback in the Interstate System within urban areas are just that—comments and nothing more. You have indicated that traffic jams are heaviest in the cities, and the bulk of taxpayers are concentrated in urban areas, so why shouldn't gasoline tax money finance highway construction in these areas. As a matter of fact, any change along this line would be contrary to the highway act itself which specifies that to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable and feasible, local needs shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

Some talk also has been heard about the possibility of changing the 90–10 ratio provided for in the act. You, as highway officials have pointed out, and I concur with you that many States are having difficulty financing the 10 percent now required, and it certainly would be impossible for many States if this percentage were increased.

It all boils down to this:

The States believed that Congress had made a firm commitment in 1956 with respect to a specific highway system calling for a specific share of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government, and for completion of this program within a specific time. Based on these commitments, the States have made specific plans, borrowed money and in many cases, expanded their highway departments to complete the job they thought they were given to do. Contractors, manufacturers, equipment distributors and material producers also took Uncle Sam at his word.

The temporary 1-cent gasoline tax increase passed late in the last congressional session prevented a complete stoppage of the program. I might add that as late as July of last year it appeared we might have no interstate apportionment authorized because of this disagreement between the White House and Congress over the method of financing.

PERSISTENCE OF PRESIDENT

Now, what can we see ahead of us for 1960 and the years following.

Certainly you are all aware of the decline in construction awards in fiscal 1960 particularly because of the control of reimbursement planning which the bureau was obliged to place on the States to keep within the $3½ billion limit necessary to stay within funds available in the highway trust fund.

The worst is over and the second half of fiscal 1960 will allow the States to obligate the States twice as much money as in last half of 1959. The President as you know, has asked for an additional ½-cent gas tax increase this year. This is an election year, of course, so it is uncertain what will happen with this request. Of course, next year the economic study is due and all of us are hopeful a permanent solution to the financing of the highway program will be found.

I would hope that some States will proceed with interstate projects which have already been designed and prepared for advertising.

Financing of these projects in some States is being undertaken by short term borrowing which would be repaid by the Federal Government as additional apportionments become due. So much for financing.

In addition to financing, of course, there are also other problems in our highway program. These include the engineering problems, and you and I know that good engineering is the only satisfactory solution to any problem.

I certainly want to compliment the Bureau of Public Roads and the 50 State highway departments for the wonderful job that they have accomplished during the past 4 years in retooling their organization to handle such a tremendous undertaking. As I travel across the country, I marvel at each of the complicated urban interchanges which were designed by our engineers and constructed by our contractors under the Federal interstate highway program. These are truly wonders of the world. I want to compliment the AASHO, the Mississippi Valley Conference, and the Bureau, for its excellent work in disseminating good engineering practices and ideas amongst the States and would like to see this policy continued, not to the extent of making one State a prototype of another, but to advance the best engineering experience and theories so that each individual State can have a vast reserve of information and select that which is the best for their own individual problems.

From my experience as a building contractor, it is my belief that considerable engineering manpower could be saved by two other means, namely, more lump-sum contracts and fewer engineers on inspection. You might say now that he has changed his hat again and is favoring the contractors. Certainly this is not true in the first instance, because I know from my own business experience that it takes several estimators working full time to figure quantities and costs on lump-sum building contracts. The major saving in the use of lump-sum contracts applies to you gentlemen who have the responsibility of supervising construction projects. Lump-sum contracts eliminate the necessity of keeping records of unit items in detail and on many projects would save substantial engineering man-hours.

In my home State of Massachusetts, I initiated lump-sum contracts on bridges and realized immediately a considerable savings in engineering costs.

The second part of my recommendation to relieve engineering manpower is to have fewer engineers as inspectors on a project. On a building contract of $5 million, the owner would have one or possibly two inspectors known as clerk of the works or some such similar title. The architect makes periodic inspections, as well as engineers and consultants, on special type subcontracts, but in general, there are considerably less inspectors than on highway or bridge projects.

Assuming that most of the contractors are capable and reliable (that is your job to insist on proper prequalification of bidders) and the adoption of "results" specification on certain items that will allow a contractor to use his know-how and ingenuity, will result in better work and lower engineering and inspection cost.

I hesitate to get into the field of State highway personnel versus consulting engineers. I cannot imagine a highway division without an adequate permanent engineering force.

Consultant engineering firms are to be congratulated on their assistance to most of the States in getting the Federal highway program underway, but with a financial slowdown such as we are experiencing at the present I believe that the State forces should be kept intact to work on the multitudinous problems in redesigning and rebuilding the remainder of the roads in every State which will not benefit under the Federal Highway Act and must be improved to keep pace with the increased automobile traffic.

Of course, competent engineering firms should be utilized for complicated projects and peak periods, as they have much to contribute.

In some of your States you utilize prequalifications of contractors. We believe in this as it generally makes for better conditions and better competition. I suggest, however, that greater care should be exercised in the selection of contractors and that awards not be made to contractors unless they are financially qualified and have the equipment and know-how to complete the projects.

Gentlemen, you hold all the cards and I am sure that if you play them right, your contractor-engineer relations can generally be improved.

I recommend that frequent contractor-engineer conferences be held, that specifications be revised to eliminate obsolete, slow, and unsatisfactory methods of construction.

Payments to contractors should be expedited. In the East I know of two States; one pays its contractors 3 days after the resident engineer makes out his estimate, and the other takes 2 or 3 months to process the same type of estimate. Just imagine. Any estimate is generally only a good guess of the amount of work done as estimated by a busy resident, but redtape can delay the payment for too long a period. Moneys held in reserve should be reviewed occasionally, and only funds necessary to protect the State's interest should be retained. The percentage retained by many States is much higher than actually needed.

Remember, a penny saved is a penny earned, and a contractor who does not have to borrow to meet payrolls, equipment payments, etc., can save considerable money in interest on a project if the State and the engineers involved can use some of the expedient and simple methods of handling the finances as I have suggested. I am sure that such practices will reflect lower prices to some degree.

I would like to comment briefly on the fact that we have not done as good a job as should be done in keeping the public and legislators informed on the need and progress of the highway program.

Although it has been sold once, this is a continuing job, and we must continue to sell the need of the program and how essential

it is to keep it going on an orderly programed basis.

I would like to just say a word about urban renewal which ties in so closely with many of the highway projects being undertaken. I believe it is the duty of all highway administrators to coordinate their plans with redevelopment officials.

Oftentimes locations for sections of the new highway facility can be located in part of the slum area or sections can be utilized for parts of interchanges, ramps, etc., designed to serve the area after it is redeveloped.

The cost of construction of a new highway, contiguous with an urban renewal project, often is allowed as a down payment, or part of the communities contribution to the redevelopment project. We should not pass pass up any opportunity to improve our local streets when an urban renewal project is contemplated.

Before closing, I would like to touch on a subject that has been kicked around like a football without a receiver. That, of course, is mass transportation.

I am firmly convinced that we must concern ourselves with mass transportation if our large urban cities are to survive.

We are all aware of the fact that in urban areas our traffic surveys, highway designs, and construction have not been adequate and we are still encountering traffic congestions.

I recommend that serious consideration be given to this problem by highway planners and that recommendations be presented by highway officials to State legislatures on how mass transportation can best be coordinated with a highway system.

In closing, may I say that all of you are making an outstanding contribution to the welfare of your fellow citizens. I trust that you will not be deterred by occasional criticism. Do the best job you know how, and I am sure that your fellow citizens will thank you for what you are—dedicated public servants doing a constructive job for the welfare of the Nation.

The Washington Post Endorses as "Sensible" Proposal To Make Unlawful Retired Officers Using Influence or Selling to the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on Monday joined with the Washington Star and the Washington Daily News in supporting criminal penalties for retired officers who use their influence or who sell to the Pentagon within 2 years after retirement. The action of the Washington Post makes the position of Washington's three great newspapers unanimous.

The Washington Post called my proposed amendment to the legislation which is scheduled to come before the House on Wednesday as "sensible reform."

Nota single editorial of any newspaper in the Nation that has been brought to my attention disagrees with me on the issue. From every section of the Nation has come favorable and encouraging comment.

There is no middle road. Either such practices shall be permitted and given the blessing of Congress or shall be made unlawful by the imposition of criminal penalties.

There can be no compromise with this issue. It is either wrong or it is not. I believe it is wrong.

The Washington Post editorial follows:

WHEN OFFICERS RETIRE

Two questions concerning retirement provisions for military personnel deserve public attention. The first involves the relatively modest problem of rectifying a defect in the military pay bill passed by Congress in 1958. This bill breached a century-old military tradition that retirement benefits should be related to active duty pay; it provided a benefit increase of 6 percent for officers who had retired before June 1, 1958, and continued the pay-benefit system only for those who retired after that date. Plainly this discriminatory policy has a demoralizing effect on service personnel. When the House Armed Services Committee begins hearings tomorrow there will be wide support for the legislation which would remedy this inequity.

A second matter, however, is far less simple. When some officers retire, they step into affluent positions with private concerns that do most of their business with the Pentagon. Investigations conducted by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT have disclosed a widespread disregard for the spirit, if not the letter, of conflict-of-interest laws.

A civilian official of the Justice Department is deterred by criminal penalties from accepting within a 2-year period of leaving the Government any private post that involves any matters he handled as a public official. However, when Mr. HÉBERT proposed a tightening up of similar penalties relating to retired admirals and generals, the House Armed Services Committee rejected this sensible reform. If the military has a just grievance in discriminatory retirement legislation, the public has an equally valid objection to practices which tend to tarnish the reputation of Pentagon brass.

In Support of Family Farm Income Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD my statement, "In Support Family Farm Income Act of 1960," which I submitted on March 30 to the House Committee on Agriculture.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of a proposal which reflects the thinking of Representatives from both rural and urban areas. Its sensible and workable approach will benefit the farm community, the consumer, and the taxpayer.

My statement follows:

IN SUPPORT OF FAMILY FARM INCOME ACT OF 1960

(Statement by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT submitted to House Committee on Agriculture, Mar. 30, 1960)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to supplement my brief remarks which I made before you on March 2.

I join with my colleagues in support of the Family Farm Income Act of 1960. This legislation would raise family farm income, which will reach a new low in 1960, and would, at the same time, drastically reduce cost of the Federal farm program. I believe that in the long run the legislation is not only to the advantage of these engaged in agricultural pursuit who suffer gross inequality in the marketplace, but to the advantage of consumers.

Family farmers are entitled to sufficient income to maintain their families at a decent standard of living—a standard of living, I might add, which compares with the standards of people living off farms.

Other groups, including labor and business, are protected by many Federal laws and in addition, because of the nature of our industrial organization, have been able to increase their bargaining power greatly. As a result, business as a whole—particularly big business—is in a favorable position. Labor, where it is organized, is able to maintain a relatively good income.

Farmers, on the other hand, as the largest segment of our economy which is unorganized, have comparatively little bargaining power. Every farmer is competing against every other. When there is a surplus, prices may be driven to below cost of production. Industry, on the other hand, maintains its prices and merely reduces production when demand falls off. The record indicates that farmers, partly because their costs are fixed and partly because of the competitive situation, must go on producing more and more as prices decline.

That is the reason, Mr. Benson's effort to reduce surpluses by increasing production has fallen on its face. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture turned corn loose, lowered the support price but told farmers they could produce all they wanted to. The result is that corn is running out of our ears and the corn situation constitutes another farm scandal. According to the Wall Street Journal, the inevitable result of reduced price is increased acreage. Here is a quote from the March 16, 1960, issue of that publication which never, to my knowledge, has been called irresponsible:

"DE KALB, ILL.—Husky farmer Joseph Faivre may be planting something more than corn on his 640-acre farm this spring. What comes up next fall could be the biggest crop of trouble the administration's farm program has faced so far.

"In 1958, the Government's price support for corn was $1.36 a bushel; Mr. Faivre planted 52 acres. Last year, the support dropped to $1.12 and the Illinois farmer planted 186 acres. 'This year,' he says, 'it will drop to $1.06, so I'm going to plant 287 acres.'

" 'With price supports going down, I have to increase my volume to end up with the same income,' Mr. Faivre explains."

This bill—the Family Farm Income Act of 1960—would cost the Government very little by providing for payment-in-kind to the farmer who reduced his acreage. It would authorize a 10 percent deduction in acreage for which the farmer would receive nothing and an additional 30 percent reduction for which the farmer would receive payment out of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings. Thus, the surplus which is costing so much and which constitutes a major scandal would be reduced. In addition, the bill provides that farmers can get together and plan their production and vote on such a plan, a two-thirds majority being required to put it into effect.

I firmly believe that if something is not done to maintain and stabilize the family farmer that inevitably agriculture will be taken over by big business. Investigations of the House Small Business Subcommittee

No. 5, of which I am privileged to be chairman, indicate that national corporations are putting out of business small distributors of food products. Often the result of price wars carried on by large corporations is higher prices for consumers and lower prices for farmers. In some areas, where dairy companies carried on price wars, the consumer benefitted during the price war, but after the large corporations had accomplished their purpose of destroying local competition, they raised prices to a point higher than they were before the price war.

Investigations of the House Small Business Subcommittee indicate that chain stores are, to some extent, now taking over in the area of agriculture. They are engaging in cattle feeding and packing and they are manipulating the market, by-passing the Government regulated stockyards and paying the farmer the lowest possible price. At the same time, they have been raising prices to the consumer. For example, lamb producers a year or two ago experienced a net loss on their operations. Safeway stores at the same time raised the price of lamb chops to the consumers. I have introduced legislation which will prevent chain stores from engaging in agricultural activities.

The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 proposal is complementary to my proposed legislation which would prevent, or check, vertical integration in the food industry. It would give the farmer bargaining power and enable him to protect himself from price manipulation and discrimination practices of giant corporations.

The urban consumer, although he naturally wants to get his money's worth for food, has no desire to grind down American farmers to the status of peasant or peon. The urban consumer, I believe, is for fair play and not economic discrimination.

Critics of this 1960 proposal have not produce any convincing arguments against it. They talk wildly of regimentation. The farmer who is losing his farm, or is reduced to a state of penury because of low prices, is the one that is regimented—not the farmer who participates in a farm program to determine his own destiny. According to some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, this regimentation seems to consist of two-thirds of all the farmers participating in a referendum to determine what kind of a program they want.

What could be more democratic and more in the spirit of free enterprise? A referendum by farmers is no more undemocratic than a congressional election.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this Congress has a pressing obligation to act to resolve the farm delimma created by a bungling administration. I likewise submit, respectfully, that the Family Farm Income Act of 1960 merits support and enactment as a practical, workable and fair means to resolve this dilemma—a dilemma which is costly to the farmer and the American taxpayer.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following report on the Cuban situation and Latin America has been sent to me by a constituent who has been making a study of the many problems confronting our Nation in our own hemisphere.

As the report is intelligent, clear, brief, and authoritative, I commend it to the House of Representatives for their thoughtful consideration:

I. Cuban sugar: If it is decided by Congress to cut the Cuban sugar quota and to redistribute it among the nations more friendly to the United States than Cuba, I think it would be very important to back up this action by reasoning which is as invulnerable as possible to attack on the ground of being just economic retaliation.

One line that could well be taken could be as follows:

(A) Cuba has gotten itself in a position of having a kind of monopoly on the Latin American sugar trade with the United States. Cuba attacks the United States on monopolies when it is following the same policy itself. The virtual Cuban monopoly does positive harm to the legitimate desire of countries like Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, Nicaragua, Haiti, Peru, Brazil, and others, to get a fair share of the prize U.S. market.

(B) It has been argued that if the Cuban sugar monopoly were taken away from it and sugar production was built up in other countries such as Mexico, Costa Rica, etc., that if and when Cuba would be a more reliable and friendly supplier of sugar to the United States, it would become desirable to again use large quantities of their sugar and this would cause trouble in the new countries. There are two possible fallacies in this point of view:

(1) The countries who are asking for an increased sugar quota to the United States are not doing so on the basis of building up their sugar quota but on getting a better price in the U.S. market for their existing production.

(2) Any proper reorientation of the Cuban economy in the future ought to involve less emphasis on sugar and a greater diversification of their agricultural production. At the very least Cuba ought to produce its own food crops, which it falls very short of doing today. Therefore there is plenty of room, after Cuba changes, to see that its restored economy follows sound lines.

II. Cuba as a base for subversive activities in Central America and the Caribbean in general: All the Central American governments and many others in the Caribbean area and South America also, have noted with alarm the tremendous build-up in activities of Cuba's diplomatic missions. For a little country with as few legitimate diplomatic problems abroad, an unconscionable amount of money is being spent by these Embassies and certainly—at least in Central America—the Cuban diplomatic missions are crudely intervening in the internal affairs of their host governments. The following activities are notable:

(A) Extraordinarily large and expensive propaganda campaigns. Masses of literature. Paid time on radio networks. Motion picture shows. Support and organization of "Friends of the Cuban Revolution" organizations are following an identical pattern in all the countries. Cuban Ambassadors are continually seen with and found encouraging leftist student and labor movements.

(B) In this connection the Communists in Cuba are clearly following orders from Moscow. In the past Moscow has been almost overtly using its tremendous diplomatic establishments in Mexico and Uruguay, for instance, as the focal points for dissemination of subversive literature and the carrying out of subversive activities. This conduct is becoming increasingly unpopular in the host governments. Mexico has declared certain Russian diplomats persona non grata and there are press stories that Uruguay is about to demand that the 80-man Embassy in that tiny country be cut down to 6 or 7, comparable to the Uruguayan representation in Moscow. It seems clear that Russia, foreseeing a future limitation in Latin America on the illicit activites of their own embassies, is building up, under the cover of Cuba, a strong mechanism to keep the same work going for the future.

III. Cuban inspired third force labor movements: Russia, for a generation or more, has had a very strong Latin American international labor mechanism which has very effectively placed Communists in key positions and even control in a very large percentage of the Latin American labor movements. In the past this has been operated from Mexico by the known Mexican Communist Lombardo Toledano. The overtness of the Communist connection, just as in the case of the Embassies, is becoming embarrassing to Russia and the new tactic is, again, working through Cuba to set up a so-called third force labor movement through Latin America. It is understood that the Communists, for cover reasons, are prepared to sacrifice their current mechanism if they can get the other one going.

IV. The Cuban counterpart of UPI and AP press news services: Cuba has recently created Prensa Latina, a wire service available throughout Latin America and subsidized by the Cuban Government, no doubt with help in that connection from the international Communist propaganda apparatus. This service is furnished free where papers, as all too frequently in Latin America, have difficulty in paying for legitimate wire service. The legitimate news articles are heavily interlarded with Communist propaganda and all stories play up the Communist point of view.

V. Cuban supported revolutionary expeditions in Central America: Since the rise of Castro a dozen or more expeditions, supported with Cuban Communist experts on guerrilla warfare and with Cuban arms, have been keeping the countries in the Caribbean in a state of upset conditions and instability. All of these expeditions are operating under the guise of antidictatorship forces, which of course is a tremendously popular thing in Latin America today. In fact, the last thing in the world that the Communist conspiracy wants to do is to overthrow dictators. They fatten on the ability to use the dictatorship theme as a slogan and an entering wedge into liberal movements. It is only when the Communist conspiracy feels that it can substitute its own dictatorship in a country, through control of revolutionary movements, that it is really anxious to win a revolution. Thus, this multitude of small, 50 and 100 man, expeditionary forces, is currently being used for 2 purposes which give real fundamental aid to the Communist conspiracy. These are:

(A) By creating a climate in the press of the world that Central America, for instance, is in a very unstable political situation because of constant revolutionary action, they are accomplishing their major objective of trying to bring about economic depression in the area, which will set the theme for popular discontent and uprisings. The existence of this apparent political instability freezes up the desire of nationals of the countries in the area toward investing their own funds in development of their own country and has virtually killed all possibility of additional foreign investment.

(B) A more subtle purpose of the manner in which these 50- and 100-man expeditions is used appears to be a deliberate attempt to liquidate the manpower available to sincere democratically inclined revolutionaries who are merely discontent with their home governments. It is obvious that so long as there are strong non-Communist revolutionary groups, that communism operating through Cuba cannot hope to control any revolution that succeeds. However, once the more or less legitimate revolutionary forces are weakened then they will have to, if they

wish to continue, seek Cuban support and permit Cuban control.

In furtherance of this tactic the recruits for revolutionary expeditions are invariably told that they can expect popular uprisings when they invade; that fleets of airplanes will drop more troops and supplies, etc. These promises, which emanate from Cuban sources, are never met and the poor, misguided revolutionaries have, as a result, stuck their heads into traps and are rapidly being liquidated.

Reds Court Suicide—The True Image of Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial "Reds Court Suicide—The True Image of Our Defense," from the San Diego Union, Friday, March 18, 1960.

This editorial is of particular significance at this time because it sets forth in clear, understandable terms the sound strategic reasoning that is the foundation for our defense policies. In so doing, the editorial underlines the strategic wisdom that characterizes our defense thinking which has rejected the dangerous clamor that our Nation should match the Soviet Union on a missile-for-missile, weapon-for-weapon basis.

As the editorial points out, the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has resolutely rejected such irresponsible demands, and has proceeded to follow a strategically sound policy of maintaining an unquestioned superiority of deterrent power over the Soviet Union. In so doing, he is protecting our Nation and the free world from the disaster that could result if we put "all our strategic eggs in one basket." In his forceful observation that as a nation "we must not allow ourselves to overconcentrate on any instrument of war," Secretary Gates has enunciated a fundamental and unquestionably sound concept. Because our Government is following the policy of basing our deterrent forces on balance, versatility, and mobility, we have a total power that surpasses that of the Soviet Union.

As the editorial indicates, it is indeed fortunate that the Nation possesses in Secretary Gates a man of such administrative ability and sound strategic thought. His views, as reflected in this editorial, make sense and underline the reasons why we can have a genuine feeling of pride and confidence in our Nation's defenses.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 18, 1960]

REDS COURT SUICIDE—THE TRUE IMAGE OF OUR DEFENSE

Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has given the true image of our defense capabilities. An attack on this country, Mr. Gates testified before the Senate Space Committee and Preparedness Subcommittee "would be tantamount to suicide."

The defense issue has been so steamed by controversy that the mirror of the Nation's real strength has been blurred. Many politically inspired critics, notably Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, have insisted that the United States must match Russia on a missile-for-missile basis. And they have asked the public to pass judgment on how many long-range missiles we should have. The foolishness of having the public decide such a highly technical issue is obvious.

The important consideration is that the Nation have the power to bring destruction to anyone who attacks us. And, in Mr. Gates' words, we have that power in combination. The administration's program is designed to maintain this strength.

The administration has concentrated on the development of the solid fuel missiles, meanwhile depending on a mixed defense of our present missiles and manned bombers. Our existing deterrent power is acknowledged to be tremendous and far superior to that of the Soviet Union.

We would be in trouble if we put all our eggs in one basket, something the defense critics are asking the Nation to do. Mr. Gates, who with the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is charged with keeping the Nation strong, told the Senate committee that "we must not allow ourselves to overconcentrate on any instrument of war."

Our deterrent force in being shows that the administration is not letting this happen. It is predicated on balance and marked by versatility, mobility, and tremendous striking power. This balance embraces the capability for general war, limited war, and the quick-to-the-spot police actions.

The United States does not have a static posture. For Mr. Gates told the Senators that U.S. plans are constantly under review. And it very correctly has given first priority to deterrence. There is no deterrent gap now, and Mr. Gates made it abundantly clear that there will not be one.

The United States will not permit itself to be mesmerized by one weapon or one threat. Its eyes are open to the broad challenge.

Hon. Russell V. Mack

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues from the State of Washington and others in paying a brief, but sincere tribute to the memory of our departed colleague and friend, Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington.

He was a fine gentleman, a genuine representative of his district and his Nation, and a man of great courage in his devotion to the public interest.

He served for many years on the Public Works Committee, where he proved to be at all times broad in his approach, kind in his treatment to those in disagreement with him, and helpful to those of us whose tenure of service on the committee was less than his long and fruitful years of dedicated work on the committee.

He will be greatly missed. In his passing, the Congress of the United States has suffered the loss of one of its Members it could least afford to lose. My deep sympathy goes to his family, to the congressional district he represented so well, to the great State of Washington, and to the Nation.

Airline Asks Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion previously to comment upon the way in which when the weather becomes unfavorable mail which ordinarily is transported by highway or airway is assigned to the railway for transportation to the postal patron.

All of us are concerned about the way in which the pattern of airline accidents have caused alarm among the general populace. Now a new ingredient has been added in that one of the country's major airlines, Capital Airlines, is asking the taxpayers of the United States not only to venture as an individual to travel in equipment having a poor safety record but the taxpayer as a group is being asked to sustain the company's losses as a result of such accidents.

Capital Airlines is asking for a subsidy of 22.5 cents per revenue-plane-mile to offset its losses brought about by bad winter weather and "the public's worry over air accidents." Presumably the transportation of first-class 4-cent mail by air might be thought potentially to offset some of this subsidy if it should be approved. But if mail traffic to offset Capital's losses is taken away from surface transportation, would not the railroads then be justified in asking for a subsidy to make up for the loss of mail traffic?

Mr. Speaker, in the question of transporting first-class 4-cent mail by air there is the basic legal determination of whether or not Congress consents that it be done. I have asked that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee take speedy action on my bill, H.R. 9488 to clarify the law in regard to transportation of first-class mail by air and to provide specifically that only mail bearing first-class airmail postage shall be furnished air transportation.

I hope that we will not now again become involved in a series of subsidies to airlines. It might be worthwhile for the United States to copy the European system under which a nominal charge of $1 is charged to each user of an airport thereby enabling the users of an airline to pay in part for the facility, to lower the tax burden on the general public and generally to assign the cost of maintaining air facilities in a more equitable manner.

I hope that the fresh request for a subsidy will be laid aside and under leave to extend my remarks I include a newspaper article from the Washington Eve-

ning Star for March 26, 1960, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1960]

AIRLINE ASKS U.S. SUBSIDY

Capital Airlines, suffering from bad winter weather and the public's worry over air accidents, asked the Government for financial help yesterday.

Lawyers told the Civil Aeronautics Board that Capital had a net loss of $1,811,679 in January and one of $2,131,745 in February.

For the 12 months which began March 15, they said, Capital requires subsidy payments of $12,949,000.

Accordingly, they asked "an immediate 22.5 cents per revenue plane mile rate to supplement its present service rate for carrying the mail."

This was based on an estimate that the line will fly 57,510,000 revenue plane miles in the coming year.

Capital last had a Government subsidy in 1951. Trunk airlines generally have not been subsidized for several years. In aviation's earlier years, subsidies designed to foster air transportation were common.

Capital's petition to the CAB said:

"The several major air accidents which have occurred within the past several months have seriously depressed Capital's traffic. These accidents, coupled with an unusually large amount of publicity (especially the repeated publicity relative to the unknown causes of these accidents and the speculation that they may have been caused by bombs), have served to shake the confidence of certain segments of the public in the safety of air transportation."

"The extremely bad weather which has prevailed over Capital's system has caused major disruptions of Capital's operations with a consequent economic loss. Capital has been forced to cancel many flights."

The airline serves 72 cities in the Eastern half of the United States. Last year it carried almost 4 million passengers.

College Youth for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call your attention to a publication entitled "College Youth for NIXON." The issue of February 1960 tabulates polls taken at 13 of the Nation's colleges, and I believe the results of these polls will be of interest to many Members of this body:

COLLEGE YOUTH FOR NIXON

FLORIDA COLLEGE YOUTH PICK NIXON IN 1960

University of Miami students disprove the "solid South" theory by picking RICHARD M. NIXON for President by a surprisingly wide margin in a poll of the campus this month.

The poll, which included 312 registered voters on the campus, revealed that 573 of the 1,154 students questioned favored NIXON, with Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, polling only 259 votes, in second place. Adlai Stevenson, twice the Democratic presidential candidate, was the third choice of the Miami students with 193 votes.

Eric Raepple, chairman of the Dick Nixon club on the University of Miami campus, reports that the results received coverage on the wire services and local TV and radio stations.

Arthur T. McGonigle, Jr., son of the Republican candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania in 1958, is organizing youth-for-Nixon clubs on other Florida campuses. Art is a student at Rollins College in Winter Park.

SMALL RELIGIOUS SCHOOL FINDS NIXON HAS EDGE

Not to be outdone by the scores of other colleges in America solidly behind NIXON for President, Monmouth College, deep in the heart of Lincolnland at Monmouth, Ill., has picked NIXON by a landslide.

A mid-January poll of the campus at the 700-student Presbyterian college showed 201 for Nixon; 55 for Kennedy; 37 for Rockefeller, and the residue scattered among numerous Democrats.

Four hundred and six students participated in the poll which was conducted under the auspices of the political club. The Nixon sweep and the Democratic breakdown is as follows:

NIXON versus KENNEDY, 187 to 73.
NIXON versus HUMPHREY, 165 to 25.
NIXON versus Stevenson, 170 to 28.
NIXON versus SYMINGTON, 170 to 16.
NIXON versus MORSE, 172 to 19.
NIXON versus JOHNSON, 177 to 15.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA STUDENTS PREDICT NIXON VICTORY IN 1960

The Daily Nebraskan, campus newspaper at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, reports that in a cross-section poll of 100 students, Nixon scored 65 percent of the vote, while his chief opponent, Senator John Kennedy, was a poor second with only 24 votes, Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey received 1 vote each, with 9 ballots undecided.

EISENHOWER CLUB SURVEYS HARVARD FRESHMEN

In a somewhat closer race, Harvard freshmen rate the candidates as follows, when asked which candidate they favored irrespective of political affiliation:

NIXON versus HUMPHREY, 170 to 114.
NIXON versus JOHNSON, 168 to 113.
NIXON versus KENNEDY, 122 to 159.
NIXON versus Stevenson, 119 to 166.
NIXON versus SYMINGTON, 179 to 100.

For a traditionally Democratic stronghold, the Harvard survey indicates a major breakthrough. Those who considered themselves independents preferred NIXON over HUMPHREY, JOHNSON, and SYMINGTON, and Republicans favored NIXON over all other candidates. An interesting sidenote: Democrats' choice for their own presidential candidate included one vote each for Eleanor Roosevelt and STYLES BRIDGES.

INDIANA COLLEGE REPUBLICANS ENDORSE NIXON AT CONVENTION

Meeting in convention, representatives of all the college young Republican clubs of Indiana adopted a resolution unanimously endorsing RICHARD NIXON for the Republican nomination, and expressing their "complete confidence that he will be overwhelmingly elected."

MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE GOP ANNOUNCE SUPPORT FOR NIXON

A group of college leaders in the Midwest Federation of Young Republicans met in Madison, Wis., and polled themselves on presidential preference. According to Jim Mack, Midwest Federation chairman, members of the federation's executive board favored NIXON unanimously. The group represented campuses from Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

GOUCHER GIRLS ELECT NIXON IN CAMPUS MOCK ELECTION

Vice President NIXON captured 66 percent of the vote, easily beating his nearest opponent, in a recent mock election at Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Brownless Corrin, director of Goucher's field politics center, which conducted the poll, was baffled by the apparent contradiction of a situation in which KENNEDY received 30 percent of the votes in the preliminary poll, but students calling themselves Democrats voted a slate of Stevenson for President with KENNEDY as his running mate in the actual elections.

Tape-recorded interviews verify the results of the poll, in which the students predicted Mr. NIXON would win the Republican nomination and Senator KENNEDY would win the Democratic nomination.

COLUMBIA BASIN COLLEGE SHOWS NIXON FAVORED BY STUDENTS

Secret balloting by means of the county's portable voting booths added realism to the Columbia Basin College, Washington, mock presidential elections, in which NIXON ran far ahead of all other candidates.

The CBC Collegiate reports that Nixon received 55 percent of the vote, Rockefeller 22 percent, Kennedy 19 percent, and all others 14 percent.

Columbia Basin plans another mock election to be held in May, because, the Collegiate explains, "by that time the clouded political atmosphere will be somewhat clearer, and the issues will be better defined."

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE IS ALL FOR NIXON

Paul R. Boire, chairman of the Williams College Young Republican Club, Williamstown, Mass., reports 44 percent of the students polled at Williams are for NIXON. Rockefeller has 12 percent of the student body; Kennedy 21 percent; Symington 1 percent; Humphrey 2 percent; and all others 2 percent.

ROCKEFELLER STUDENT CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES FOR NIXON

Bruce Chapman, of Harvard College, formerly chairman of the National Students for Rockefeller, has announced his support for NIXON, now that the Governor has withdrawn from the race.

Bruce says in a recent newsletter to collegiate Rockefeller supporters:

"For myself, I believe that events have proven that Vice President NIXON is a modern Republican worthy of wholehearted support by progressives within and without the party. On the 27th of December I issued a statement announcing my own support of the Nixon candidacy and my intention of urging other Rockefeller supporters to do the same."

MOST TEENAGERS FAVOR NIXON; PURDUE POLL SHOWS

The best argument for lowering the voting age is shown in the intelligent choice made by the Nation's teenagers as revealed in a recent poll. An opinion research panel of Purdue University questioned 15,000 teenagers, carefully selected to represent a fair sampling of high-school students.

The results are overwhelming support for NIXON from the high-school age group. NIXON received 45 percent of the nationwide vote, with Stevenson, Rockefeller, and Kennedy his nearest competitors.

NIXON strength was slightly better among youth in the East and Midwest, but he received 39 percent of the vote from the South, still far ahead of any other candidate. West coast teens favor NIXON by 43 percent.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENTS GREET NIXON WITH SONGS, CHEERS

As Vice President NIXON and his wife, Pat, entered the Mayflower ballroom in Washington, D.C., where they were being honored at the annual Lincoln Day dinner, a contingent of 70 students from area colleges greeted them with placards, cheers, and songs.

One group had written a song to the tune of "Clementine," which began: "RICHARD NIXON, tell your lady, you're to be next President."

NIXON took note of the enthusiasm by observing, "If being a delinquent means having the support of these fine young Republicans from Trinity, Dunbarton, and Georgetown, then I'm for it." He was referring to Senator HUMPHREY'S labeling of Mr. NIXON as the "juvenile delinquent."

WYOMING STUDENTS PICK NIXON

The citizenship clearinghouse, in cooperation with young Republicans and young Democrats, conducted a poll on the campus at the University of Wyoming, Laramie, in which NIXON received the highest percentage.

His runnerup was again Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and the rest of the vote was distributed among a myriad of other hopefuls. Another poll is scheduled for the spring to test any change in student attitude.

Kinzua Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people, a thoughtful letter which was sent by my good friend Carl Jansen, an outstanding civic leader in Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania to the Honorable ROMAN HRUSKA, Senator from Nebraska.

I have long been interested in the proposed flood control projects in western Pennsylvania which will save many lives and much property from flood damage in the future and I feel Jansen's letter is a good expression of the deep and thoughtful civic interest in this project.

I insert the letter in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

DRAVO CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 1, 1960.

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Member, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this as an interested voter and industrialist located in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County to urge your support of the early start of construction on Kinzua Dam as proposed by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

I understand that hearings are to begin during the second week in April on this matter. A great deal of controversy has entered this question, principally having to do with the interests of the Seneca Indians. Mr. Arthur E. Morgan has been employed by the Seneca Indians to further their interest in this matter, and primarily with respect to abandoning the Kinzua site in favor of Mr. Morgan's proposed Conewango-Cattaraugus plan.

Many of us here in the Pittsburgh area have studied the relative merits of these two plans over a number of years. We are convinced that the Kinzua location is by far the better of the two in all of its aspects. We are further convinced that the arguments in favor of Conewango-Cattaraugus are self-serving and are deliberately intended to delay construction of Kinzua and to confuse the issue.

Plans for building Kinzua dam have been thoroughly studied over a period of many years by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, and have been confirmed generally by the consulting firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton. I can see no reason for further complicating this issue.

Again, I urge your support of the Kinzua project in the location now recommended by the Corps of Engineers and supported by the majority of interests in the Pittsburgh-Allegheny County region which is so strongly in need of this added flood protection.

Respectfully yours,

CARL B. JANSEN.

"Education and Freedom's Future"—A Policy Statement of the Democratic Advisory Council—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen and as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am deeply interested in proposals to encourage greater support of education in our country. America's most valuable natural resource is educated young men and women.

Members of Congress who share this concern will find very useful the recent publication by the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee of a study entitled, "Education and Freedom's Future." This publication is another in a series of "Democratic Programs for Action" issued by the advisory council.

The policy pamphlet, published on January 18, 1960, was prepared by a subcommittee on education of the Advisory Committee on Economic Policy. Chairman of the subcommittee was former U.S. Senator William Benton. Other members of the subcommittee were: Dr. Seymour E. Harris, chairman, department of economics, Harvard University; Dr. Walter Heller, of the University of Minnesota; and Beardsley Ruml, economist and educator.

I am pleased to join with two of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon and Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, to insert the three parts of "Education and Freedom's Future" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Part 1 follows:

EDUCATION AND FREEDOM'S FUTURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1. The educational challenge of the sixties.
1. Implications for national policy.
2. The Eisenhower formula: Strong words and weak deeds.
3. Dimensions of our educational needs.
4. The need for classrooms.
5. The need for teachers.
6. Financial requirements.
7. Disentangling the issues.
Part 2. Federal responsibilities in education.
Part 3. Recommendations.
1. Improving Federal organization.
2. The National Defense Education Act.
3. Federal support for public schools.
4. Federal-State cooperative scholarships.
5. Expansion of colleges and universities.

PART 1. THE EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE OF THE SIXTIES

Since World War II American education has been propelled by a combination of massive forces into a new era of growth, change, and challenge. The explosions of population and of knowledge—the almost unbelievable breakthroughs of science and technology—the worldwide revolution of human expectations—the menacing contest between democracy and communism—these forces have compounded the educational needs of this Nation and every nation. They have required the American people to revise their educational sights sharply upward.

Even in a world at peace it would be priority business for our free society to help every young person develop his full potentialities through education. In a world threatened by the aggressive challenge of the Soviet Union, education becomes a means for national survival as well. The world struggle between freedom and communism has become a battle of brainpower. All citizens, and not simply scientists and engineers, are engaged.

Sir David Eccles, president of the British Board of Trade, told an American audience: "The prizes will go to the people with the best system of education—in the sciences and humanities." The shrewd leaders of the Kremlin agree thoroughly with this proposition. They have convinced their own people—and declared to the world—that education is their most potent instrument for promoting communism's goals. Because the Soviet Government has come to take education much more seriously than has our own, Soviet education has begun to rival American education in quantity and—in some respects—in quality as well.

The ultimate goals of these two educational system are radically different. Soviet education is training for the service of the state. American education is designed for development of the individual. Obviously, education is not just a struggle with the Russians; it is a struggle with ignorance and bigotry. Both challenges require us to strengthen American education in order to strengthen the pursuit of democracy's goals. It will not be enough for us merely to help our schools and colleges do more of what they are already doing. They have made great progress in the last half century and many believe that what they are doing today is much better than ever before. But it is not enough better to meet the new strenuous demands.

The boys and girls entering school today will be the men and women responsible for their nation in the 21st century. They must be prepared to meet that century's unimaginable tests. A fairly good system will not be good enough to prepare them. The kind and quality of American education, not merely its quantity, must be equal to the challenge.

The demands upon our educational system do not lie somewhere off in the future. They are upon us now. As Walter Lippmann warns, the United States has already developed an ominous educational gap and it threatens to grow to disastrous proportions. Closing the gap—and keeping it closed—will require a breakthrough comparable to the breakthrough in the level of our defense effort since Pearl Harbor.

1. Implications for national policy

First among the consequences of the new situation is that we Americans in the 48,600 school districts of the United States cannot longer afford to regard education as a matter simply of State and local concern and responsibility. Whether we like it or not, education has become a matter of highest national concern and responsibility, as vital to freedom's future as the national defense program. The educational role of State and local governments, and of private groups en-

gaged in education, must remain strong and paramount. But their efforts must now be supported by increased national effort—effort guided by a clear sense of national purpose.

Such a transition in our thinking is not easy; the world has a habit of changing faster than our attitudes and insights. An experienced Washington reporter has wisely observed that education is the one great issue of national policy which returns to kindergarten every year. Until we free ourselves of emotional rhetoric, clarify our thinking, and disentangle the issues which are genuinely educational from others which are not, we cannot hope to lift American education to the excellence the times demand.

Many States, and thousands of communities, have exerted themselves to expand their support of education over the past 10 years. They must now do even more. But in doing more they are entitled to stronger support from the Federal Government.

How can the Federal Government best carry out its share of responsibility for the education of American youth? Part II of this report recommends specific actions toward this end, including:

1. Improvements in the organization of the Federal Government designed to increase its usefulness in the field of education.

2. Implementation of the National Defense Education Act, including the student loan and fellowship provisions.

3. A program of basic Federal financial support for local public schools, devoid of Federal control.

4. A federally supported program of scholarship to help able but needy students to acquire a college education.

5. A Federal loan and grant program to help colleges and universities prepare their physical facilities to handle twice as many students as they do now.

2. The Eisenhower formula: Strong words and weak deeds

On issues of education the Eisenhower administration has been characteristically strong on words and weak on deeds. Periodically White House spokesmen have proclaimed the virtues of education and the urgent need for more and better education. Periodically also—when the time for action came—their voices grew soft or silent. They failed to heed even the modest recommendations of their own advisory groups—or to press Republican Members of Congress to support even the mild educational proposals of the President.

There has been no shortage of Presidential committees on education, and no shortage of committee recommendations. The White House Conference on Education, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, and more recently the President's Scientific Advisory Committee have helped alter the Nation to the dimensions and urgency of its educational needs. Their reports have helped to stimulate some constructive actions outside of Washington. As for action by the very administration which sought their advice—these conferences and studies have been earnest exercises in futility. They have served as excuses for postponement and inertia. Seemingly, the Eisenhower administration has never quite been able to believe its own words.

Even before the first Soviet sputnik brought about a "rediscovery" of the importance of education, President Eisenhower told an assembly of educators: "Our schools are more important than our Nike batteries, more necessary than our radar warning sets, and more powerful even than the energy of the sun." Yet nearly 2 years after the first sputnik, in August of 1959, a member of his Cabinet warned that he would recommend a Presidential veto if Congress passed a modest compromise school construction bill similar to one the President himself had proposed in 1957.

This earlier bill lost in the House of Representatives by a close vote, 208 to 203. Three of the top four Republican House leaders voted against it, even though it had Presidential endorsement; their "ayes" alone could have made the shortage of schoolrooms today less acute. In that crucial vote, 111 Republicans voted to kill the measure and only 77 voted to save it; 59 percent of the Republicans opposed the President's bill while 57 percent of the Democrats supported it.

The President made no real effort to encourage Republican support of the bill during the critical period of debate; the phone from the White House never rang. A few days later at his press conference he expressed disappointment. But later, when he was reminded that a majority of Democrats stood ready to support his earlier request for a school construction measure, he added, "I am getting to the point where I can't be too enthusiastic about something that I think is likely to fasten a sort of an albatross, another one, around the neck of the Federal Government."

In the spring of 1959 the Democratic Congress passed a housing bill which, among other things, would have bolstered Federal capital loans to colleges and universities to help them to expand their physical facilities. The President vetoed the bill.

As a nation, we must make up our minds whether Federal support of education is a necessity or an albatross—whether it is vital to our life as a nation or only a threat to a balanced budget. Eloquent speeches will not build classrooms. Pious rhetoric will not staff them with able and decently paid teachers. Earnest utterances about the national need for young talent are not a substitute for adequate scholarships and fellowships. Until all of us in the United States, in both political parties and in every community, stand ready to match our words with deeds the ominous educational gap will grow steadily wider.

3. Dimensions of our educational needs

The need for more and better education in the United States isn't a new story. For many generations the people of the United States have responded to the need by investing heavily in educational expansion. What is new is the pace at which the need grows.

The number of boys and girls attending elementary and secondary schools, public and private, grew from less than 17 million in 1900 to over 43 million today. College enrollment in the same period rose 15-fold, from 238,000 to nearly 3,800,000. Today more than 80 percent of the young people of high school age are actually attending high school, compared with 11 percent in 1900, 51 percent after 1930 and 70 percent 10 years ago. College and university enrollments are now equivalent to 38 percent of all the 18-to-21-year-olds in the Nation, against 4 percent in 1900 and 12 percent in 1930.

Most observers—but not all—agree that, despite deficiencies, there has also been a growth of quality and variety in education. Taken as a whole, the educational qualifications of teachers have arisen steadily, the curriculum is broader, educational materials have improved, physical facilities and equipment are decidedly better, and most students are learning more.

An unparalleled investment in education in the past 60 years has proved highly profitable for the United States, whether it is reckoned in benefits to individuals or in benefits to national economic growth, cultural enrichment, and military security. Yet these benchmarks of past progress are modest measured against what must now be accomplished in a much shorter time.

The high level of births since 1944—twice as many babies were born here in 1956 as in 1936—has overcrowded the elementary schools. It will force enrollments still higher in the next few years. High school enrollments will rise more than 50 percent in the next 10 years; and by 1970, college enrollments are expected to reach 6 or 7 million compared to 3.8 million in 1959. The time is within view when the majority of all young people in the United States will continue their formal education beyond high school.

4. The need for classrooms

Good facilities can contribute greatly to good eduction. American schools and colleges entered the postwar period with a serious physical handicap. The low level of construction during the depressed thirties and during the war had given them a big backlog of building needs at the very time they faced rising enrollments. As a result—despite the greatly increased level of educational building since the war—millions of youngsters have had to spend their days in crowded and often dangerously obsolete classrooms. The widespread inspection of public schools prompted by the tragic parochial school fire in Chicago last year confirmed that many of these old buildings are physically hazardous.

We have had to "run fast to stand still" in our school building needs. From 1949 to 1958 a total of 500,000 new classrooms were built—an accomplishment to the credit of local communities and State governments. Yet at the end of that period, according to the Office of Education, there remained a shortage of 140,000 classrooms. Some qualified experts believe this figure is low by at least 60,000. In August 1959 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that, conservatively, "the number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees by the classroom shortage is about 10 million."

The physical needs of higher education are no less great. Despite a high level of construction in the last 10 years, particularly in tax-supported colleges and universities, a large proportion of existing collegiate structures are obsolete and overcrowded. The new buildings needed by higher education in the next 10 years are equivalent to all of the college structures built in the previous 200 years.

The total construction needs of the schools and colleges combined have been conservatively estimated at $4 billion a year for the next 10 years, or $40 billion. This is a large but an entirely manageable requirement for a Nation as economically strong as the United States—provided we decide that it is important to meet it.

5. The need for teachers

A far more formidable task than housing tomorrow's students will be providing them with good teachers.

About 1,500,000 new teachers must be recruited over the next 10 years if the present ratio of teachers to pupils in the public schools is to be maintained. This exceeds the total number now in service. It would require about one-third of all the 4-year college graduates expected in the same 10 years. Considerably fewer new college graduates than this can be expected to enter teaching—even under improved conditions. Further, if present trends prevail a substantial proportion of new teachers may be drawn not from the ablest category but from the bottom half of the ability spectrum of college students. Unless standards for teaching are raised—and unless teaching becomes more attractive to young people of high ability—we may wind up with the tragic reality of poorer rather than better education.

There is no mystery about the shortage of good teachers. The "small generation" of the thirties has had to supply teachers for the "large generation" of the forties and fifties. But an even more important factor is the increased market demand for able and well-educated people for all kinds of nonteaching functions in our society. Despite

recent substantial increases in teacher salaries, the schools and colleges suffer a competitive disadvantage against other bidders for top-quality manpower whose purses are stouter.

It should never be forgotten that our educational system is both a consumer and a producer of manpower. The human talents of one generation are required to develop the human talents of the next. If schools and colleges are deprived of their fair share of society's able manpower society will pay a heavy price later on; the effect is cumulative. The United States is today storing up serious trouble for itself. When—as an example—industry takes the lion's share of today's new crop of able young scientists and engineers it cuts down the Nation's capacity to produce an equally good crop later.

The central issue of teacher-supply for the next 10 years is not whether enough people will enter teaching. It is whether enough qualified people will choose teaching against other careers. If we act as if the problem is merely one of numbers our schools and colleges will become mediocrity mills at a moment of history when the pursuit of excellence is imperative.

Obviously the first requirement for improving the supply of good teachers is to improve their compensation. This will help attract them and hold them. Simultaneously the prestige of teaching must be lifted to a high level. Along with higher salaries and prestige must come a large-scale strengthening of the teacher-preparation programs of the colleges and universities.

These approaches will strengthen the supply of able teachers. The problem must be attacked also from the demand side. The number of teachers required is determined not only by the number of students but by the method of teaching. Many of our conventional practices in education are demonstrably obsolete and inefficient. They waste the abilities of teachers and the time of students. It is educationally wasteful, for example, when a good teacher is obliged—as most are—to spend time on clerical, housekeeping, and other duties which could be handled satisfactorily by a less highly trained assistant.

The good teacher should be permitted to concentrate upon those things which only a good teacher can do. A redeployment of teaching staffs on this basis would make teaching more challenging, more productive, and better paid. And by making it possible for able teachers to be more productive we shall need relatively fewer of them to improve the quality of education.

Also promising is the more extensive classroom use of modern means of communication such as motion pictures, television, and sound tapes. Through these instruments it is now possible to give unlimited numbers of students access to the finest teachers and scholars and to provide rich learning experiences—such as scientific demonstrations, re-creations of great historic events, acquaintance with distant lands and peoples—which would be impossible in the ordinary classroom. Along with the imaginative application of these newer educational tools there is need for still more effective use of books and other printed materials from which students can dig out their own educations and make their own contacts with excellence.

6. Financial requirements

The combined expenditures of schools, colleges, and universities in the United States in 1958–59 for current operations and new buildings was nearly $20 billion. It is conservatively estimated that these expenditures, measured in today's prices, must be raised to between $35 and $40 billion by 1970, or nearly doubled. This is a conservative estimate; several estimates are higher.

Such an increase seems large. But it is small by comparison with expected increases in America's gross national product between now and 1970, as projected for Fortune magazine, the Rockefeller panel, and others. (Indeed, a superior educational system can, by virtue of its excellence, increase the gross national product.)

Total educational expenditures in 1958 were equivalent to roughly 4.5 percent of the gross national product. If national output continues to grow at no better than the average annual rate since World War II, educational expenditures of $35 to $40 billion in 1970 would still not exceed 5 percent of the gross national product. The Democratic Advisory Council insists that the United States need not and must not longer tolerate the reduction in growth rate which has characterized the period of the Eisenhower administration. This reduction has brought the postwar average well below where it should be. The Council will issue a separate policy statement on this question.

Measured against any reasonable or likely growth-rate the real problem of education finance is not whether the United States can afford good education. It can. Though members of the Democratic Advisory Council would be willing to see Federal tax rates increased if this were necessary to meet the educational challenge we do not believe this is necessary. The real problem is whether we can agree on what good education is, and on a set of fiscal measures for channeling an adequate share of national income into the support of education.

7. Disentangling the issues

Over the years issues of public policy toward education have become entangled with other important issues in ways which have confused and frustrated constructive action. The most notable example is the issue of racial segregation for which the schools unhappily have become a battleground.

Unequal treatment of races is a profoundly important and deep-rooted problem which affects all aspects of community living. It is not simply or even primarily a problem of the schools. Encouraging progress is being made toward its resolution. Because better education can contribute greatly to this end we should redouble our efforts to strengthen the schools rather than use segregation as an excuse for postponing action.

Federal funds obviously should never be used to impede this progress. Most certainly Federal support for education should never be allowed to slow the carrying out of the 1954 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on segregation. Neither must we condone actions such as those by a group of House Republicans opposed to Federal support for education who in 1956 supported an anti-segregation amendment to the school-construction bill with the ultimate purpose of defeating the bill.

Education and Freedom's Future—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I should like to insert in the RECORD part 2 of "Education and Freedom's Future," a policy statement of the Democratic Advisory Council:

PART 2. FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATION

Does the United States as such have a national stake in education? If so, what should be done about it? Past utterances and debates on these two questions have reflected confusion, inconsistency and detachment from reality.

The critical reality today is that, at minimum, the national interest can be deeply injured by the inadequacies of our educational system wherever these inadequacies occur. A soldier who cannot communicate and compute is a positive menace. During World War II and since, poor education in some States has meant the failure of a high proportion of young men in selective service examinations. This reduces the Nation's total supply of manpower for military service. It also imposes disproportionate draft demands upon States where education is better. These facts are ignored by those who, on grounds of equity, oppose the use of Federal taxes collected in high income States to strengthen educational opportunities in low income States.

The vast migratory streams from rural to urban areas and from one region to another mean that a high proportion of tomorrow's adult citizens in almost every community will have been educated in some other community and some other State. Each year 35 million people—20 percent of all Americans—change their addresses. No State of the Union, rich or poor, can escape the heavy costs of poor education in any other State—or fail to share the benefits of good education.

The importance of good education, universally available, has been an article of faith for Americans for more than a century. When the Soviets borrowed this American idea of universal education they took only that half of it which holds that education is a powerful instrument for building national strength. The more important other half is profoundly subversive to their ideology; it holds that education is the principal means by which every individual in a free society achieves his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Since in our Nation the Federal Government is both the ultimate guarantor of individual rights and the primary instrument for promoting and protecting the national welfare it can no longer be questioned—if ever it could be—that education deeply affects the national interest. Where there is a national interest there is a Federal duty. In the case of education that duty requires the Federal Government to do what others cannot or will not do to insure that every American youngster is given a reasonable opportunity to developed his potentials through education and to insure further that our national educational effort keeps pace with our national needs.

Federal duty in this respect should not be confused with Federal authority. The silence of the Constitution has been taken to mean that authority over education rests with the States, and it has indeed so rested. But the framers of the Constitution never intended to imply by this silence that the Federal Government had no interest or duty concerning education. Their writings and recorded discussions show that education was very much on their minds and that they considered making specific reference to it in the Constitution. But they also had very much on their minds the problem of keeping separate the powers of church and state. Since nearly all education at the time was under the sponsorship or control of church groups the assignment of constitutional authority for education to any level of government, Federal or State, would have raised perplexing issues. All things considered, it seemed best to them that the Constitution

should remain silent about education. This has put the question up afresh to each new generation.

When these considerations are taken into account it seems clear that the emphasis in recent educational debates upon States rights, local autonomy, and the dangers of Federal intervention has served more to confuse than to clarify the issues. But the question of where ultimate control over the content of education shall rest remains vitally important. Many persons of differing political persuasion have expressed deep and honest concern about the dangers of Federal control. We insist that the recognition of a national interest, and the exercise of a Federal duty, are not at all the same thing as the declaration of supreme Federal authority over the content of education. Nor is it valid to assume that an increase in the Federal Government's role in education necessarily reduces the role of State and local government. It has been demonstrated again and again with respect to highways, hospitals, unemployment compensation, public welfare, and other important public activities that initiative by the Federal Government has stimulated State and local governments to exercise their own responsibilities more adequately. Senate testimony on the Murray-Metcalf bill demonstrated that in nearly a decade of experience with Public Laws 815 and 874, which provide support for schools in federally impacted areas, Federal control need not be a consequence of Federal support.

There is no fixed quantum of responsibility and activity to be divided, like pieces of a pie, between the Federal and State governments. The combined responsibilities of governments at all levels, and of private groups as well, expands as the complexity and needs of society expand. This is clearly the case with education.

Some who have opposed Federal support of the public schools in the name of avoiding Federal control in reality oppose it mainly because they are unwilling to pay a price for better education. They proclaim their devotion to the cause of better education but insist that State and local governments can and should achieve it. Yet often the same individuals and groups are later found in the lobbies of State capitals and townhalls vigorously opposing larger education budgets—this time because they threaten to increase some State tax or the local property tax.

If the distinction between interest in principles and interest in pocketbooks can be kept clear our educational debates will be more productive.

Education and Freedom's Future—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I should like to insert in the RECORD part 3 of "Education and Freedom's Future," a policy statement of the Democratic Advisory Council:

PART 3. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improving Federal organization

The Federal Government is poorly organized in the realm of education—even to carry out efficiently its educational responsibilities already enacted into law.

Nowhere in the executive branch, not even in the Office of Education or the Bureau of the Budget, can one obtain a simple check list of the educational programs now being conducted under legislation adopted piecemeal by Congress over the last hundred years. A study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress shows that the Federal Government is presently engaged in more than 300 educational programs, most of them administered by departments and agencies other than the Office of Education.

There is scarcely a semblance of coordination among these programs. Most are designed to meet some specific need such as training of particular types of personnel or the conduct of specialized research. Federally supported fellowships, research grants, and officer training programs, have a marked impact, for better or for worse, upon the schools, the colleges, and the universities. Yet no one is in a position to assess their net impact, or to judge whether the same purposes could be accomplished more effectively or at less cost.

For example: Through a variety of fellowships and research grants administered by a variety of Federal agencies, each with its own particular objectives in mind, the Federal Government is supplying a surprisingly high proportion of the total revenues of some of the higher institutions, including private universities. These programs are having an enormous influence upon the shape and direction of the universities. But what kind of shape? And in what directions? What is their impact on other needed fields of teaching and research, and on the supply of teachers? No one in the Federal Government knows, and no one is responsible for knowing.

Congress is no better informed. The various pieces of legislation authorizing these programs have emerged from various congressional committees, most of them concerned primarily with matters other than education, such as defense, atomic energy, agriculture, health, labor, and foreign affairs. No committee has an overview.

Here is a danger that has not been mentioned in the debates. There has been little complaint of deliberate Federal interference in education despite the substantial and growing Federal role in education ever since President Lincoln signed the first Land Grant College Act. The real danger is that through a piecemeal approach the Federal Government is producing unintended distortions in the national pattern of education while at the same time it fails to provide education the help it really needs.

The experience developed in the past dozen years under the Employment Act of 1946 provides suggestions for a remedy. The Employment Act, after declaring that the Federal Government has a basic interest and responsibility concerning the Nation's economy, established certain goals and procedures to enable the Federal Government to function more intelligently and efficiently. No new powers were given anyone. The President was provided with a Council of Economic Advisers to help him maintain a continuing review of basic economic trends and of the effect of various Federal economic policies. On the basis of this review the President was required to submit an Economic Report to Congress annually. A Joint Committee on the Economic Report was established in Congress to provide a forum for competent discussion of the President's report and of major economic problems and policies.

These arrangements have helped notably to keep the President, the Federal agencies, Congress, business and labor, and the Nation as a whole better informed about the state of the economy, about its strengths and weaknesses, its trends and needs. Public debate about economic policy has been better informed. The formulation of both public and private economic decisions and programs has improved.

A similar set of procedures for education could do enormous good. It need not involve the grant of any new Federal powers. It would keep the White House, the administration, the Congress, State and local governments and the Nation better informed about educational policies and problems including those in adult education.

Annual presidential reports on education could provide a surer basis than any that now exist for detecting strengths and weaknesses, spotting important countrywide new trends, and identifying serious gaps or deficiencies. Considering that one-quarter of the population of the United States is enrolled in our schools and colleges, and that economically the educational system constitutes one of our largest enterprises, our factual knowledge about the system is astonishingly inadequate for purposes of planning and decisionmaking, regardless of where final authority rests. Relative to the need, we have much more adequate information about Dutch elm disease, wheat crops, fish runs, bank balances, horseracing, baseball, and hogs.

The first obligation of the Federal Government is to furnish to the Nation adequate and up-to-date facts about the broad spectrum of our educational system and to put its own house in order with respect to Federal education programs already in existence. Passage of an Education Act of 1960 which would require the President to submit to Congress on Annual Report on Education, prepared with the assistance of a small Council of Education Advisers, on which hearings would be conducted by a Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Education Report, would go far toward meeting this obligation.

2. The National Defense Education Act

The National Defense Education Act passed by Congress in August 1958 is the most significant action by the Federal Government in education since the first Land Grant College Acts in the 1860's. The act does not provide for general support of education. But its 10 separate titles mount specific attacks on a series of critical problems. Through fellowships, grants, and loans, the act seeks, for example, to improve instruction in foreign languages, science and mathematics; to strengthen guidance and counseling in the public schools; to assist needy college students with loans; to expand the supply of college teachers in all fields; and to encourage broader application to instruction of films, television, and other audiovisual aids.

Most educators welcomed this new legislation because it was addressed to problems they know are vital. The funds made available for carrying out the purposes of the act were small measured against the dimensions of the problems being attacked. Moreover, the Office of Education, in its attempts to recruit outstanding people to develop and administer these new programs, was severely handicapped by lack of funds and authorization.

It is probably too early to say from experience what changes are needed. But one amendment should be made immediately. The act requires that any student who borrows money from his college under the loan provisions of the act shall take an oath that he does not belong to a subversive organization. However well intended, this oath is an affront to the college youth of the Nation. It not only singles them out as a special class under suspicion; it is doubly unfair because it furnishes no guide as to whether any particular organization is subversive within the meaning of the law. No such oath is required by farmers, businessmen, home own-

ers, or other groups who receive Federal loans, payments, or financial guarantees. And it is obviously ineffectual. Actual subversives would not hesitate to sign any oath, and every student intelligent enough to be in college knows this full well. Requirements of this sort imposed by the Federal Government upon young people are more likely to foster disrespect for Government than to foster good citizenship. An attempt in 1959 by Senators KENNEDY and CLARK to eliminate the affidavit provision was killed by the Republican Senators, who with few exceptions voted for its retention.

The National Defense Education Act should be supported by appropriations to the full amount authorized by Congress, and the act itself should be restudied to determine if its authorization limits are adequate; the Office of Education should be authorized and given funds to employ topflight people to administer the new programs under the act; and the requirement of an antisubversive oath in connection with student loans should be dropped as being ineffective and undesirable.

3. Federal support for public schools

Today we rely nearly exclusively on State and local tax revenues to finance the public schools. Forty percent of all State and local tax revenues goes to finance education. This reliance has brought our hopes and plans for strengthening the schools face to face with a series of roadblocks. Here are some of them:

1. A high proportion of school costs are borne by real estate and other taxes which fall most heavily on lower income families and which—unlike the progressive income tax—are relatively unresponsive to increases in the national income. An even heavier tax load on real estate is not the answer. Future increases in school costs must be financed largely from increases in the national income. The present pattern of tax support for education is, to put it mildly, unpromising and unsatisfactory.

2. The overall fiscal position of State and local governments has become increasingly strained because of growing demands for many types of public services. The increase in State and local debt since the war has been much larger than the increase in the Federal debt. Since 1946 the indebedness of the States has increased 500 percent and that of local governments by 200 percent while the Federal debt rose by 10 percent. A pattern of resistance to school-construction bonds has been developing, for example in votes in November of 1959 in New York, Pittsburgh, and other centers.

3. Education is at a disadvantage relative to many other public services. If local taxpayers feel that their total tax bill is too high they exert greatest restraint upon increases in local taxes and expenditures. And since a major proportion of local taxes goes for education the public schools tend to be the first and the main victim of taxpayer frustration and resistance.

4. At the State level education is also at a disadvantage. One factor is the policy of the Federal Government to grant to the States matching funds for expenditures on highways, hospitals, and welfare programs. There are no such matching funds for education, and State governments are naturally tempted to spend their limited dollars where they can find matching money. Another factor limiting State expenditures for education is fear that new or higher taxes will result in loss of industry to other States.

Dr. James Conant sees the choice as one between "massive" Federal support by the schools and "drastic" revision of State and local tax systems. His second alternative is so unlikely as to be unreal.

The Democratic Advisory Council believes that the moment has at length come when the Federal Government must provide some significant share of the cost of education. Although it is involved in a miscellany of educational projects the Federal Government today pays less than 4 percent of the Nation's school bill. The main financial responsibility—and certainly the control of the curriculum—must remain with State and local governments. But the Federal Government must now share the burden. This is not a question of sacrifice. It is a proposal for investing public funds in the Nation's future.

The simplest, most efficient, most equitable, and safest way for the Federal Government to support public education is by annual grants to the States, on a per pupil basis, with no strings attached except that such funds should be used for public elementary and secondary education, what is "public" to be defined by the States. State and local governments would be free to use these funds to meet their highest priority school needs. In some cases it might be new construction. In other cases it might be teachers' salaries, stronger guidance programs, or better educational materials.

Safeguards such a matching funds should perhaps be established to insure the Federal funds are not used as a substitute for educational expenditures already being made by State and local governments. This is not likely to be a serious danger so long as States and localities continue to provide the preponderant share of school costs and so long as these costs continue to rise.

The case for Federal support of public education, on grounds of national interest and of the superior fiscal powers of the Federal Government, is compelling in every State. There is a further case for additional Federal support to those States whose internal means to finance adequate educational opportunity are strikingly below the national average. These States by and large are devoting a proportionately greater financial effort to education than the highest income States. The fact that our wealthiest States have three times the per capita income of our poorest States should not be perimitted to impose an inferior education upon the boys and girls who happen to live in the poorer States. Therefore a program of Federal support should aim also toward the equalization of educational opportunity for all young Americans.

A Federal support program should be started at a modest level. After procedures are worked out and experience has been gained the level of support should be stepped up over a period of years. The schedule should if possible be predetermined so that State and local governments can plan their own budgets and taxes accordingly.

It is recommended that a basic Federal support program be established whereby each State would receive $25 a year in the first period for each resident child of school age; $50 a year in the second period; $75 a year in the third period, and $100 a year in the fourth period and each year thereafter. Supplemental support should be provided to those States in which per capita income is significantly below the national average. All such funds would be distributed by the State governments for the support of public education in a manner to be determined by each State.

4. Federal-State cooperative scholarships

Each year tens of thousands of able and deserving young people are prevented from going to college—or from attending the college or university best suited to their abilities—because they cannot afford it. They are thus deprived of educational opportunity. And the Nation is thus deprived of educated manpower.

The loan program under the National Defense Education Act allows many to borrow for a college education. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has introduced a bill to make $100 million of Federal guarantees available for student loans. State governments and colleges are providing increased resources for college loans.

These programs help democratize college education. By stretching the financing over many years they can enroll many who otherwise would not attend. They help make higher education competitive with other goods and services available through credit financing. The average American family is indebted more than $3,000 for housing, automobiles and other durable goods. The average student is in debt less than $30. Rather than the $100 million per year currently available for student loans we should have $500 to $1,000 million.

Several State governments recently have taken steps to assist able and needy young people by establishing competitive scholarship programs at State expense. These scholarships can be used at either private or public institutions, thus giving the student maximum choice and spreading increased enrollments over a large number of institutions.

There is considerable merit in administration of scholarship programs by States, as against a nationwide federally administered program, particularly if a scholarship winner is free to choose a college in any State. And it is reasonable that the Federal Government should assist the State governments in financing such scholarship programs because of the national benefits and obligations involved.

It is recommended, therefore, that a Federal-State cooperative scholarship program be established to provide for the award of 25,000 scholarships a year in the first period rising to 100,000 a year by the fourth period, to students of outstanding ability selected by an appropriate agency or commission in each State, with half the costs borne by the Federal Government and the other half by the State. These scholarships would cover a period of up to 4 years if the recipient maintained a satisfactory academic record; they could be used in any approved institution of the student's choice in the United States and where desirable in a foreign country; the amount would be adjusted to the individual's financial needs, but would not exceed $1,000 per year.

Our goal is that no qualified boy or girl be denied an education for purely financial reasons.

5. Expansion of colleges and universities

Within the next 10 years the colleges and universities of the United States will be called upon to accommodate about twice as many students as now. If they are to achieve this objective, maintain and improve their quality at the same time, they will require help from every available source, public and private.

The expansion plans of many colleges and universities are being blocked by lack of capital funds to finance new facilities and improve old ones. The college housing program of the Federal Government, under which institutions can borrow to build self-financing buildings—mainly dormitories and dining halls—has been helpful to many colleges and universities. President Eisenhower in his budget message last year proposed phasing out this program. Far from being killed, the program needs to be expanded, as the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School urged. Since the most important buildings on a college campus are those designed primarily for teaching and learning, the College Housing Act should be amended to permit loans for academis structures such as classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and faculty offices, at the present low-interest formula. These are the structures most needed by the scores of community colleges that have been created in recent decades.

A broadening of the Federal loan program for college construction will be helpful but not enough. In the years ahead colleges and universities will need to put all of the resources they can into faculties, books, and other essentials to quality instruction. Too

heavy a commitment of future income to paying off capital loans will jeopardize quality.

These considerations led the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School to recommend, nearly 2 years ago, that the Federal Government establish a matching grant program for college and university construction comparable to the Hill-Burton hospital grants program which has worked so well.

To help the colleges and universities secure the physical facilities and equipment to handle greatly expanded enrollments the college housing loan program should be expanded to include all types of college structures needed for housing or instructing students, and a new program should be established under which matching grants would be made to colleges and universities for improving existing structures and building new ones. Consideration should also be given to providing Federal insurance of capital loans to colleges and universities by private lenders, comparable to FHA mortgage loan insurance.

These five recommendations are designed to strengthen the system of formal education. It is also important and urgent to strengthen the Nation's opportunities for adult education, and for civic education. These become more necessary as the pace of social change grows ever swifter. Intelligent use for these purposes of the great new medium of television—misuse of which was so dramatically revealed in 1959—is one of the Nation's great undeveloped resources.

The total cost of the five recommendations affecting formal education is substantial—as indeed it should be. In its first stage this program would require perhaps $1 billion a year in Federal support; in its fourth stage $3 to $4 billions. But these costs are small in comparison with the financial commitments of the Federal Government for highways, defense and many other public purposes. They are small especially in comparison with the enormous growth of our national economy and with the contribution that better education will make to national growth.

No one can question that dollar cost is important. But far more important to the health and survival of our free society is the fullest possible development of every individual. This is the goal toward which we as a Nation have aimed from the very beginning. It is this goal that gave our Nation birth. It is this for which our fathers and sons fought and died through generations. And this is the goal which distinguishes democracy from tyranny.

Whatever progress we may make in new weapons and new ways to deliver them, education remains our ultimate weapon in the unending battle against human misery and strife, in the quest for realization of mankind's ageless dream of peace and progress. There is no greater claim upon statesmen—no greater claim upon every citizen—than the improvement of educational opportunity. Here, ultimately, we must place our trust.

Hon. Russell V. Mack

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with our deceased colleague, Congressman RUSSELL MACK, for the last 6 years on the Public Works Committee, particularly with regard to his being the ranking minority member on the Flood Control Subcommittee. I had the pleasure of working closely with him and knowing firsthand of his dedication to his job as a Member of Congress. He spent many tireless hours toiling for the people of his district, and was one of the best authorities on flood-control matters as well as many other problems before the Public Works Committee and Congress. He was a dedicated public servant, and gave tirelessly of his time and energies, and, typical of that, is the fact that he should spend his last breath in carrying out his congressional duties on the floor of the House.

I remember well the tremendous contribution he made on the floor of the House on many occasions toward better legislation and toward serving all the people. He was a fighter for his point of view, and demonstrated this many times in recent years on the omnibus public works bills, during debate of which he took a most active part.

I also had the privilege of serving under him in the Republican whip organization as the assistant regional whip, he being in charge of the western and southern division, and I can attest to his efforts spent in that important duty. His knowledge, his forthrightness, his ability, will be impossible to replace and the people of the State of Washington and the people of America have lost a great public servant. I have lost a very dear friend, upon whose judgment, and with acknowledgment of his ability, I have on many occasions relied very heavily, and I join in expressions of bereavement to his wife and family.

Georgia Postal Employees Support H.R. 9488

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the Georgia Branch, National Transport Association, at a recent meeting:

Whereas airmail facilities are seldom, if at all, located near railroad stations, which is not conducive to speedy transfer, in case space is not available, or the weather does not permit flying, thus contributing to the loss of transit time of 1 to 3 days; and

Whereas the general feeling of persons using the mails is that they prefer a dependable, all-weather service in the regular manner, not subject to the above-described delays; and

Whereas the airlift mail is thus subject to the whims of space availability and weather conditions; and

Whereas the railroads are, and must be at all times, ready to take over the transportation of airmails and airlift mails, delayed by weather or the unavailability of space; and

Whereas airmail facilities are avalable for those who wish to pay a premium price for faster service, which gives them preferential treatment, as paid for; and

Whereas the airlines are now subsidized to a considerable extent, at the expense of all taxpayers, though seemingly under the rate of compensation jurisdiction of the CAA, the costs are still chargeable to the Post Office Department; and

Whereas the bulk of airlift mails will, in all likelihood, be flown to outer distribution centers, for return by train or truck, a probable source of further delay and expense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, with due consideration of, and justice to the taxpaying public, together with the concomitant confusion and loss of morale among thousands of mobile postal transportation employees, That further expansion of the airlift of 4-cent postage (surface) first-class mails be prohibited by specific act (H.R. 9488) of Congress, at the current session.

Good Advice—Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us realize the importance of mail as a major means of keeping in touch with the people we represent back home. Certainly the more we hear from our constituents the better able we are to represent them and their interests here in Washington. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of March 28, 1960, which expresses this idea more appropriately and succinctly than I know I could do. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

DON'T GRIPE—WRITE

Your spokesmen in Washington are the two Senators from this State and the Representative from the 32d Congressional District. In Albany they are your State senator and assemblyman.

This is true whether they represent the political party to which you belong or an opposing party. Once they have been elected to public office they represent all the people.

But they cannot be expected to do a good job for you unless they understand your views and you, in turn, understand their problems. They need and want the opinions of all their constituents.

It must be remembered that a public official's first obligation is to his constituents. Their views are always given first place in his thoughts. Accurate and useful information sent by voters in his district is always appreciated. When he hears from "back home" it shows him the people know he is alive and are interested in what he is doing.

Until we realize our representatives welcome our views and we take the trouble to make them known, our relations in Washington and Albany will not be what they could be—or ought to be.

Remember, too, you don't have to wait until you have a complaint to register. Our elected officials are human, too, and a pat on the back is appreciated by them as it is by you. The important thing is: Don't gripe—write.

Questionnaire to the People of the 17th District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I recently circulated a questionnaire among the constituents it is my honor to represent in the 17th Ohio District and I want to say that I am extremely gratified by the response received from people in all walks of life. It is indeed reassuring to learn that so many of our people in the midst of the daily routine of making a living are willing to take whatever time is necessary to think and write about the important public issues of the day. This kind of citizenship responsibility at the local level assures continuance of vigorous representative government.

I was especially impressed with the fact that most people not only answered the specific questions asked, but in addition, made their views known on many other matters, such as disarmament, food additives, TV programing, high taxes, high interest, tight money, and inflation.

It is apparent from tabulating the returns of a typical cross section of central Ohio that the subject uppermost in the minds of the people is waste, extravagance in all departments of Government, and particularly in the foreign aid program. The items most frequently mentioned were the interservice rivalry in the Defense Department, the high cost of storing surplus farm commodities, and the losses involved in procurement and disposal of defense equipment.

The tabulation in percentages follow:

1. Do you favor an acceleration of our defense effort in such fields as long-range ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, and the satellite program? Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

2. Would you favor an increase in taxes to meet any added expenditures for the defense program? Yes, 33 percent; no, 61 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

3. The President, in his recent budget message, proposed appropriations of $4.2 billion for our foreign aid program. Do you favor the appropriation of the entire sum? Yes, 19 percent; no, 61 percent; no opinion, 20 percent.

4. The President, in his budget message, indicated a surplus of about $4 billion for fiscal 1961. This comes about chiefly through an increase in revenue rather than from a reduction in services. In which way would you favor our arriving at a surplus? Present taxes with some increases, 9 percent; reduction of spending, 86 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

5. Do you favor Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools? Yes, 34 percent; no, 57 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

6. Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include medical expenses, the financing to be shared by the employers and employees? Yes, 39 percent; no, 54 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

7. Do you favor lifting the restriction of $1,200 on what a retired person may earn and still collect his social security payments? Yes, 66 percent; no, 31 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

8. What kind of program should Congress adopt to solve the farm problem?

(a) Institute farmers self-help plan whereby bona fide farmers would be given greater freedom to develop a program of their own liking with provisions against Government buying and storing commodities. Yes, 58 percent; no, 10 percent; no opinion, 32 percent.

(b) Enlarge the soil bank program by paying farmers to take approximately 60 million acres out of production at an estimated cost of $1.5 billion. Yes, 15 percent; no, 52 percent; no opinion, 33 percent.

(c) Free farmers of all controls allowing them to plant as much as they wish to plant of any crop on any land; and, do away with all price supports and other subsidies to farmers. Yes, 53 percent; no, 20 percent; no opinion, 27 percent.

9. Are you in favor of stronger civil rights legislation? Yes, 45 percent; no, 20 percent; no opinion, 35 percent.

10. Do you favor an increase in the Federal gas tax to meet the additional cost of the Federal highway construction program? Yes, 26 percent; no, 59 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

11. Do you favor the establishment of a youth conservation corps as one means whereby we can combat juvenile delinquency? Yes, 48 percent; no, 34 percent; no opinion, 18 percent.

Depressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the policies of government are sometimes most difficult of interpretation. Without challenging the basic philosophy of foreign aid at this time, I cannot understand how or why the application of this beneficence should under any circumstances supersede consideration for our own people. America stands ready to provide the funds for a powerplant in the Middle East, a highway in South America, a steel mill in Europe, or a railroad in Asia, yet there is no response when representatives of seriously depressed regions of the United States ask for a medium of stimulating the economy of these areas.

Several millions of Americans may be unemployed, yet the United States will go on and on bestowing cash so that foreign nations may purchase—wherever in the world they may chose—automobiles, generators and other electrical apparatus, machine tools, coal, petroleum products, glass, aluminum products, chemicals, textile products, mining equipment, paper products, leather goods, and a myriad of other items that may be in surplus awaiting purchase here at home. When one of our many charity agencies exhausts its annual allowance, a loan office of convenience will be established to assure continuance of the flow of dollars abroad.

For years we have had pockets of heavy surplus labor in Pennsylvania and a number of other States, but getting a very small percentage of the sum lavished on foreign countries to provide employment for these unfortunate Americans is perennially denied us.

Mr. Speaker, is it asking too much of the Democratic leadership in the House to permit us the opportunity to vote on a depressed area bill? We have waited patiently in line while our foreign friends march by and have the cash ladled out to them. Should not Americans be given just one turn through the turnstile? Our people are not looking for handouts, but just a chance to get back to earning a living.

Dakota Territory Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, next year, 1961, marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Dakota Territory.

South Dakota and other States comprising the original Dakota Territory will be commemorating this centennial year.

Believing that a matter of such historical importance should be recognized by the U.S. Government, I am today introducing a resolution calling upon the President to designate 1961 as the Year of the Dakota Territory Centennial.

The text of my resolution is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 653

Whereas the year 1961 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment by President Lincoln of the Dakota Territory of the United States of America, comprising the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and Minnesota; and

Whereas recognition of the Territorial government in 1861 was one of the most significant milestones in America's history in that it symbolized the new and greater strength of the pioneers who settled in this area and signaled the beginning of a century which was to be one of continuous and rapid progress; and

Whereas the centennial will commemorate the history these early settlers lived and recorded, along with the progress of the people and the communities since that early beginning; and

Whereas this anniversary is to be commemorated with ceremonies, celebrations, and festivals in the State of South Dakota and other territorial States; and

Whereas all of the people of the United States should be given an opportunity in educational, religious, business, agricultural, labor, and governmental units to participate in this historic observance; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating 1961 as the Year of the Dakota Territory Centennial and calling upon all citizens to

join in commemorating the early pioneers who came by covered wagon to develop this area that now holds a position of greatness in our Nation.

Patty Ellis Tells: Why I Love My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the White House Conference on Youth has just ended. I am hopeful that from this major meeting will come the actions which will enable our Nation to meet today's problems with the vision of tomorrow.

It is a pleasure at this time to call to the attention of this body an essay by Miss Patty Ellis. Miss Ellis is an eighth-grade student in Langlois School, in my district. Her beliefs, incorporated into her essay, "Why I Love My Country," are well defined. They are a credit to her, her family, and her teachers.

Her article as reprinted in the March 24, 1960, edition of the Port Orford News follows, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

WHY I LOVE MY COUNTRY

(By Patty Ellis, Langlois eighth-grade student)

In this land of America that I call home, I have more freedom than any other people in the world. I have mentioned this first because I feel that freedom is the most important one thing that any individual in the world can possess. This freedom that we have is guaranteed by the Constitution of my country and cannot be taken away from me or any other person, if I respect the rights of others.

I have the right to worship God as my conscience may direct me and in doing so I need not fear any man. I have the right to say what I may choose, as long as I do not bear false witness against my neighbor. I have the right to meet with others and discuss the problems of my America without fear of being molested by those who do not agree with me.

I love my country, because it is respected by the other nations of the world. We are looked upon as the foundation of the democratic way of government. This democratic system gives each and everyone the same privilege to advance as far as the individual may desire. It is this form of self-government that has made my country great.

I know that many people of the world are far less fortunate than I and do not have these rights of freedom. I know that in the years that lie ahead I will be able in some way to help them realize a small part of this freedom I enjoy.

I love my America, too, because it is the land of plenty. There are few who are hungry or in need of food. Many people of the world do not know the satisfaction of knowing that they will have another good meal.

My country is a beautiful land of forests, lakes, mountains and plains. Large rivers flow through almost every State bringing an abundance of water to the farms and homes of its people. These rivers also furnish electric power to the huge factories that produce the many things that help to make life much easier in our homes.

The plains feed the large herds of cattle that go to the markets to soon be on the table of the families of my country. From the forests come the many wood products that make modern homes that we live in and the offices and the factories in which our people work. The lakes and mountains furnish wonderful opportunities for recreation and relaxation and are open to all people whether rich or poor.

I love this country of mine because it is home and I wish that every person on earth could enjoy the blessings that I have of freedom of speech and worship, and the privilege of choosing what I may desire to be or make of myself. In doing this I have the right to obtain as much education as I wish. Education is the foundation for a people who rule themselves in our democratic manner.

This is my America, the land of the free.

Nobel Physicist Comments on Sharing of Atomic Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Owen Chamberlain, of the physics department at the University of California, in Berkeley, recipient of the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1959 and a distinguished resident of the Seventh California Congressional District, recently wrote to the President with reference to the President's proposal to share atomic weapons with our allies.

On February 3, 1960, the President, at his press conference of that date, was asked his thoughts on changing the law so that the United States can provide allies with custody of weapons that Russia has or knows how to make. He replied:

Well, from the very beginning, from what I know about allied cooperation, and so on, I have always been of the belief that we should not deny to our allies what the enemies, what your potential enemy already has. We do want allies to be treated as partners and allies, and not as junior members of a firm who are to be seen but not heard.

Under permission to extend remarks, I submit for the RECORD, Professor Chamberlain's brief letter referring to this proposal, so that all Members may be advised of the views of this distinguished scientist.

The letter is as follows:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am strongly against your proposal of February 3 that we share our atomic weapons with our allies.

I believe that if we shared atomic weapons we would then have to make satellites out of our allies.

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CHAMBERLAIN,
Professor of Physics.

Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse favorable action by the House by which the appropriation for aid to schools in federally impacted areas has been continued.

My position on Federal doles or gifts to the schools of our Nation to help them educate our children has been consistent throughout my terms in the Congress. I am firmly opposed to such aid. At first glance, it may seem, then, that my equally consistent stand in favor of full appropriations for the aid to federally affected areas progams is contradictory to my overall position on general Federal aid to education. I do not believe that it is. The federally affected areas programs have been incorrectly labeled "aid," "assistance," "grants"—connoting beneficence, good will, and charity on the part of the Federal Government toward these particular communities. If this were true, I would oppose the programs vigorously. But it is not true, as I propose to show.

The payments under these two programs are merely assumption by the Federal Government of its just responsibility to those communities in which it operates. The reason for this responsibility is twofold. First of all, the presence of Federal Government operations within a community tends to swell the public school enrollments in the community to a marked extent, thereby necessitating the construction of new facilities, as well as an increase in operation and maintenance costs. But the second side of the responsibility is yet more significant. Property owned by the Federal Government cannot be taxed. This means that at the same time that these activities of the Federal Government are adding enormously to the expense of operating the public school system, they are subtracting from the tax base upon which the school district can draw. When a private business moves into a community, it may produce a great swelling in school enrollment, but at the same time it swells the tax base.

Secretary Flemming, in his testimony last summer before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, repeatedly and rightly labeled this assistance as "payments in lieu of taxes." In speaking on behalf of the President's proposals to cut payments under these two laws, Secretary Flemming described

the philosophy behind these programs as follows:

I believe that the Federal Government should provide assistance to those school districts whose school revenues are impaired by reason of the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

I also believe that this assistance on the part of the Federal Government should be reasonably related to the school revenues actually lost by school districts by reason of the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

Since we are agreed that the payments under these programs are "payments in lieu of taxes," then it would seem logical, when debating the amount of appropriation, to consider just exactly how much is lost in taxes due to the presence of tax-exempt Federal property, and compare that to the amount received under these programs. If these payments really exceed the tax loss, then we must agree with Secretary Flemming and the President that the programs should be cut.

Last summer figures were compiled in my constituency, the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, to illustrate the impact of Federal Government activities on the operation of the public schools in the northern Virginia communities of Arlington County, Fairfax County, Alexandria, and Falls Church. It was estimated that almost $12 million would be added to local tax revenue if the federally owned land were privately owned. In these northern Virginia communities a very high proportion of local tax revenue is channeled into the public school systems. It therefore seems most apparent that the amounts these school districts would receive if this property were privately owned would be considerably in excess of the $4,138,255.28 now received each year under Public Law 874. Furthermore, almost $94 million has been spent in these communities since World War II on school construction. Unquestionably the primary cause of the vast increase in enrollment that necessitated this plant expansion was increased Federal Government activity. Yet the Federal Government payments under Public Law 815 have been only $17 million or 23.7 percent of the construction costs.

It seems obvious, then, that these communities are being underpayed rather than overpayed. It is hard for me to understand why Secretary Flemming, after so well describing the Federal responsibility to these communities, is recommending an appropriation that would cover only 68 percent of the entitlements under Public Law 874 and only 70 percent of the entitlements under Public Law 815 for fiscal year 1961. I hold that this is both illogical and unjust.

The people in my district have done an extraordinarily fine job of helping their school systems cope with the 338-percent increase in enrollment over the last 13 years. So large is the Federal impact on the area that 51 percent of the pupils in our public schools are federally connected, and payments under Public Law 874 comprise 11.8 percent of the school budgets. If the Federal payments were cut as drastically as Secretary Flemming recommends, the impact on our school districts would be disastrous.

Secretary Flemming has stated that the Federal Government has a responsibility to compensate "those school districts whose school revenues are impaired by reason of the tax-exempt status of Federal property." I agree with him completely. And I do not see how a reduction in the appropriation for these programs now or in the future can mean anything but a shirking of that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the payments under Public Laws 815 and 874 are not Government doles or gifts, but rather are "payments in lieu of taxes." It seems only just that we continue to appropriate the full amount authorized in these laws, thereby enabling the Federal Government to more adequately carry out and fulfill its responsibility to those communities in which it operates.

Penalty for Speaking Out on Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New Orleans Times Picayune for October 15, 1959:

PENALTY FOR SPEAKING OUT ON LEGISLATION?

The Internal Revenue Service says the money spent by business firms or various organizations to promote or defeat legislation or for political campaigns, is not a legitimate business expense and therefore it should be taxable. It also holds that the dues, membership fees, etc. paid to trade, labor or civic organizations should not be "deductible" if a "substantial" part of these dues are paid to lobby, influence legislation or do political campaigning.

The revenue service has proposed a "rule" to this effect and will hold hearings on it soon.

When business people or organizations support or oppose legislation, they usually do so because the legislation would affect the business of their members. In that case we don't see why the money so spent is not a legitimate business expense. It is hard to think of any expenses more necessary to a firm than money spent to fight a bill that might destroy the business. Government agencies spend public money to do their lobbying.

When the revenue service says members can't deduct their dues to trade associations, labor union, chambers of commerce, etc. if these organizations devote a substantial part of their activities to influencing legislation or campaigns, what is meant by "substantial"? Apparently it would be whatever some bureau officials said it was.

Of course many business groups and other organizations will oppose this apparently unfair rule. The revenue service may have in mind instances of excessive or improper expenditures to influence legislation or political campaigns. But if so it ought to make its rule to cover what seems to be illegitimate and not penalize what organizations and groups have a right to do or an obligation to do.

The Navy's Pioneer Aviation Camp at Annapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently an account of the Pioneers of Naval Aviation was brought to my attention. This article, by Miss Ruby R. Duval, entitled "The Navy's Pioneer Aviation Camp at Annapolis," first appeared in the May 1959 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association. It is a valuable contribution to the history of this branch of the naval service, and it is a tribute to the fearless pioneers who established naval aviation. The article follows:

THE NAVY'S PIONEER AVIATION CAMP AT ANNAPOLIS

Fifty-one years ago, the U.S. Navy first investigated the possible advantages of aviation for naval usage; and 2 years later Capt. Washington Irving Chambers, U.S. Navy, received orders directing him to attend certain aviation meets as an official observer. He had already envisioned the practicability and value of airplanes in naval warfare and—after attending meets at Belmont Park, N.Y., and Halethorpe, Md.—he tried to interest the Wright brothers in arranging for a demonstration flight from the deck of a naval vessel. When the Wrights declined, the Curtiss Co. was consulted and they agreed to make the attempt.

Necessary arrangements for the flight were made, and on 14 November 1910 a Curtiss representative successfully flew a landplane from a platform erected on the bow of the U.S.S. *Birmingham* as the ship got underway just off Old Point Comfort, Va. Captain Chambers was enthusiastic in his appraisal of the feat, but the Navy Department was reluctant to seek an appropriation of funds for the development of naval aviation. However, when Glenn H. Curtiss of the Curtiss Company offered to instruct several naval officers in the art of flying "free of charge," his offer was accepted and Lt. Theodore Gordon Ellyson, U.S. Navy, was ordered to the Curtiss Camp at San Diego, Calif., in December 1910. Successful experiments followed and, after the perfection of a hydro-airplane attachment which is credited to Ellyson and Curtiss, many naval officers were volunteering for flight training. Lieutenant Elyyson had qualified and was recognized as naval aviator No. 1.

The first appropriation of $25,000 earmarked for naval aviation was included in the Navy Appropriations Allotment for 1911–1912, and Captain Chambers was ordered to the Bureau of Navigation with instruction to devote his efforts to aviation and the coordination of the aeronautical work of the various bureaus of the Navy Department. Lt. John Rodgers, Lt. John H. Towers, and Ens. Victor D. Herbster were detailed for flight training early in 1911. Rodgers and Herbster received instruction at the Wright Brothers camp in Dayton, Ohio, and Towers took his flight training at the Curtiss Camp at Hammondsport, N.Y.

The U.S. Navy soon had three more licensed pilots. Lieutenant Rodgers, Lieutenant Towers, and Ensign Herbster qualified, and they were designated as Naval Aviators Nos. 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Two Curtiss

planes and one Wright plane were purchased and, in the summer of 1911, the first naval aviation unit was organized as an aviation camp on U.S. Government property. This was located at Greenbury Point, opposite Annapolis where the Severn River meets the Chesapeake Bay.

Weather conditions in this locale, however, prompted recommendation that the pioneer camp be moved to San Diego, Calif., for the winter months—and the transfer was made.

Early in the summer of 1912, the first naval aviation unit was brought back to Annapolis. Hangers were set up on the north shore of the Severn River, near the Naval Engineering Experiment Station, which was by far preferable to the Greenbury Point site. Lt. John H. Towers, Naval Aviator No. 3, was put in charge of the camp, and had the able assistance of Ensign Herbster, Naval Aviator No. 4.

More pilots were needed; the enthusiasm of those who had qualified was rapidly filtering throught the fleet, and more officers were clamoring for flight instruction and training. The Marine Corps expressed keen interest and two of their officers, 1st Lt. Alfred A. Cunningham and 2d Lt. Bernard L. Smith, were ordered to annapolis for duty at the aviation camp. Ens. Godfrey de C. Chevalier, U.S. Navy, joined the group that summer and the three novices, Cunningham, Smith, and Chevalier, wone their coveted licenses as Naval Aviators Nos. 5, 6, and 7 in the order named. Two of the pioneers, Lieutenants Ellyson and Rodgers, had been detached.

In the late fall of 1912 Lt. (jg) Patrick N. L. Bellinger and Ens. William Devotie Billingsley reported for flight training at the camp on the Severn. It is of interest to recall an incident in relation to their assignments, for while Ensign Billingsley had anticipated orders to the Naval Academy and the Department of Ordnance and Gunnery for his first shore duty, he had not requested aviation duty. Lieutenant Bellinger had officially requested aviation instruction there; but, through some misinterpretation in the office of the Detail Officer in the Bureau of Navigation, Billingsley received orders for flight gation to personally inquire about his regard to his request. It was only after Lieutenant Bellinger visited the Bureau of Navigation to personally, inquire about his request that he learned what had happened. The Detail Officer was ready to make amends and promptly asked Billingsley whether he would like aviation at Annapolis. The reply was "yes." Lieutenant Bellinger also got his orders to the camp on the Severn and both officers were happy.

From the inception of the naval unit dedicated to the theory and practice of aviation these pioneers collaborated with the aircraft industry and thus kept in touch with rapidly developing phases of aeronautical technology. Their sponsor and mentor, Captain Chambers, although not a flier himself, was enthusiastic about the advantages adaptable to the naval service.

The seven officers, including Lieutenant Towers, who made up this distinguished group seemed to be a happy family who were learning much through practical experience. A corps of mechanicians attached to the camp had been selected from the enlisted men in the Navy, and each man evinced pride in his assignment.

Even though officers and men exercised the greatest care at all times, there were some accidents and trying experiences. The hangars were rather flimsy, and on more than one occasion high winds damaged the planes. Motor truble was another problem which was perplexing and ofttimes upset plans for flights, but the ingenuity of the pilots and mechanicians usually "saved the day."

While the officers on duty at the pioneer aviation camp were under the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, they understood that the Superintendent, Capt. John H. Gibbons, took no interest in them officially. In fact Vice Adm. Patrick N. L. Bellinger, U.S. Navy, retired—the only surviving member of the nine pioneers—recalls that no one, with the exception of Captain Chambers in Washington, seemed to take any particular interest in them and what they were doing for the naval service. Socially, however, these young officers were in demand at the Naval Academy, and were never at a loss for invitations to dinners, teas, and the then popular Sunday breakfasts.

Captain Chambers, in an article in the "Naval Institute Proceedings" of December 1912, referred to his proteges as follows:

"There is no risk that these zealous aviators will not cheerfully undertake in the interest of adapting the art of aviation to naval purposes. Work has progressed so far without serious accident although it has been arduous, dangerous, and replete with temptations for the aviators to rival many of the sensational performances that have resulted disastrously to contemporary pioneers in civil aviation."

Early in January 1913 the aviation camp was transferred to Guantanamo for operation with the Atlantic Fleet on winter maneuvers. The group, commanded by Lieutenant Towers, was subject to orders from the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, and opportunity was afforded for practical tests of the employment of airplanes in cooperation with ships. The usefulness of planes as scouts in spotting the approach of distant vessels, and in detecting mine fields and submarines, was soon recognized.

Ensign Billingsley's description of routine at the Guantanamo camp in mid-January is of interest to our naval aviators of today:

"The camp here is situated on a nice beach on the bay and its location is almost ideal. * * * We are early to bed and early risers. We get up at 5:30 in the morning and get all of the flying in before breakfast which is at 8:45. After this time there is too much wind for flying. * * * The latter part of the forenoons and the afternoons are spent in overhauling and dolling up our machines."

Later that month he wrote of moonlight flights the aviators were making and he explained that they were for pleasure and not because of insufficient flying weather during the day. It is understood that the U.S. Navy's first night flight was made by Ensigns Herbster and Billingsley.

Some of the difficulties encountered by the pioneers of 1913 are revealed in Ensign Billingsley's letter of February 14:

"* * * I wanted to make my first flight alone before writing to you today, but we are having quite a bit of motor trouble. Our machine (the Wright plane) is out of commission about two-thirds of the time; and as a result, I have not yet qualified to take a machine up alone. We need a new motor and we understand it was due here the first of this month. Now we hear it will not get here before March. * * * I am out of luck for much flying before then. With a good motor I can qualify to fly alone in 2 or 3 days.

"With 2 hours of sure flying weather a day the camp gets in quite a bit of flying. We made 134 flights last week. That is the whole camp, you understand, not I."

The new motor finally arrived, and on March 5, 1913 he received his orders confirming his qualifications as Naval Aviator No. 9. A few days later he wrote of the satisfaction and fascination of being a full-fledged pilot, and explained that flying had become very popular with the officers of the Atlantic Fleet. He said there were groups of visiting officers at camp early every morning awaiting rides in the aircraft. The aviators were accommodating as many as possible.

While the aviation camp was at Guantanamo for winter training, Leslie's Illustration Weekly sent their columnist and photographer, Mrs. C. R. Miller, to get a timely story for the publication. A few excerpts from her article are of historic interest:

"My first view of the aviation camp at Guantanamo was early one morning, about 7 o'clock. I had come from Caimanera in a motorboat, and as I landed, a Curtis hydroplane shot out from the beach and skimmed along the water. Lieutenant Bellinger was going for altitude and rose higher and higher to a height of perhaps 2,500 feet. Then he began to descend and a few minutes later I was talking with him on the beach. * * * Ensign Herbster was gliding over one of the battleships with Ensign Billingsley in a Wright hydroplane and after a number of turns and twists in the air a landing was made in front of his hangar.

"Lieutenant Cunningham, who was giving one of the naval officers a ride, was the next to land. Then came Lieutenant Smith from Caimanera whither he had taken the steward. * * * All this time Lieutenant Towers and Ensign Chevalier were flying about in a Curtiss boat. At last they landed and I was able to get a good look at the queer looking air and water craft.

"I pictured a number of flights as the aircraft darted about over and alongside the battleships like so many gulls. Then I returned to camp and we began to talk about photography from a flying machine and just what could be done along these lines. * * * Ensign Herbster suddenly looked up at me and said: "Would you like to go up and try picture making?'

" 'Delighted,' I answered * * * and soon we are off. I made two exposures over Fisherman's Point showing the aviation camp. Then we rose higher and, it seemed, hovered over the battleship *Connecticut* as it was coaling from the big collier *Cyclops*."

The aviation camp returned to Annapolis early in April 1913, and the hangars were again set up on the north shore of the Severn River. Routine flights and the establishment of new records in altitude, mileage covered in endurance tests, and stability in the air were winning nationwide acclaim; and Josephus Daniels, who had joined President Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet as Secretary of the Navy the previous month, took a personal interest in the endeavors and accomplishments of the able pioneers. Secretary Daniels visited the camp on several occasions and, in the late spring, enjoyed a ride with one of the officers.

A Baltimore newspaper, the American, reported on May 1, 1913, a successful flight by naval aviators in three machines from Annapolis to Baltimore and return without touching the water at any time and without the slightest mishap. The men named were Ens. Victor D. Herbster with Ens. William D. Billingsley, and Lt. B. L. Smith, USMC, with Mechanician Pullin—both of whom operated Curtiss hydroaeroplanes. Also Lt. P. N. L. Bellinger with Mechanician Boyden, in a Wright earoplane with hydro attachments. The news item stated that the start from Annapolis was made at 3:05 p.m. and that arrival after the trip was at 4:27. The machines followed the water route—rounding Greenbury Point at the entrance of Annapolis harbor and headed up the Chesapeake to the mouth of the Patapsco River which they followed to Baltimore. "After several spiral flights without touching the water, the machines started at once for Annapolis * * * and it is considered that the performance of the three machines and their corps of aviators was a notable indication of the standard of reliability which has been reached by the naval birdmen," commented the newspaper. An altitude of from 2,000 to 3,000 feet was maintained during the flight. The account further explained that the appearance of the three

planes in the air aroused great interest and that many persons lined the shores of the Patapsco enjoying the sight. It concluded as follows: "The spiral flights and other figures cut in midair by the aviators were rewarded with applause from the spectators."

The statement of figures cut in midair brings to mind one of the commanding officer's firm directives—that the aviators avoid unnecessary acrobatics. It was said that Ensign Chevalier was somewhat a daredevil and that he was eager to diverge from routine at times. Fortunately the group, as a whole, pulled together and the intrepid young flier refrained from any sensational maneuvers in the air.

By the first of June all was progressing well at the camp at Annapolis even though flight training was not "a bed of roses" as one of the aviators expressed it. There were minor accidents and many delays caused most often by motor trouble; but on Friday, June 20, the first fatality shocked the camp, the Naval Academy, the surrounding community, and the whole naval service. This was the first accident to naval aviators resulting in loss of life since the Navy began aviation experiments.

Lieutenant Towers and Ensign Billingsley crashed from about 1,600 feet in the Wright machine which had left camp in the early afternoon for a flight over Chesapeake Bay to Claiborne, Md. Billingsley was at the controls and was thrown clear of the plane. Safety belts had not been adopted at that time. Towers, riding as a passenger, happened to have hold of a stanchion to which he clung during the plane's fall, and to this he doubtless owed his life. He was seriously injured and was hospitalized for some weeks. A special board appointed to investigate this tragedy reported to the Navy Department that "only the ungovernable elements" could be held responsible. A strong current of wind had upset the plane from behind.

A memorial tablet erected at the Naval Academy by the classmates of Ensign Billingsley records that he was "the first naval aviator to meet death in the performance of duty."

The Need for Eliminating Waste in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, because of the enormous size of the Nation's defense budget, more than half of our total national budget, it is particularly important that we should make every effort to eliminate waste in our Armed Forces and to insist on rigid economy. As a member of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have been particularly concerned with this matter. And while I know that the Defense Department is also attempting to eliminate unnecessary waste, I think it is frequently helpful when outside observers bring to their attention possible areas of improvement. In this connection, I was particularly impressed with an editorial that appeared in the Oneonta Star for March 25 of this year, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial and invite the attention of my colleagues and the Department of Defense to its wise comments:

[From the Oneonta Star, Mar. 25, 1960]

ARMED FORCES WASTE SHOULD BE CORRECTED

The military mind is not much given to economies. There is some historical justification for this. The business of providing the Nation with a good shield is far too important, it might be argued, to warrant being overparticular about what it costs to do the job. But does this really justify the general lack of concern about the taxpayer's dollar which pervades the Armed Forces? We think not.

The Department of Defense spent $24 billion last year for supplies and equipment. It has on hand surpluses with a book value of nearly $27 billion, for which the annual storage bill runs to about $134 million. Yet there is little coordination of procurement among the services, with the result that vast sums are wasted. This waste cuts into the amount of defense we get per dollar.

The lack of any general supervision of procurement has been underscored in a new report prepared for the Joint Congressional Committee on Economics. This report recommends creation of a separate service to purchase supplies and equipment for all the Armed Forces. Such a system would, demonstrably, reduce waste—if only by letting the Pentagon's right hand know what its left hand was buying.

The military people don't like the idea of unified procurement, though it seems to work all right in limited areas. But the Armed Forces will have to put up far better arguments than they have yet advanced if they want to be convincing.

Year 1960—The Challenges We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent article on Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche. This article appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of Saturday, January 2, 1960, and was written by Charles Lucey of the Scripps-Howard staff.

Because I feel Dr. Bunche has done an outstanding job in his position at the United Nations, and in many other endeavors, I am calling this article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the people of America:

YEAR 1960—THE CHALLENGE WE FACE—DR. BUNCHE CONFIDENT CRISES CAN BE MET, HAILS ATOMIC FUTURE—OUTLOOK BRIGHT FOR U.N.

(By Charles Lucey)

NEW YORK, January 2.—There is no despair in Ralph Johnson Bunche, scholar-diplomat, as he views a world harried by greed and arrogance and rowdyism of men and nations.

A man of heart and hope is the world figure, one of the greatest Negroes America has produced. He is our highest representative in the United Nations central structure, second only to Dag Hammarskjold.

He measures the march of the U.N., not by headlines but by history. With other men he finds cause for "guarded optimism" in the East-West struggle. But his real benchmark for today's newest crisis—whatever it is—is to recall that other crises stirred the world 3, 5, or 10 years ago and, largely with U.N. help, were settled and forgotten.

A year ago Cyprus threatened to inflame the Mediterranean. Earlier, the Arab-Israeli war. Tunisia and Morocco were almost as bitter as Algeria today. If India and Pakistan haven't agreed on Kashmir, neither have they gone to war. In 1959 a Thailand-Cambodia dust-up was settled quietly through U.N. The North Vietnam-Laos flareup is dampered down. The Red China-India border may be uneasy, but no war rages.

NO COMBAT FATIGUE

Dr. Bunche had every right to show combat fatigue after the long General Assembly session just closed. But on this day, sturdy and still young at 55, he was bright-eyed despite meetings that kept him up until 3 a.m. Quiet in voice and dress, in manner and mood, he looked out across the world from his stylish 38th-floor office in the big slab above the East River.

Few men have tramped the sod and sand of that world as has Ralph Bunche. No one has followed its postwar stir and ferment more closely. Now, preparing to be off again for Africa, he marvels at the breakthrough from colonialism to independence which has swept whole continents.

"When the United Nations was set up only 14 years ago," he muses, "800 million people still lived as non-self-governing colonials. By the end of 1960 there will be fewer than 125 million. India and the Philippines signed the charter though they were not yet independent. Then came Ceylon, Indonesia, Nepal, Laos, Vietnam, Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Ghana, and Guinea.

MORE NEXT YEAR

"Next year will come at least 4—Nigeria, with 35 million, to become the largest country in Africa, and Somaliland, French Togoland and the French Cameroons. French Sudan and French Senegal seem likely. The British West Indies are uniting to emerge from colonialism into dominion status. So it goes all over the world.

"When I came to United Nations in 1946 to set up the Department of Trusteeship and non-self-governing territories, I predicted we would work ourselves out of a job. Many thought self-government for so many lands would take many decades, even centuries. I was convinced that once colonial peoples got the bit of nationalism in their teeth, given the encouragement from the outside such as from the United Nations, self-government would come faster. But nobody foresaw that the tempo would be so great as it has.

"Within a decade there'll be only a vestige of colonial life in Africa."

STRUGGLE NOT ENDED

The surging for independence and equality is by no means ended. The Union of South Africa can be a violent trouble spot. The struggle will focus in Algeria, the Congo, and Kenya as other peoples become self-governing and put pressure on those holding to colonialism. But, said Dr. Bunche:

"There is always a threat of violence but it can be averted with statesmanship. The United Nations is trying to see through this vast transition without resort to war. It's not easy to isolate a colonial war in today's world, and keep it from spreading. But there's encouraging evidence of good will and moderation on both sides in some of these disputes."

Not for a moment does Dr. Bunche accept the picture of the United Nations shunted onto a sidetrack by Big Four and Summit Conferences. "Below the Summit," he says, "the way must be prepared for agreement at the top on broad principles; after the decisions have been made the United Nations must be ready to implement them."

Indeed, the United Nations has greater world acceptance today than at any previous time, Dr. Bunche insists. Except for the issue of Germany, which is a peace treaty that it never was intended that the U.N. should settle, the U.N. has had a role in every major international question since it was founded.

LEDGER LOOKS GOOD

"The U.N. ledger looks good. It is approaching universality in membership. It has been effective in stopping bloodshed in Indonesia, Palestine, and Kashmir. The fact of the complete devastation of nuclear war is causing more and more people to look to it. Its work in health, agriculture, and technical aid has touched millions.

"The United Nations has developed a kind of international common law today rooted in no specific authority. All over the Near East and in India and Pakistan with regard to Kashmir there are U.N. uniformed personnel, aircraft, vehicles, flags. You probably never could have got this into the charter in 1945. But it is part of maintaining peace; it is accepted and no one complains.

"There's a quiet-working diplomacy that goes on all the time. Take last spring's Thailand-Cambodia trouble, which threatened to be serious. Secretary General Hammarskjold sent out an experienced Swedish diplomat and it was smoothed over. Yet it was never on anybody's agenda.

"Mr. Hammarskjold's recent trip to Laos was quite informal. Yet it has pulled the tension out of the Laos-North Vietnam situation. A lot goes on that never reaches the stage of big news."

VISION OF TOMORROW

Nothing more excites Dr. Bunche's vision of tomorrow than peaceful use of nuclear energy, a United Nations project under his direction since President Eisenhower made his dramatic 1953 plea for such a program.

"Here lies a means of development far greater than the industrial revolution. Today, sponsored by the United Nations, there is free international exchange of information on fission and fusion. Many nations will share the knowledge of atomic reactors in which the United States, the United Kingdom, and Soviet Russia have pioneered. Fusion would mean harnessing ocean water to provide energy for underdeveloped nations which now lack it.

The hopes all this holds for the world stagger the imagination.

As Dr. Bunche heads for Africa he looks over his shoulder and appraises the progress of desegregation here at home. The back of the fight has been broken, he believes. Achieving integration now is a matter of time. For the individual Negro and his family it is bitter medicine that he still must suffer some unfairness and indignity which one day will be wiped out.

But the road forward looks good to Ralph Bunche.

The Problem of the South Tirol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, both Austria and Italy are stanch friends of this country. For this reason, I am concerned about the increasing tension between Austria and Italy arising out of the problem of minority rights in South Tirol.

Just a few weeks ago the Italian Government refused admission to Italy to the Austrian Deputy Prime Minister, Professor Gschnitzer. Almost at the same time, the Austrian Government announced its intention to bring claimed Italian violations of the rights of the German minority in South Tirol before the United Nations.

South Tirol, which contains 250,000 German-speaking citizens in an area of 74,000 square kilometers became Italian as a result of the Peace Treaty of Versailles in 1919. President Woodrow Wilson, it is said, later came to regret this decision, and the failure of the treaty to call for a plebiscite in the area.

During the Fascist regime, there was suppression of the rights of these mountain people. After the Second World War, Austria and Italy signed the Paris agreement to regulate the minority rights of the German-speaking inhabitants of South Tirol. Once again, the Western Powers acquiesced to the incorporation of South Tirol into Italy. In the words of former British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin:

We for our part were never altogether happy about leaving some 200,000 German-speaking persons in Italy, and were anxious that the Italian Government should do everything to preserve the minority rights of these people.

The Paris agreement left two or three important provisions to be negotiated between Austria and Italy. The most important one, which was not settled until 1948, dealt with the question of the options for citizenship resulting from the 1939 Hitler-Mussolini agreement. In 1939, Mussolini permitted any South Tirolean to opt for German citizenship. Eighty-six percent of the population did so, but only about 25 percent actually emigrated northward before the war was over. In 1948, under a supplementary agreement, almost all of the South Tirolese were able to retrieve Italian nationality, although for many this was dragged out for several years. Of the 70,000 who emigrated, only 9,000 persons have returned.

The Austrian position on the social and economic rights of the South Tirolese has been put forth in a speech in the United Nations General Assembly on September 21, 1959, by Dr. Bruno Kreisky, Austrian Foreign Affairs Minister:

Austria, needless to say, has full confidence in the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes—a principle fully applicable to the question that ranks among the highest of our foreign affairs, namely the question of the South Tirol, whose cultural and economic development must be safeguarded and whose ethnic substance must be preserved.

Clearly this is a problem which can only be solved in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, whose aim it is, in conformity with the principle of justice and international law, to bring peaceful means to bear on the settlement of international disputes, and to develop friendly relations among nations.

SOUTH TIROL'S TRAGIC FATE

The Saint-Germain Treaty of 1919 severed the southern part of the Tirol from Austria and made it part of Italy. The South Tirol now is a territory of 2,860 square miles with a population of roughly a quarter million Tirolese.

Under the Fascist regime, South Tirol suffered the consequences of a sustained campaign of denationalization. Even the children were prevented from receiving instruction in their own language and finally, in 1939, an agreement between two dictatorships led to the displacement of tens of thousands of families. After the end of World War II, all attempts to find an equitable solution of the problem of the South Tirol ended in failure. I should like to stress in this context that it was not only Austria which considered this state of affairs unjust and, indeed, untenable. For instance, an Italian manifesto appeared in the American press as early as 1944; it was signed by prominent political leaders, scientists and artists, among them Randolfo Pacciardi, Prof. Giuseppe Borghese, Prof. Gaetano Salvemini, and Arturo Toscanini. In this manifesto it was even suggested that Italy relinquish her control over the ethnic minorities in the extreme north and northeast of her territory.

In 1946, Italy and Austria reached an agreement which, it was then hoped, would assure the South Tirol a cultural and economic development unhampered by restrictions. This agreement which, as Annex 4, is a part of the Italian peace treaty, expressly provides for "special measures to protect the national character and the cultural and economic development" of the South Tirol; it also grants this minority group autonomous legislative and executive powers.

And yet, the correct interpretation of the Paris agreement has been subject to differences between the Governments of Italy and Austria ever since.

Let me briefly summarize the situation in South Tirol:

There can be no doubt that, compared with the Fascist era, the South Tirol is relatively free from restrictions in the cultural field. The social and economic area, however, presents a different picture. Here the situation is indeed serious.

Let me say at once that the South Tirolese are an extremely vital ethnic group. And yet, the present practice of the administration undermines the very foundations of their existence on their native soil. It discriminates against them when they look for employment; and, as far as housing is concerned, it may be apposite to point out that only 7 percent of the apartments built with Government aid in the South Tirol have been made available to its indigenous inhabitants. This is indeed a gross and incomprehensible discrimination; it has compelled many thousands of young South Tirolese to emigrate.

The South Tirol problem which, of course, remains a national question, is increasingly becoming a social and economic concern. It is one of the more tragic aspects of the problem that, in a court of law, a South Tirolese will probably be faced by a judge with whom he cannot communicate in his own language. Among those to whom jurisdiction over the South Tirol—a population of a quarter million—is entrusted, there are only five South Tirolean judges.

The parliamentary representatives of the South Tirol have repeatedly sought redress of this utterly unsatisfactory state of affairs; they have also submitted a draft bill outlining the proper autonomous status for the region of South Tirol.

In their draft, the representatives of the South Tirol insist on their people's right to use their own language in public life, to claim their share in public office in proportion to their population, and, finally, to create conditions requisite to the equality of opportunity in their daily lives, paying particular attention to housing and employment.

AUTONOMY FOR BOZEN PROVINCE

The Austrian Government cannot but endorse these just aspirations. Clearly, there is no other way to implement the Paris agreement, in spirit as well as in fact, but to create an autonomous Province of Bozen. Indeed—is there any other way of assuring an ethnic minority its full democratic rights than to grant it self-administration?

It is only thus that an ethnic minority may claim to profit from the principle inherent in the Magna Carta of modern democracy, the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, according to which governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

In the true spirit of the Paris Treaty, the Austrian Government will continue to claim its proper share in the implementation of that international agreement. Should, however, bilateral negotiations not succeed in creating conditions satisfactory for a minority of 250,000 in a nation of almost 50 million, Austria will have no alternative but to appeal to the United Nations to put this question on its agenda at the earliest possible moment.

It is quite evident that it is neither spite nor hostility against our Italian neighbor that compel us to state the case of South Tirol. Indeed—how could we have hostile feelings against a nation which, for many centuries, we have been bound by mutual ties of commerce and trade, a nation whose abundant spiritual heritage has greatly enriched our own culture.

It is, let me repeat, not enmity which motivates our step, but the responsibility which rests upon us. It is, moreover, the restlessness of thousands of young people of the South Tirol, who want to plan their future and to shape their lives, as young people do elsewhere in the world.

Nothing divides us from our Italian neighbor but this open question. If a solution can be found which the South Tirolese can accept, new avenues of fruitful cooperation would be opened up in our part of Europe.

I am indebted to Mr. Gabriele Paresce, press counselor of the Italian Embassy here, for a statement of the Italian position on Alto Adige—the South Tirol:

It must be recalled that five German-speaking representatives of Alto Adige are members of Italian Parliament and that some of them, as a matter of fact, represent it in multilateral assemblies.

German-language newspapers in Alto Adige may criticize the Italian Government in complete freedom and they certainly do not restrain themselves in the exercise of this right. The Italian Government is as pleased with the criticism per se when it is constructive, as it is by the fact that criticism, whatever its nature, is completely free.

In almost 500 Alto Adige schools, German-speaking students are taught in German by German-speaking teachers who employ textbooks mostly printed in Germanic nations. In addition, Italy recognizes all of the scholastic achievement records acquired in Austria by its own citizens, even when the level of such accreditations is more than doubtful when compared with similar Italian scholastic achievements.

The economic situation is very satisfactory and may be favorably compared with that of adjacent territories in Italy or on the other side of the frontier. The preferential trade agreement with the Tirol-Vorarlberg naturally creates a privileged situation. Even though this was criticized by other parts of Italy the Italian Government nevertheless persists along this line. Regarding access to public employment, the Italian Government did not limit itself to assuring equality with others to German-speaking citizens, but agreed that a special quota of local employment be reserved for German-speaking residents. Regarding state employment, it agreed that a special quota of jobs be reserved in various cases for applicants with a knowledge of German. Furthermore, where professional qualifications are required in certain instances (state examinations) applicants may take the examination in all subjects in the German language.

Bilingualism—that is the parity of German and Italian—is generously applied in the Province of Bolzano. Beginning with the immediate postwar period, German-speaking citizens could correspond with public offices in German. Recently it was also agreed that public offices or agencies, may exchange correspondence exclusively in German if they wish.

A matter which has received considerable polemical treatment is the appropriation of State funds for popular housing. Efforts were made to have these funds allocated according to different criteria from those applied in the rest of Italy where such allocation is based on purely social considerations. While it is the responsibility of the constitutional court to establish certain principles of law, as far as the Government is concerned, it has already taken steps to satisfy the desires of communes with German-speaking populations.

* * * * *

With the Italian Government's full acquiescence, Alto Adige's traditions and customs are still extant and visible. There are many organizations of all kinds, even those which give training in the use of firearms. Uniforms, often of a military type, are used on every occasion. The multiplicity and compactness of the various organizations are closer to the German than the Latin tradition.

The Province of Bolzano was even allowed to retain the institution of "Maso Chiuso," which permits a farmer to will his entire property to only one son. This is contrary to Italian law—to the very spirit of private law—which forbids restriction of the right to inherit to the first-born son. Despite this, it was permitted precisely because primogeniture (Maso Chiuso) is part of the traditions and cultural patrimony of those peoples which Italy wishes to respect as well as to safeguard.

* * * * *

The Alto Adige problems are concrete and can be solved; they are not mutually opposed absolutes based on principle. Thus, for example, one of the continuing difficulties has been the insufficient knowledge of the two languages in public offices. Few Italians know German, and even fewer German-speaking citizens are interested in a government career. Therefore, it is necessary on the one hand to encourage and facilitate the study of the German language and on the other, to make a government career easier and more attractive to German-speaking citizens. The Italian Government is considering both these matters.

The social aspect of the question is another matter to be followed with the utmost interest. Everyone knows how important the creation of jobs is for Italy. In the zone in question, this problem is of a special nature, particularly in the exclusively agricultural mountain valleys prevalently inhabited by German-speaking citizens. There the transformation into a mixed economy is undertaken unwillingly and with difficulty.

The "landsknechte" (disinherited children) who cannot find agricultural employment must seek work in the cities. There, however, they must compete with Italian-speaking workers skilled in industrial work. This necessarily creates the complicated need for adaptation. The Italian Government's financial means are limited by force of circumstances and are inadequate for the nation's needs. But in Alto Adige, another important consideration is added: the Italian Government does not in any way wish to promote industrial development projects which may seem designated to favor artificial immigration from other provinces. Therefore, enterprises must be purely local with minority participation. The Italian Government may then help them to the extent of its means.

These are the problems in which the Alto Adige question is articulated. Certainly they are important and they can be solved through the good will of everyone concerned.

The United States has a deep interest in assuring that the minority rights of these 250,000 German-speaking mountain people are protected. This interest flows from the principles of our own Declaration of Independence; from the rights proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter; and from our participation in the European settlement which gave rise to the South Tirolese problem.

The leaders of both Austria and Italy are men of good will. Surely discussions and negotiations between the two countries—perhaps under the aegis of a binational conciliation mission such as envisaged by article 83 of the Italian constitution—can lead to a great recognition of the human rights of the South Tirolese.

To these discussions, Mr. Speaker, the United States, I am sure, will want to bring whatever good offices the parties shall request.

International Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of many airline pilots residing in my congressional district, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following communication from Capt. R. J. Regnery, a pilot with Pan American Airways. Captain Regnery's views are representative of those expressed my many airline pilots, who are deeply concerned with maintaining a strong U.S. international carrier system.

In considering route applications by foreign carriers I believe the Department of State has adopted a sound and commendable policy as outlined in the Department's letter which also follows:

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., *March 11, 1960.*
Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House Office Building,
Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GUBSER: As a California voter and a pilot with Pan American Airways, I strongly support the recent stand of the State Department in being opposed to the route application of the Dutch airline, KLM, into Los Angeles. I feel you should request of the State Department that they continue to inspect operation rights of foreign carriers into the United States on the same realistic basis. The Italian airline, Alitalia, and the German airline, Lufthansa, both have pending route applications into west coast cities.

In the refusal to approve the application of KLM into Los Angeles the State Depart-

ment for the first time has examined foreign carriers' applications into the United States on the basis of an "equitable exchange of traffic." The examination of KLM's application disclosed:

1. KLM is now serving two U.S. cities, New York and Houston, while the U.S. carriers are only allowed to serve one Dutch city, Amsterdam.

2. In 1957, 38,835 passengers were flown out of the Netherlands to the United States; 36,032 were carried by KLM; 2,803 were carried by four other carriers, one of which was a U.S. carrier.

3. In 1956, KLM's revenue out of New York was in excess of $12 million; U.S. carriers' revenue out of Amsterdam, $108,000.

4. In 1959, KLM collected $29,400,000 from 86,225 U.S. passengers; U.S. carriers collected $1,700,000 from 2,842 Dutch passengers.

It is obvious the U.S. international carriers cannot continue to exist under this type of foreign aid giveaway program. It means they die an economic death due to the U.S. route giveaways. It will mean a great cost to the U.S. Government to keep them in operation. The State Department should be commended so that the public will know and become acquainted with the importance of this realistic approach which is vital to the life of the U.S. international carriers.

Yours sincerely,

R. J. REGNERY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1960.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of March 2, 1960 transmitting a telegram from the Airline Pilots Association in California and asking to be informed of the background information which led to this Department's decision concerning a commercial air route to Los Angeles for the Netherlands.

A civil aviation consultation was held in Washington between January 7 and February 3, 1960 to consider the request of the Netherlands for such a route. On February 3, the Netherlands delegation was told that the executive branch, after considering all of the factors put before the U.S. delegation, was unable to give a commitment to grant the route to Los Angeles.

In negotiations of this type the balancing of the various aspects of the public interest is difficult inasmuch as conflicting interests sometimes appear. In this case, the interests of the Los Angeles community had to be weighed with the interests of the U.S. domestic and international airlines. Overall relations between the United States and the Netherlands were also involved.

In order to balance the routes which we grant to foreign countries against the rights achieved for our own carriers, we have adopted certain fundamental principles which we believe result in an equitable exchange of rights and assure the future development of U.S. international air operations. In the report on civil air policy dated April 30, 1954, and prepared for submission to the President, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the interested agencies of the executive arm of the Government took the position that in determining the routes to be included in bilateral air transport agreements, the United States should continue its objective of establishing insofar as possible an equitable exchange of economic benefits. This policy is still pursued.

In this connection, it is difficult when treating with countries of small territorial expanse such as the Netherlands to achieve a route exchange resulting in economic benefits of similar value to both the United States and the country concerned. At the time of the conclusion of the Air Transport Services Agreement with the Netherlands in April 1957 it was recognized that factors other than those relating solely to aviation should be taken into account. As a result, the Netherlands was authorized to operate air services on separate routes from the Netherlands to New York and Houston and from the Netherlands Antilles to New York and Miami but did not receive authorization to serve Los Angeles. In turn, the United States airlines were authorized to operate to Amsterdam, Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles, and points beyond.

The Netherlands Government's recent request for a route to Los Angeles was supported by considerations of broad economic and political nature which, upon examination by the United States delegation, were found to differ but little from those which were exhaustively considered in 1957 and which led to the decision to grant additional routes, but not Los Angeles. Consequently, in view of the economic advantages from which the Netherlands airline had greatly benefited under the 1957 agreement, and in view of the impossibility of obtaining reciprocal advantages for United States carriers, it appeared that a further grant to the Netherlands was not warranted.

I hope that this information will meet with your needs. If I can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Michael J. Kirwan, HH.D.

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune not to be on the floor the morning the announcement was made of the academic honor conferred on our distinguished colleague from Ohio by one of the great universities of the Nation. And of course with his customary modesty he did not enlighten me.

I was not aware of it until I read of it belatedly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and so am taking advantage of the first opportunity to extend felicitations to him and to the House, which is also honored by this well deserved tribute to one of its outstanding Members.

MIKE KIRWAN is one of the great men of the House and the Nation. The congressional committee of which he is chairman does not contribute to my campaign. He is a typical American and his career might well be an inspiration to every American youth in the land.

From the other side of the track, as a breakerboy working 10 hours a day for 50 cents a day—without formal schooling—without pull or favor or help from anyone—through his own unaided efforts, he has come to membership in the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

But to every assignment along the way he gave the best that was in him. Wherever he found his niche, he worked, indefatiguably and loyally.

Seest thou a man diligent in business; he shall stand before kings.

What he has achieved the humblest boy who walks the meanest street of the smallest hamlet in the remotest corner of the land may, under our free American institutions, aspire to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, no academic authority has ever conferred a degree more worthily. If anyone here feels the need of a mental checkup you could do no better than consult Dr. KIRWAN. He is the best judgment of human nature I have known. I would rather have his diagnosis of the personality and character of a man than that of the most eminent psychiatrist of the day—and he will not charge you $50 a visit. In fact one of his most notable characteristics is that he does so much for so many, without asking for himself. He loves his fellow man.

Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold:
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the Presence in the room he said,
"What writest thou?"—The vision raised its head,
And with a look made of all sweet accord,
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord."
"And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay, not so,"
Replied the Angel. Abou spoke more low,
But cheerly still; and said, "I pray thee then,
Write me as one that loves his fellow men."
The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blessed.
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

Editorial Backs Up Congressman Fogarty's Appropriation for Juvenile Delinquency Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for many years our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, has contributed unstintingly of his time, his talent, and his knowledge of social problems to the particular area of juvenile delinquency.

As the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Congressman FOGARTY this year has persuaded his colleagues to make more money available to the National Institute of Mental Health and the Children's Bureau for the study and drafting of a "major national blueprint" for juvenile delinquency control.

Congressman FOGARTY has for some time been aware of the need for this approach to the problem. It is gratifying to me, as one who sits on the Appropriations Committee with Congressman FOGARTY, to know that support of the FOGARTY approach to this social evil is gaining acceptance from the public, Congressman FOGARTY is to be commend-

ed for his efforts which will pay rich dividends to the youth of America.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of March 31 entitled "Anti-Delinquency Plan Up" which backs up Congressman FOGARTY's program of study of youth problems:

ANTIDELINQUENCY PLAN UP

Perhaps some material will come out of the present White House Conference on Children and Youth to support the drive in Congress to get Federal funds for a national program to control juvenile delinquency. The leader of this campaign, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, says that most of the States taking part in the conference put juvenile delinquency at the head of the list of youth problems they need help with.

Meanwhile some citizen backing could be used to get action on bills now in both Houses of Congress, to support projects to combat juvenile delinquency. These bills authorize $5 million a year for 5 years for this purpose—a small amount compared to what delinquency costs us in our home communities.

In addition, Congressman FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, says the House Appropriations Committee has requested $1 million for the National Institute of Mental Health and $60,000 for the Children's Bureau to get them started to work together on a major national blueprint for delinquency control.

This would finance exploratory work in four vital fields: research in child development, field studies and pilot programs to help delinquent children, more and better trained manpower, and improved direction and coordination of activities to combat delinquency in the States and communities.

There is a mass of evidence to show the need for such an undertaking. Communities are frustratingly hampered in their efforts to combat delinquency, first of all by the general ignorance of the cause and basic nature of delinquency, and secondly by their inexperience in marshaling all community resources to attack a major social problem such as this. With all the good will in the world, and even with all the money in the world, communities still do not have the tools for this extremely difficult task.

Congressman FOGARTY is absolutely right in backing any national budget policies to push through this kind of program, which the whole country desperately needs, and which costs less than one new prison.

New Orleans States, Twice Winner of Award for Courage in Journalism, Supports Criminal Penalty for Retired Officers Selling or Using Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, another one of America's great newspapers, the New Orleans States, twice winner of the Sigma Delta Chi award for "Courage in Journalism" has raised its voice in support of my position regarding criminal penalties for retired officers who use their influence or who sell to the Department of Defense within 2 years after leaving the Pentagon.

The House will come to grips with this issue Wednesday when consideration of legislature dealing with the subject comes before the House for consideration.

The lines are clearly drawn between those who favor giving congressional consent to such activities and those who desire to legally outlaw such a probability or such a practice.

Here is what the New Orleans States has to say on the subject:

INFLUENCE PEDDLING

Influence peddling by retired military officers furnishes one of the more sordid sides of the Nation's defense effort.

Last year Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, member of the House Armed Services Committee, following revelatory investigations by his subcommittee, offered remedial legislation.

Sharpest teeth in the bill were those which would exact fines, prison terms, or both from retired officers who peddled or tried to peddle material or services to the Defense Department within 2 years after retirement.

But those teeth were extracted, leaving only a mild penalty for wrongdoing: Guilty retired officers would merely suffer a dock in retirement pay.

Bristling over this watering down of his bill, HÉBERT has offered a new bill imposing a maximum fine of $10,000 and sentence of 1 year.

Committee investigations have disclosed shocking abuses in this field. Need for legislation is beyond question, but that legislation will not install the safeguards necessary if it confines its penalties to wrist slapping.

National defense accounts for half of the U.S. budget and the competition for a slice of that spending is terrific. The temptation for defense industry to take on retired officers solely for the string pulling they can do has seemed irresistible in countless instances.

If there is not strong legal restraint, military strength of the Nation suffers, and along with it the taxpayer.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.* The Congressional
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N. Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Skiing at Big Mountain in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on several occasions I have spoken to the Senate about the ever-increasing importance of recreation and tourism to my State of Montana. In fact, it is rapidly becoming one of our major sources of income.

We have many fine resorts, both summer and winter, and one of the best is the skiing resort at Big Mountain in northwestern Montana. The resort is a few miles from one of the State's most delightful small towns, Whitefish.

During March, Montana's first winter carnival was held at Whitefish. It was the first of the annual events, a milestone in the development of one of the Nation's finest ski resorts.

I ask unanimous consent to have three newspaper articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD concerning the Whitefish carnival and the Big Mountain resort—the New York Times, February 28, 1960; the Kalispell-Daily Inter Lake, March 10, 1960; and the Columbia Falls-Hungry Horse News, March 26, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1960]

CARNIVAL TIME AT WHITEFISH, MONT.

(By Ed Christopherson)

WHITEFISH, MONT.—Winter carnivals in snow-covered sections of the country are becoming almost as common as sunshine festivals in the South. It comes as little surprise, therefore, that this town in northwestern Montana is making elaborate plans for its first winter carnival, which, it hopes, will become an annual event.

The carnival, to be held March 10 through March 13, will serve a twofold purpose. It will celebrate the fact that skiing on Big Mountain, 7 miles north of Whitefish, helps to keep this town alive during the cold winter months and, in addition, it will mark the beginning of spring skiing.

The carnival will get underway on the evening of March 10, when King Boreas and his queen arrive here from St. Paul, Minn. The royal couple will lead a torchlight parade that will proceed along the main street of Whitefish to Big Mountain, where torch-bearing skiers will etch their flaming patterns in the night and demonstrate their skills in a slalom race.

PRETOW SKIING

The program on March 11 calls for broom hockey, skating races, a novel crosscountry race on skis and ski-joring. In ski-joring, a sport in vogue long before modern tows were developed, the skier is towed by a fast-galloping horse. The crosscountry race will find the skiers charging along a trail in the business section of Whitefish. Their course will take them into such places as stores and restaurants.

Other events on the 4-day program include ski races for junior and senior contestants and dogsled races for youngsters. Interspersed with these sports activities will be dances, special luncheons, cocktail parties, a pancake breakfast and a snow-sculpture contest. Also on hand will be a group of nonspeaking "Yettis," or abominable snowmen, who promise to add a humorous touch to the entire proceedings.

Big Mountain is now in its 13th year as a skiing resort, and the fact that Whitefish is easily accessible via all means of transportation has added to its popularity. Whitefish is on the main line of the Great Northern Railway, and West Coast Airlines provides regular service to Flathead County Airport, adjacent to Whitefish.

This Northwest area also is reached easily via U.S. 2 and U.S. 93.

Whitefish, a town of 3,200 persons, is about 20 miles west of Glacier National Park. Its namesake, Whitefish Lake, is a favorite spot in the summer for swimming, fishing, and boating. But skiing on Big Mountain did not come into prominence until after World War II. It now has 9 miles of runs, 2 square miles of open snowfields, a T-bar with a rise of 1,024 feet, a Pomalift and a tow.

Accommodations are numerous. The ski lodge on the mountain charges $8.50 a day for a dormitory bunk and three meals; room rates at the chalet, also on the mountain, go up to a maximum of $13.50 a day, double occupancy. In Whitefish itself, hotel and motel rooms rent from $5 to $10.50 a day, also double occupancy.

PACKAGE RATES

Package plans also are available. For $98.68, the skier can spend 7 days and 6 nights, or 6 days and 7 nights, here. This includes lodging at the chalet or in Whitefish, three meals a day, unlimited use of all lifts, daily ski lessons and transportation between the town and Big Mountain.

The carnival, incidentally, also will serve as a kickoff for Big Mountain's $600,000 expansion program. This includes a new 6,880-foot double chairlift that will start near the chalet and rise 2,083 feet to the summit of the mountain. This lift will exploit the higher powdersnow areas that skiers now reach via Big Mountain's Sno-Cat.

The expansion program also lists additional housing, dining and entertainment facilities on the mountain, a swimming pool, an intermediate Pomalift, a new ski shop, and a building for the ski patrol.

[From the Kalispell (Mont.) Daily Inter Lake, Mar. 10, 1960]

FOUR-DAY WHITEFISH CARNIVAL OPENS TODAY; COMPLETE SCHEDULE OUTLINED

WHITEFISH.—Festivities at the 4-day Whitefish winter carnival will begin today as residents and visitors turn out at 6:30 p.m., to welcome King Boreas and his queen from the St. Paul, Minn., winter carnival at the Great Northern depot.

A crowd of winter sports enthusiasts and other interested spectators will then join a torchlight parade from the depot down the Whitefish main street to the municipal tree at Central Avenue and Third Street for the official opening of the winter carnival by the Whitefish king and queen at 7 p.m.

At 7:30 p.m., there will be full-length ski movies at the Orpheum Theater. Carnival festivities will then move to Big Mountain where the schedule, beginning at 8:30 p.m., includes a fireworks display, a spectacular torchlight skiing parade and a night slalom ski race.

FRIDAY

Friday there will be two luncheons for the St. Paul and Whitefish queens sponsored by the Women's Club at the Reeves Restaurant and at the Cadillac Hotel a luncheon sponsored by the Rotary Club for the St. Paul and Whitefish kings.

At 1:30 p.m., the Whitefish Lions Club will meet the Whitefish Rotary in a broom hockey tourney on Central Avenue followed at 3 p.m. by ski-joring on Central Avenue. At 4 p.m., there will be children's races at the Whitefish High School rink.

Friday night highlights include a dinner at the Whitefish Lake Golf Club sponsored by the Soroptimist Club honoring the St. Paul and Whitefish royalty.

At 7 p.m. there will be special student ski movies at the Orpheum Theater. Rounding out Friday night activities will be gala merchants night at 8 p.m. and a metropolitan cross country race which will run through downtown sections as skiers follow a circuitous route in and out of business establishments. At 9 p.m. there will be ski movies at the Orpheum Theater, "White Victory," a film of the 1956 Olympics and "Gold and Silver Slopes."

SATURDAY

First event on Saturday will be the kid's dog sled races on Central Avenue at 10 a.m. followed at 2 p.m. by go-cart racing by the Glacier Goat Cart Association at the high school ice rink.

At noon the carnival royalty will have lunch on the Big Mountain followed by flag-raising ceremonies to start the Doug Smith Memorial ski race on Big Mountain at 1 p.m.

Saturday night there will be a smorgasbord and dance for adults at the Moose home. At 10 p.m. there will be a teenage dance at the Central School gym.

SUNDAY

Sunday morning at 6:10 a.m. the St. Paul royalty will depart on the Great Northern Empire Builder. The Mountain Trails Saddle Club will have a pancake breakfast at the clubhouse and sleigh rides for all children.

Big Mountain ski area will again be spotlighted at 10 a.m. with the flag-raising ceremonies which will open the final day of racing.

Sunday at 1 p.m. the award ceremonies at Big Mountain will include the presentation of racing awards, event awards and the drawing for the winter carnival grand prize of 500 silver dollars.

Many unscheduled events are also included in the 4-day program, among them periodic unannounced appearances by the "yettis," frivolous funmakers who plan to add spice to various events.

[From the Columbia Falls-Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, Mar. 26, 1960]

TELLS OF BIG MOUNTAIN'S NEW CHAIR LIFT

(By Jacqueline Adams)

WHITEFISH.—A double chair lift which will carry skiers and summer sightseers well over a mile to the top of the Big Mountain,

Whitefish, has been purchased by Winter Sports, Inc.

Installation work for the new lift, one of the highest in the Nation, will start at the close of the ski season on the Big Mountain, about May 1, Heron Engineering Co., Denver, manufacturer of the lift, estimates it will be ready for operation October 1, 1960.

The 6,800-foot lift will have a vertical rise of over 2,000 feet and will triple the present skiable area on the Big Mountain, with the addition of a variety of new runs. It will take skiers high into the deep powder snow and make possible uninterrupted downhill trips of 2½ miles and more.

Although the chair lift will be continuous from just outside the Big Mountain chalet to the summit of the mountain, there will be an intermediate station at which skiers may embark or disembark, should they want to ski either half of the mountain.

With the existing T-bar Pomalift, and rope tow facilities on the lower slopes of the Big Mountain, the addition of the chair lift will enable the area to handle well over 1,000 skiers a day without crowding.

EXPANDING HOUSING

To take care of the expected increase in number of skiers on the slopes, the Big Mountain also is expanding housing and food facilities.

Work on an annex to the present ski lodge is scheduled to start May 15. The additional space will approximately double the resort's present capacity for overnight lodging. The lodge's present snackbar will be converted to a dining room to augment the present dining facilities in the Big Mountain chalet.

Also added to the lodge will be a warming room and cafeteria for day and weekend skiers. The new facilities are expected to be open before Thanksgiving 1960.

Construction this year will begin a 5-year long-range expansion plan for the Big Mountain. This first phase, which represents more than a quarter-million-dollar development, will be financed by means of private capital and sale of the corporation's common stock.

DESCRIBES NEW LIFT

Some statistics on the new double chair lift:

It will have 117 chairs with foot and arm rests and will be supported by 26 tubular steel towers.

It will be powered by a 150-horsepower electric motor, with a gasoline engine standby. Its top speed will be about 500 feet per minute.

It will employ a 1¼-inch steel cable.

It will have a capacity of 530 skiers per hour.

Will the area skiable from the new lift be for experts only?

Not at all, says Karl Hinderman, head of the Big Mountain ski school, Hinderman says his instructors can take a third lesson beginner from the top of the mountain to the base of the lift without getting the skier "in over his head" (both literally and figuratively).

Conversely, the area offers runs challenging enough for top skiers. In its 13-year history, the Big Mountain has been host to three national championship ski meets.

And for nonskiers, the chairlift will operate in the summer to take them to an international view 4,000 feet above the floor of Montana's Flathead Valley. From the top of the Big Mountain can be seen the peaks of Glacier National Park and Canada's Waterton Lakes National Park. Sightseers also can look down into the nationally known Hungry Horse Dam and onto the Flathead's lakes and communities, including Whitefish, Kalispell, and Columbia Falls.

The Big Mountain already is well-known, particularly to skiers from the Pacific Northwest and Middle West, who can reach it by Great Northern Railway in a few hours or a day.

The area was opened by Winter Sports, Inc., on December 19, 1947, with a T-bar lift and a lodge. The T-bar, 3,220 feet long with a 1,024-foot rise, was then one of the biggest in the country.

In 1949, a chalet was built privately, and in 1954, Winter Sports purchased it and took over its operation.

In the third year of its existence, the Big Mountain got a 675-foot permanent rope tow. Added in 1958 was an 1,800-foot-long Pomalift, giving two new beginner-intermediate slopes over 2,000 feet in length.

Each year, in fact, new runs have been added to the two original ones, until at present there are more than 9 miles of open slopes and trails.

With its expansion, the resort will employ more than 100 persons.

The lower parts of the ski area belong to Winter Sports, Inc. The corporation uses upper faces of the Big Mountain under lease and special use permit from the U.S. Forest Service, which owns them as a part of the Flathead National Forest.

The Big Mountain opened for skiing this season at Thanksgiving and expects to operate through Easter vacation, well into April.

White House Conference on Narcotics

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in this resolution and urge its passage. I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts and the members of his subcommittee, and the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, for having given this matter an early hearing and having brought it to the floor for early consideration. I think this subject is one of great national concern. We might talk about the stiff penalties that are provided in both Federal and State laws, we might ask why a locality cannot under our criminal statutes cope with this problem. Penalties and enforcement alone will not eradicate this menace. We forget that juvenile delinquency has not been stamped out by Federal criminal statutes or by State criminal statutes. We forget that excessive drinking is not stopped by laws provided against it.

We must go to the core of this problem and search out many other problems which affect our social structure. We must go into the civic clubs, into the parent-teachers associations; we must disseminate information which brings out the evils of addiction to opium and other drugs; and I believe that the White House Conference will bring into the open and focus attention on the problems that exist not only on the part of law enforcement officers at the Federal level and at the local level, but also on the part of parents who are plagued with the dangers of delinquency among their children. We will be able to recruit the help of local civic clubs and parent-teachers associations to expose these evils and to educate our young children to guard themselves against those who would menace their social welfare.

It is in this spirit that this resolution is offered, I know; and I think it will do great good to the American structure, social and otherwise.

Key Club International—1960 Theme and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, efforts are being made at the local, State, and international levels, to deal with problems of delinquency or, more positively, to provide constructive, creative programs for the energies and talents of our youth.

Today, I would like to pay tribute particularly to efforts by Kiwanis International to sponsor Key clubs—youth organizations designed to encourage youth to seek individual excellence.

Currently, over 2,000 Key clubs are serving youth in over 2,000 communities.

According to its high code, Key Club International realizes that today's youth will determine the future; that this youth lives in an age of continuing challenge to freedom and our heritage.

The club, too, believes that the worth of man is what he can do for his fellowmen through service; and that each man, as a child of God, can reach his excellence by building his own gifts and talents.

Under this splendid concept, these clubs are doing an outstanding job.

Recently, the Keynoter, official publication of Key Club International, published a statement of its 1960 theme and objectives.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEY CLUB INTERNATIONAL—1960 THEME AND OBJECTIVES

1. Let us strive for a deeper understanding of God and His Creation with a sense of humility, sound faith, and abundant hope; denote service of club to needy places of worship for property repair and fundraising; urge regular church attendance and sponsor "Go to Church" programs; encourage Bible and religious activities for school and community publications; use "Prayer Before Meal" cards in school cafeteria and local restaurants; contact Laymen's Committee, 300 4th Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., for ideas; try to base your philosophy of life on a sound spiritual foundation.

2. Respect the rights of others; practice courtesy in driving and promote this policy in school and community; prove brotherhood by accepting each person as an individual; support local law enforcement agencies in fighting vandalism; promote honesty in school and teenage community; promote safety campaigns; "love they neighbor as thyself."

3. By example, emphasize juvenile decency; publicize objects of Key Club in school paper and other media; aid school and community programs publicizing acts of juvenile

decency; write National Teenagers Day Committee, 582 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 46, Calif., concerning other suggested programs; have school dress-up campaign and/or sponsor boys' and girls' fashion shows; prove that it is not "sissy," that it is decent; let people know that teenagers are decent, not delinquent.

4. Build a complete and happy life by daily mental, physical, and moral improvement; obtain and use better reading program material; emphasize good study habits, athletic competition, regular medical checkups, etc.; pay tribute through public recognition for high mental, physical, and moral achievement; arrange Career Days to show need for education in all fields; assist Kiwanis Career Day program, science fairs and mathematical competitions; consider establishing a scholarship for the most deserving.

5. Realize that a family based upon love and mutual respect is necessary for a responsible community; plan an Honor Thy Parents Week; say family grace at meals; advocate family vacations; plan Key Club family socials; encourage individual respect and pride of all members of the family unit; learn to appreciate the wisdom and knowledge of your parents.

6. Encourage school achievement and stimulate student-faculty cooperation; request and use Youth Salutes Its Teachers kit; spearhead school beautification programs; encourage good grades for members, and, through example, for the complete student body; set up programs to give lessons, text, and tutoring to ill student stay-at-homes; develop programs for building school spirit and good sportsmanship; help your fellow students excel in their school activities.

7. As a citizen of a democracy, spearhead an appreciation of your heritage; request and put into operation the "CQ" (citizenship quotient) program material; cooperate in disaster relief and worthwhile community charity drives; invite students who are not club members to attend club meetings; urge participation in Voice of Democracy contest; urge a study of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the British North American Act; plan municipal government study groups; ready yourself by education and experience to accept your democratic responsibilities.

8. Promote international understanding by taking an active interest in world affairs; schedule Key Club fundraisers with proceeds going to UNESCO, Crusade for Freedom, CARE, or other worthwhile charitable organizations; take part in Kiwanis-sponsored United States-Canada Good Will Week (April 24–30, 1960); have carefully selected "pen pals" abroad; take an active part in the United Nations Day programs; individually budget time and urge others to do the same in order to read about and intelligently understand world affairs; study other countries—land, customs, people, and history.

Mr. Veteran on Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERWIN MITCHELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the April 2, 1960, issue of one of our best and most influential publications on military and veterans' matters, Army Times, an editorial entitled "Mr. Veteran on Hill." This editorial called attention to the tremendous contribution in the field of veterans' legislation which has been made by our distinguished colleague from Texas the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We in this body are keenly aware of the conscientious and devoted manner in which our friend has led us in the multiple and complex problems arising in the field of veterans' affairs. It has been an inspiration to me to observe one who, while working unceasingly to obtain just benefits for the veterans of our Nation, has at the same time kept in perspective the interest of the taxpayers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this article and commend it to the attention of the membership:

MR. VETERAN ON HILL

We hear that $1,000 is being offered to the person who can name any Member now serving in Congress who has authored more benefit legislation for war veterans than has Texas' hard-working epresentative OLIN E. "TIGER" TEAGUE.

That's one proposition which will find no takers. Mr. TEAGUE'S accomplishments in the field of veterans' legislation run to imposing lengths. His efforts have not been entirely devoted to war veterans. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee which he chairmans recently completed extensive hearings on extending GI bill benefits to peacetime veterans.

During 14 years on Capitol Hill, the Texas lawmaker has achieved vast increases in service-connected compensation for disabled veterans and survivors of the war dead; he has been the principal advocate and supporter of the Veterans' Administration hospital program; he authored the Korea GI bill which has benefited over 6 million veterans; and he pushed through a liberal pension increase last year that will benefit some 1 million of the country's older veterans, their widows and children.

His legislative achievements for veterans have drawn endorsement from all of the major veterans' organiaztions, including the American Legion, the American Veterans of War II and Korea (Amvets), the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and the Veterans of World War I.

The various veterans benefit programs fathered by Mr. TEAGUE have shown careful balance between the just needs of veterans and their dependents—and the interest of the taxpaying public as well.

By astute judgment and professional handling of the veterans benefit programs, the Texas lawmaker has avoided the always-present danger of public reaction against any hint of a "gravy train" philosophy.

The measure of his accomplishment is further enhanced when one recalls the persistence with which TEAGUE has worked for passage of a sound and just "cold war" GI bill. Final enactment rests on many uncertain factors.

One factor is certain, however. On the cold war issue, "TIGER" has made it plain he will not be listed among those who maintain we are in a period of peace—with regard to readjustment benefit proposals—but in a cold war for purposes of foreign aid, armaments expenditure, crash programs for outer space, and compulsory military service.

Freedom of Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., of April 4, 1960, entitled "Freedom of Choice."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

It is about time that we Virginians stand back a bit and admire the two new freedoms, still in swaddling clothes, that were born at this time last year when the general assembly delivered itself of the revolutionary freedom of choice school plan. The law creating these freedoms has just been strengthened and reenacted, without one single adverse vote, which must mean that it is now the settled policy of Virginia.

Few people in this State and fewer still outside this State know that Virginia offers to every child—black child or white child, rich or poor—the individual option of attendance at a public school or a scholarship for use in any qualified private or public school in the entire world, in England, in Switzerland, in, if you please, darkest Ghana.

Involved in this are these individual freedoms:

Freedom of association, by which is meant the individual freedom to associate as one pleases and the individual freedom not to associate as one pleases, the latter of which of course takes precedence because otherwise there is no freedom.

Freedom of education, by which is meant the individual freedom to accept a State-directed education or to arrange a private education. This new freedom marks the first time in American history that a State has given up, voluntarily, its monopoly in education that comes about by the use of educational tax money in public institutions only.

The first of these great freedoms also marks the first instance of State action against the welling movement in this country to dictate the citizen's association in matters of employment, trade, housing, and of course education. An instance of what we mean is the recent action by the New York Antidiscrimination Commission against the employment of British secretaries, which would be laughable were it not so unctuously serious. No fewer than 14 States now have laws denying the individual freedom of choice in real estate, and 4 of them go so far as to force the individual to rent or sell wholly owned private property to anybody.

Before we set out the terms of the new Virginia scholarship law—thus far widely misinterpreted—let us recall the comment by the late Judge John J. Parker on the Supreme Court's decision of 1954. Judge Parker pointed out a distinction never adequately appreciated, that the intention of the Court was to prohibit State-enforced segregation, but not to require State-enforced integration. This must mean that what the Supreme Court really undertook to guarantee back in 1954, without understanding its implications fully at the time, was the indi-

vidual freedom to associate as one pleases—without interference by State, or any other law.

On that premise, Virginia now has stepped aside and allowed her citizens to arrange their private education in any way they want. At the same time other States, misreading the Warren opinion, have been denying this very same individual freedom. Of course a clash will come, and in that clash the Supreme Court will be forced either to yield a State the power to prescribe association—which means either segregation or integration—or to yield the individual the freedom to do as he chooses. The Virginia fight in that contest will be to add to the four famous freedoms of the first amendment which she herself defined—of speech, of press, of religion, of assembly—the new freedoms of association and of education.

Now this, quite obviously, is a tremendous thing. Yet not one single word of it has been reported, let alone commented upon, in the national press. There are two reasons for this:

First is the unfortunate fact that freedom of choice has been badly reported as meaning, in the one case, local option, or alternatively, pupil placement, neither of which has anything whatever to do with it. Because of this reporting, Georgia just lately has been told that the Virginia freedom of choice plan, said to be working so well, was nothing but the North Carolina placement plan. Another common mistake, gleefully repeated by such papers as the Washington Post, is that the Virginia scholarships, erroneously supposed to be geared to segregation situations only, have gone astray, and that the general assembly in its dumbness has given them to everybody.

On top of all this foolishness, from which the Virginia press itself is not blameless, Freedom of Choice just cannot get a hearing in the national press, which is to say the northern press, because the plan grew out of segregation. Here we have a plain instance of guilt by association. In answer we submit that only a put-upon people ever can be expected to come up with anything new, and that the South, challenged in the Toynbee sense, has made its response. Moreover, every single one of our freedoms is soundly based on a defense of those with whom we disagree, even down to the ultimate minority of one. But does the North consider that fact? Hardly.

And, now, the terms of the Scholarship Act itself, which bear repeating because of the importance this act may have for Richmond and other troubled areas this fall:

The State offers out of its own coffers $125 and $150, respectively, to elementary and secondary school pupils. In addition, it guarantees by assessment on localities to make up the difference between these grants and the least of these three amounts: (1) actual tuition cost, (2) locality operating cost, or (3) $250 and $275, respectively. Apart from this, the locality is left free to add to the scholarships whatever it pleases, which means there is no "maximum," although public school operating cost has been the rationale of such places as Charlottesville.

The qualification of private schools is left to the State Department of Education, with this one restriction: the school must be nonsectarian. This is the one legally questionable aspect of the scholarship law and the assembly has taken care of it by adding a section affirming its willingness to give the scholarships to whomsoever a court might decide.

To sum up, Virginia has discovered and agreed to the freedom of association and it has invented the freedom of education to make that first freedom possible. And we are learning to live with these new freedoms. Already the Negro candidate for the Charlottesville City Council has espoused them, and so will everybody else—in time. The reason we know this is that everybody now accepts, no matter his own beliefs, the freedom of speech for other people * * * and we are dealing here with exactly the same fundamental thing.

He Used Tax Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Wilson said, while a professor of history at Princeton, that the power of the Congress to conduct legislative hearings and make investigations was as important as the power to make laws.

This power to investigate has been under criticism of late years largely due to the fact that it has been abused by some legislative committees. One would naturally expect that any group or organization would feel they were being "picked on" when called before a legislative investigating committee.

But over the years, some dangers have become apparent because of the methods and attitude displayed by some investigating committees—for various reasons. It was never intended that these committees should investigate purely for political advantage.

I am sure it was never intended that tax dollars would be used simply to propagandize some theory of government. A few years ago a branch of the Federal Government, the State Department, was accused—and many thought rightfully—of using its appropriations to sell their own theories of foreign affairs to the taxpayers. Taxpayers were being sold a "bill of goods" by the use of their own money.

A great deal of discussion has been had in connection with some investigations that have been conducted recently in regard to high costs of drugs in the pharmaceutical field.

I append hereto an article from the Chattanooga News Free Press in regard to some of the dangers involved in conducting legislative investigations:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Mar. 9, 1960]

HE USED TAX MONEY

Several weeks ago, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, called attention to the fact that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is asking $425,000 of the taxpayers' money for a variety of investigations to be initiated at his whim without approval by the entire Senate Judiciary Committee.

Chattanoogans got a taste the other day of one very questionable phase of the way the tax funds allocated to the Kefauver subcommittee are spent.

To this city came one Paul Rand Dixon, who is counsel and staff director of the Kefauver subcommittee. Mr. Rand did not come here to investigate anything. He did not come to counsel the subcommittee or to direct its staff. His purpose was to appear on a program in which he was asked questions about the drug probe. He used the occasion to continue the one-sided propaganda which has characterized the probe from the beginning.

And who paid Mr. Dixon's expenses to come to Chattanooga and propagandize? He was asked the question. He answered:

"My responsibility is to the subcommittee and I came here at the expense of this group."

In other words, the money of the taxpayers was used to finance the propagandizing appearance of the Kefauver subcommittee counsel and staff director.

He is not an elected public official. He does not represent constituents. He is supposed to develop facts for the Senate. But here we see tax money spent to put him before the public with his tale. And the kind of tales coming from the subcommittee may be seen in the spectacular claim that one drug manufacturer charged a price on one item that gave a profit of 1,118 percent—when the facts, later brought out with much less fanfare, showed the company's base profit was only 12.3 percent. The 1,118 percent figure had been fraudulently arrived at by a process equivalent to a claim that bread ought to cost only half a cent a loaf if that's what the wheat in it cost on the farm.

Democratic process is not being served by the use of tax money to finance propaganda appearances by the salaried counsel of a Senate subcommittee.

"Employment Insurance" Instead of "Unemployment Insurance"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Carroll County Times, published at Westminster, Md., there appeared a well written editorial which, I believe, presents a viewpoint worthy of consideration. It concerns the present use of the terms, "unemployment insurance" and "unemployment office," with the suggestion that we instead should use the terms, "employment insurance" and "employment office." The editorial was written by Mr. Charles Mooshian, editor of the Carroll County Times, a good friend of mine.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—A POSITIVE TITLE FOR A POSITIVE PROGRAM

We have yet to hear of a life insurance agent extoll the virtues of death insurance, yet everyday dedicated employees of the Bureau of Employment Security in Westminster, Md., and around the Nation are subjected to the use of a negative title for a positive program—"unemployment insurance."

To us, no single program, developed during the early days of the New Deal, has benefited the workingman as the (un)employment insurance program, originally designated as unemployment compensation.

Enacted into law along with social security and the strong, vigorous, and close-knit nationwide employment service sys-

tem, these programs gave hope and help to those millions of hard-working Americans struggling out of the depression of the early 1930's.

Fifteen years ago we were part of a crusading group, which insisted on the program being designated as "insurance" rather than "compensation" pointing out the essentials of an insurance program as against compensation.

Gradually, the various States commenced the use of the "insurance" title. It caught on until the majority of the States and the Bureau of Employment Security headquarters in Washington began its use.

We believe the time is ripe for one additional and final change in the title of this positive program. We favor the removal of the two letters "un" from "unemployment", thus making the title "employment insurance."

And, the positive approach in the title will eradicate another pet peeve of ours—that of calling the Employment Service office the "unemployment office." Our colleagues around the Nation are just as guilty of this misnomer as are our uninformed citizens who utilize the services of these two great agencies.

In so doing, the negative word "unemployment" would be used only in interoffice reporting and in newspapers and other publications reporting employment and unemployment statistics.

As in the change from "compensation" to "insurance" the only method of getting the public, press, and other informational media to use the positive title is to use it and use it often. By so doing we can, once and for all, abolish the designation "unemployment office."

We urge our congressional leaders in Washington to use the term "employment insurance" in drafting future amendments to this important law.

A positive program deserves a positive title—"employment insurance."

Operation Big Slam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, Operation Big Slam was another event in our unending determination to be prepared for any eventuality. Ted Gress, editor for the Lebanon Daily News, from Lebanon, Pa., in my congressional district, put down his impressions in the written word as only a newspaperman of his background can do. Not only was he present at Operation Big Slam, but has written many years about the military and has flown with the Military Air Transport Service on numerous occasions. That is why I would attribute an air of authority about his personal writings on the subject and his opinions on MATS.

Mr. Gress' article follows:

OPERATION BIG SLAM CARRIES OVER 20,000 AMERICAN TROOPS, 11,000 TONS OF COMBAT GEAR INTO PUERTO RICO AND BACK AGAIN

(By Ted Gress)

RAMEY AFB, P.R.—Giant Globemaster cargo planes roar in from over the Atlantic Ocean and circle the field in a precise holding pattern. A voice from the control tower gives one the okay to land and it settles down on the long concrete runway like a prehistoric bird.

Within a few minutes after touchdown, the huge nose doors swing open and out roll five military vehicles, including a 2½-ton truck and ambulance.

Shortly after, a C–118 comes roaring in for a landing. Infantrymen loaded with packs and carrying rifles hustle from the plane and are quickly moved from the flight line by trucks.

This is Operation Big Slam, Puerto Pine, largest peacetime military airlift in history.

By the end of this week, more than 20,000 American troops and 11,000 tons of fighting gear will have been flown into Puerto Rico and then flown home again.

Prime purpose of this airlift is to test the ability of the Air Force's Military Air Transport Service (MATS) to rapidly and efficiently move a large ground force to an oversea staging area.

It also is designed to test the readiness and mobility of our Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve troops.

WEATHER CONDITIONS BAD

By the time every soldier and every piece of equipment has been returned to the United States at the end of this week, MATS will have flown more than 100 million ton miles.

And this has been done under weather conditions that veteran pilots described as the worst they have ever encountered.

The success of the operation—and there is every indication already that it is a success—is due mainly to two factors. First, the official operation of MATS, this country's only strategic air lift. Second, the close cooperation between the Air Force, the Army and the Navy.

Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, who commands MATS, personally directed the staff deploying the more than 200 strategic aircraft used in the airlift.

MATS also airlifted 850 members of its own support personnel and equipment to Ramey Air Force Base and to the Roosevelt Roads Naval Air Station at the other end of the island which also was used in the operation. More than 1,150 support personnel also were moved in to other key bases. Some came from as far as Japan.

VALUABLE INFORMATION

Aircraft being used by MATS in the exercise include: Douglas C–133 Cargomasters, Douglas C–124 Globemasters, Douglas C–118 Liftmasters, and Lockheed C–121 Super-Constellations. All are MATS four-engined strategic airlift aircraft, capable of flying either cargo or troops.

MATS expects to obtain valuable information from this operation. This would include: better means of predicting its maximum wartime airlift capability; an evaluation of its ability to maintain sustained wartime operations, and information about the complex logistical and operational problems of quickly airlifting large numbers of fully equipped combat troops.

An impressive fact is that during the exercise MATS is continuing to meet its responsibility for strategic airlift to the United States of Armed Forces overseas.

Typical of the interservice cooperation was that of the Joint Information Task Force operated under command of Lt. Col. Raymond L. Towne, an Air Force officer who is in charge of the MATS public information office at Scott Air Force Base, Ill.

WORK TOGETHER

Colonel Towne drew on the Army and Navy to assist in the project. One of his right-hand men was Maj. Arnold Goldberg, a Pennsylvania reservist called back for an active duty tour. Goldberg in private life is the editor of the Uniontown Standard.

But no matter what insignia was worn by the officers or the enlisted men, they all worked together in the common cause.

They had their hands full, too, with 350 news media representatives coming down to witness this gigantic exercise.

There were also many top ranking dignitaries which meant that press conferences and briefings were held daily. Among the distinguished visitors were Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, Deputy Secretary of Defense James Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force Dudley Sharp, and U.S. Senator Dennis Chavez, Democrat, of New Mexico, head of the Department of Defense Subcommitee, of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

And, of course, generals were a dime a dozen.

BRUCKER IMPRESSED

Secretary Brucker said he was impressed with the operation and declared it to be "worth every cent it cost."

Brucker said cooperation between the Strategic Army Corps (Sirac) and MATS was a practical demonstration of "what each can do if they get together and work in harness."

Operation Big Slam also got a pat on the back from Gen. Bruce C. Clark, commanding general of the Continental Army Command.

"The fact that the exercise has shaken down into a routine procedure is the best indication of its excellence," he observed.

Despite the favorable comments, hovering like a shadow over the entire operation was the knowledge that the planes now being used by the Military Air Transport Service are rapidly becoming obsolete in this jet age.

It was evident to veteran observers that if the United States is to maintain its global activities it will have to update its equipment. MATS is doing an excellent job with what it has, but the time will come when being second best won't be enough. And that day is not too far away.

Problems of the Radio and Television Industry in Recent Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a full-page article which appeared in the New York Times on March 30, under the sponsorship of Broadcasting magazine.

The article deals with the problems that have beset the radio and television industry in recent months. Its central theme is that existing law is sufficient to remedy these problems.

While I do not agree with all of the arguments set forth in the article, I think it poses many points on the thesis of existing law.

I suggest this article as provocative reading for Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT THIS MOMENT TELEVISION AND RADIO ARE IN URGENT NEED OF HELP

They need wise administration from within and wise guidance from without. They have not had enough of either, but right now wise guidance from without is in especially short supply.

Instead of guidance, television and radio are getting abuse; instead of helpful criticism, they are getting vilification. In certain newspapers and magazines broadcast baiting has become an editorial policy. The sure way for a politician to be quoted in those publications is to make a speech denouncing television and radio as the domain of rogues and thieves.

In the Federal Government the prevailing attitude toward broadcasting is punitive when, of all times in broadcasting history, it should be constructive. The Congress and Federal agencies are moving toward the imposition of controls far more rigid than are necessary to correct the defects in television and radio.

Four undesirable conditions in broadcasting have been turned up in Government investigations over the past 3 years:

1. The use of improper influence on members of the Federal Communications Commission by rival applicants for television stations.

2. The rigging of television quiz shows.

3. The acceptance of payola from music interests by performers and other broadcasting employees.

4. The broadcasting of false or misleading advertising.

The extent and seriousness of each of these disorders have been exaggerated. Beyond that the ill-informed assumption has been made that these conditions are symptomatic of general corruption in broadcasting and in the Federal agency that regulates it. The cry is for new laws and new rules that would be more suited to the administration of Alcatraz than to the guidance of communications media engaged in the infinitely complicated job of creating and conveying more entertainment and more information to more people than any other media yet invented.

There are laws enough. If the Government has failed in its regulatory duty, it is not for lack of laws, as the record clearly proves.

IMPROPER INFLUENCE

As a consequence of investigations by the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, a Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has resigned and a member of the FCC has been indicted for violation of existing Federal laws and is awaiting a second trial (his first ended in a hung jury). Under existing laws and regulations the U.S. court of appeals has ordered the FCC to reexamine four contested television station grants, and the FCC, on its own initiative, has ordered rehearings of two others and is investigating at least seven more.

QUIZ RIGGING

The mere disclosure of this practice has forced almost all quizzes off the air. Those that remain are being administered—by broadcasters, not the Government—under controls that make rigging extremely difficult if not impossible. The New York district attorney has asserted that 100 witnesses committed perjury during a grand jury investigation of the subject. If he wishes to put his assertion to a test, he can request indictments under existing New York criminal law.

PAYOLA

The Federal Trade Commission has issued more than 60 complaints against record manufacturers or distributors. The defendants are charged with giving illegal inducements to diskjockeys or other radio station personnel, in violation of existing law. The Federal Communications Commission has begun citing stations for failure to identify the sources of free records, in violation of existing law.

FALSE ADVERTISING

The Federal Trade Commission last November announced an intensified campaign against false or misleading advertising on television. Since then it has issued eight complaints, all charging violations of existing law.

(Two important features of the FTC's campaign against television advertising have been underplayed or ignored in most accounts published in newspapers and magazines and indeed in the FTC's own announcements: 1. Of the eight complaints, only three were directed exclusively to the television advertising of the defendants; the other five also involved advertising in newspapers or magazines or both. 2. In rigorous monitoring of television commercials, the FTC has so far found only eight cases to prosecute. Competent authorities estimate that during a year at least 7,000 different products and services are advertised nationally on television.)

In and out of Government there are vocal critics of broadcasting who are impatient with the orderly prosecution of the wrongful acts that the investigations of influence, rigging, payola and false advertising have disclosed.

These critics want the Government to fix other things that they, the critics, find objectionable. The list of things they want fixed is as long as the list of their personal prejudices.

What each of these critics really wants is a transformation of broadcasting to satisfy his own desires. In this respect, the critics are reflecting, in an exaggerated way, what is probably a universal feeling. It is reasonable to assume that most people have at times wished for more programs of the kinds they like and fewer of the kinds they dislike, just as they have wished for more newspapers, magazines and movies that appeal to them and fewer that displease or bore them.

But most people have better sense than to ask the Government to reshape broadcasting according to their private specifications. They express their discontent by switching to another program or switching off the set. These acts do more to improve the quality of programing than all the powers of the U.S. Government could do.

The main creative energies at work in broadcasting are directed toward the prevention of tuning out or tuning elsewhere. To remain in operation a station must capture and keep an audience. It can do neither without programs that are different from those on competing stations and more appealing than the many nonbroadcast diversions that are available to the public nowadays.

The advocates of government control argue that the present system encourages the production of programs having mass appeal and discourages programing for minorities. They assert that diversity of appeal can be assured only if the Government invokes and enforces program standards. This argument reveals ignorance of broadcasting's current structure and practices.

The creative process at work in the present system is induced and sustained by competition. The search for new programs and for improvements in those already on the air is compelled by the strongest of all instincts, survival. The process often fails, but is regenerated by failure. The more stations there are in competition with one another, the greater is the incentive for each of them to find or create programs that will differ from the others on the air.

In a community that has multiple choices of stations there is no mass audience in the sense that a dominant majority tunes to one station, program after program, day after day. There are minority audiences of infinite complexity tuning in and around and out or not switching on the set at all. The whole constitutes a mass, but the whole is composed of as many minorities as there are programs.

The existing broadcasting system is its own best argument for careful preservation of the liberties under which it has developed. In less than 40 years radio has grown from the idea stage to a complex of 4,107 stations. In only a dozen years a television system of 524 commercial stations has been built.

There are now radio sets in more than 50 million homes, 96.3 percent of all U.S. homes, and television sets in more than 45 million homes, 86.9 percent of all homes. Nobody forced people to buy those sets, and nobody is forcing them to use them.

The proper role for Government in the development of television and radio is the same as its role should be in the development of anything else. It should remove artificial barriers to competition and should guard the public against the crimes or deceptions which there is good reason to proscribe by law.

If the Government moves beyond those limits and into the field of program surveillance or control, the public will be the loser. As Louis Brandeis, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote in 1928:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding."

Office Automation and Employee Job Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service recently held hearings on one of the most important developments affecting the future of Federal employees. I refer to automation through the use of electronic data processing equipment and related electronic devices.

Although the trend toward automation in office work holds great promise of increased efficiency and reduced costs, it presents also a serious threat to employee job security. I was glad to observe, through testimony presented at the hearings held by Mr. Lesinski's subcommittee, that some, at least, of the Federal agencies are cognizant of this threat and are taking steps to meet it through carefully planned programs for employee transfer and retraining. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will do all it can to encourage proper planning so that the benefits of automation can be fully realized at a minimum cost to the loyal and valuable employees on Federal rolls.

An informative article based on the hearings recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal, and I include it as an extension of my remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1960]

CONGRESSMEN WORRY AS AUTOMATION EDGES INTO FEDERAL OFFICES—BUT TREND PUSHES FEW WORKERS OFF ROLLS; AUTOMATIC CHECKS SAVE $2 MILLION A YEAR

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Is Uncle Sam on the way to becoming a mechanical monster? Will

thinking machines someday outnumber people in the Government?

Such questions are, rightly or wrongly, beginning to worry some members of Congress. They fear in part that the Government may take on an Orwellian atmosphere of machine madness as Federal agencies turn to automation. Congressional investigators are finding that two machines are sometimes used where one would do, that 100 copies of a document are run off when 10 might suffice. At one Navy installation, the sleuths say, feeding of unnecessarily detailed inventory and other reports to a newly installed computer produced a documentary surplus that would tower twice as high as the Washington Monument.

What's more, some lawmakers worry that thousands of Federal employees could be thrown out of work by spreading automation. Yet modern machines, though their use in Government has been growing for years now, so far have made only the tiniest dent in the gigantic Federal employment structure.

The House Civil Service Committee, which handles legislation affecting the 2,350,000 civilian Federal employees, is showing particular concern. And now a subcommittee headed by Michigan's Democratic Representative LESINSKI has called in representatives of the Treasury, Post Office Department, and Veterans' Administration to explain at public hearings what steps these agencies are taking to provide work for employees who lose their jobs to faster, more efficient machines.

SHARING STEEL'S PROBLEMS

"The Government is beginning to have the same problem as the steel industry, the railroads and all other industries which are replacing men with machines," declares Representative PORTER, Oregon Democratic member of the subcommittee.

Actually, all signs indicate Government branches are making a determined effort to fit displaced workers into other assignments. In many instances, they're promptly switched to other divisions within their agencies; in other cases, they've been given new jobs in other departments.

Of nearly 900 Treasury employees in New York and Chicago affected by recent automation of savings bond auditing, 25 were shifted to similar work elsewhere and 311 were transferred to other Treasury offices and to other Government agencies; some others got private jobs with Treasury help.

In the Post Office, reports Postmaster General Summerfield, the effect of automation has been to free employees to improve mail service in other ways, rather than to cut employment.

FEW COMPLAINTS

Even when employees are due to be dropped, most agencies try to keep them on as long as feasible and fit them into vacancies which crop up. Individual complaints to Congress have been few.

It's true automation has already brought about some net reductions in personnel. Mechanization of accounting procedures in the General Accounting Office and the Treasury has reduced these agencies' combined manpower requirements by 800 persons. Similar steps in the Federal Reserve banks have lowered needs by 400 persons.

But the total impact of automation on Government employment is scarcely visible. In general, the Federal civilian work force continues to seesaw between 2.3 million and 2.4 million.

Automatic equipment is busily performing a variety of chores for the Government, most of them connected with defense projects. Huge, boxcar-size machines are employed for such projects as computing intricate measurements for rocket and missile firings at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

But the Pentagon doesn't have a monopoly on the machine marvels.

The Treasury is using the very latest in printing techniques to save money in making money. A new platemaking process for manufacturing dollar bills requires only about one-third as many plate printers as were needed a few years ago.

The Post Office is pushing ahead with a program to revolutionize the mail service. Machines to sort and count letters are in operation here in Washington and Detroit, and more are coming.

And Uncle Sam has been saving money. The Treasury estimates its automatic check-writing operation is costing some $2 million a year less than the old method. A modernization of the Washington post office, featuring new mail-handling machines, is bringing savings of $747,000 a year.

University of Wisconsin Reaches Out To Teach on a Campus as Big as State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the University of Wisconsin, one of our great educational institutions—is carrying on one of the most constructive forward-looking programs in America.

Not confined to its campuses, the University—through its extension services—is reaching out to provide opportunity for individuals, in almost all walks of life, to gain greater knowledge in their chosen fields.

What is the scope of this program?

According to the latest figures: 12,000 persons take correspondence courses directly from University of Wisconsin; and 106,000 others take University of Wisconsin correspondence work under the Armed Forces Institute program; over 14,000 persons—many of them adults—attend special courses offered in their home communities; more than 30,000 persons participate in institutes covering projects ranging from bituminous road construction to management's role in politics—sponsored entirely, or in part by the extension division of the university.

In Wisconsin last year, over 715 communities requested and received special services.

In the face of an ever-growing need by our citizens for educational opportunities—even though many of these folks do not have an opportunity to take on campus training—this splendid program, I believe, is a fine example of university efforts to make its programs flexibly available to interested persons—wherever they may work and live.

Currently, the Milwaukee Journal is publishing a series of informative articles by Richard H. Leonard on Wisconsin's "big idea in education" entitled "University of Wisconsin Reaches Out To Teach on a Campus Big as State."

I ask unanimous consent to have a major article of the series printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 27, 1960]

WISCONSIN'S BIG IDEA—UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN REACHES OUT TO TEACH ON A CAMPUS AS BIG AS STATE—THOUSANDS COMPLETE COURSES, ENRICH LIVES IN HOMETOWNS AS "WISCONSIN IDEA" OF SERVICE TO EVERY HOME IS PUSHED

(By Richard H. Leonard)

MADISON, WIS.—The University of Wisconsin campus, thousands of its extension students know, reaches from rich farmlands along the Illinois border to lake-studded counties in the north, from bustling cities on Lake Michigan to quiet villages along the Mississippi.

These extension students, ranging in age from 13 to 84, participate in University of Wisconsin courses and activities away from the ivy-covered buildings on Bascom Hill in Madison and Kenwood Boulevard in Milwaukee.

For some of them, University of Wisconsin is as close as the mailbox to which their correspondence courses are delivered. For others it is no farther than a University of Wisconsin center where they can complete freshman and sophomore courses at low cost while living at home—or a public building in the hometown where University of Wisconsin classes are offered at night.

"THE WISCONSIN IDEA"

Extending university instruction and services to every home in the State is part of a philosophy, more than half a century old, that is known as "the Wisconsin Idea."

How is Wisconsin's big idea working out? Well:

In Campbellsport, a high school boy rushes home in the afternoon, feeds the chickens and then settles down to study a University of Wisconsin correspondence course in German.

At Brillion, university specialists in community development are working with Mayor Clarence Wolf to make the city an even better place in which to live and work.

Marathon County has a bright new college building at Wausau, with facilities rivaling anything in Madison or Milwaukee, where 260 freshmen and sophomores are earning University of Wisconsin academic credits.

The high school bands at La Farge and Readstown are receiving some expert instruction this winter from Prof. Emmett R. Sarig of the University of Wisconsin music faculty.

Pupils at Westby and West Salem High Schools, which do not have foreign language courses of their own, are learning Latin, French, German, Spanish, and Norwegian from lessons and tape recordings sent out from Madison.

The Lake Mills Moravian Men's Club is still chuckling about a humorous lecture on Alaska by Col. Arnold Maahs, a speaker from the University of Wisconsin Lecture and Concerts Bureau.

Union shop stewards in the Beaver Dam area are learning, in a school for workers program, how to present grievances to company officials.

University of Wisconsin courses in engineering are being given right on the campus of La Crosse State College, which does not have engineering courses of its own.

In Milwaukee, Mayor Frank Zeidler has taken more than 70 credits of University of Wisconsin work by correspondence and is now enrolling for a course in sociology.

At Wayland Academy in Beaver Dam, pupils were treated recently to a first-rate performance of "Othello" by the Wisconsin Idea Theater players.

ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX ATTEND CENTERS

How many people actually benefit from this program to extend the university throughout Wisconsin—and beyond its borders to the Nation and the world? The latest figures available at University of Wisconsin show:

Twelve thousand persons taking correspondence courses directly from University of Wisconsin—and 106,000 others taking University of Wisconsin correspondence work under the Armed Forces Institute program.

One thousand nine hundred and fifty-six freshmen and sophomores receiving university instruction at extension centers in Green Bay, Kenosha, Manitowoc, Marinette, Menasha, Racine, Sheboygan, and Wausau.

Fourteen thousand nine hundred and seven persons, many of them adults, attending special courses offered in their home communities—2,414 of them for University of Wisconsin credits and 12,493 in special classes not given for credit.

Thirty thousand two hundred and twenty-nine persons participating in institutes, covering topics ranging from bituminous road construction to management's role in politics, sponsored entirely or in part by the extension division in the last year.

Seven hundred and fifteen communities in Wisconsin requesting and receiving special services in the last year.

Wisconsin's idea of making the boundaries of the State the boundaries of the campus began to develop in 1860 when Chancellor Henry Barnard started a lecture series for teachers in the State. It grew in 1885 when the board of regents established short courses for farmers.

Probably the first formal reference to extension work was made in the university catalog of 1888, which said:

"This embraces two cooperative phases. First, original investigations and experimentation for the purpose of discovering and proving new truths, and second, a series of publications and a system of local professional institutes, by means of which certain available aspects of latest knowledge are communicated directly to the people."

The idea was expanded in 1891 with the formal acceptance of correspondence study as part of the curriculum. Then, at the turn of the century, Robert M. La Follette became Governor, Charles McCarthy became State legislative reference librarian and Charles R. Van Hise became president of University of Wisconsin.

SERVICE TO THE STATE

The combined influence of these men gave vigor to the movement to take the university to the people of the State, and to make use of university experts in framing legislation and administering the State.

At the inauguration of Van Hise in 1904, the university celebrated its 50th commencement by striking a medal inscribed: "Commemorating 50 Years of Service to the State."

This service to the State concept was crystallized in the minds of many and later, it is difficult to say exactly when, was referred to as the Wisconsin idea.

"I shall never rest content," Van Hise declared in a 1904 speech to the Wisconsin Press Association, "until the beneficent influences of the university are made available to every home in the State."

TOO MUCH CANNOT BE SAID

Two years later, Van Hise told the regents, "Too much cannot be said as to the importance of university extension under which the university goes out to the people."

The regents responded with a sizable budget for extension work and that year, 1906, is counted by University of Wisconsin as the true beginning of the Wisconsin idea in education.

In the years that followed, educators from other States came to Wisconsin to study its extension program and to adapt it for their own purposes.

The famed writer Lincoln Steffens said in a letter to Van Hise:

"When you stop to look beyond your own State you must find no little personal satisfaction in the thought that you are leading not only your neighbors but the whole round world."

So much for history. In future articles we will, among other things, visit correspondence students with unusual stories to tell, travel the twisting roads of southwestern Wisconsin with an extension fieldman, attend an extension center and tell of the university's role in promoting the arts throughout Wisconsin.

In Support of Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of our leading agricultural economists is Prof. George E. Brandow of Penn State. He recently participated in a farm forum in Des Moines, Iowa, and the summary of his remarks is that the party in power since 1953 has had very little to do with the economic ills that beset agriculture.

Numerous other references were made to the farm policy debate, and for that reason I ask that the Chicago News report of February 23 by farm writer George Thiem be made a part of these remarks:

BENSON DEFENDED ON FARM POLICIES
(By George Thiem)

DES MOINES, IOWA.—Economic conditions, not Secretary of Agriculture Benson, were responsible for the steady drop in farm prices since 1952, an eastern farm expert told the National Farm Conference here.

Prof. George E. Brandow, agricultural economist at Pennsylvania State University, said Benson's critics have put far too much blame on his shoulders.

"In a way it was unfortunate there was a change in administrations in 1952," said Brandow, "for the economic situation changed fast after that. Politics or the party in power had nothing to do with it."

When the Korean fire died, he explained, war scare buying stopped and the propensity to expand farm output began.

High price supports were continued by Congress at a time when reduced acreage, lower prices and less use of fertilizers would have prevented an excess piling up of surpluses.

The audience applauded Brandow enthusiastically.

Lauren Soth, Des Moines newspaperman, remarked: "People whose only farm program has been anti-Benson are going to have to get a new one in about a year."

There was unanimous agreement by a score of speakers that the U.S. agricultural plant has been expanded far beyond the opportunity for profitable markets.

Prof. J. Carroll Bottum, of Purdue University, suggested shifting 60 million acres of the 450 million total in plowland to grass and trees.

He testimated such a shift of 13 percent would cut production by 5 to 7 percent—the approximate annual accumulation of surpluses the last 8 years.

He conceded that more poor than rich land would go into soil conserving crops.

What It's Like in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, since Hawaii has been admitted as the 50th and newest State in the Union, people from the mainland have been asking more questions than ever before about "What it's like in Hawaii." In order to make some of these answers readily available, I ask unanimous consent that material on this subject prepared by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material entitled, "What It's Like in Hawaii," was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII

Hawaii is composed of five major islands (Oahu, Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, and Molokai), located in the Pacific Ocean 2,100 miles from San Francisco. Not only has Hawaii the distinction of being the youngest State in the Union, but her estimated civilian population of 597,910 is one of the youngest in the United States, the median age being 24.5 years as compared to the national average of 30.1 years.

HONOLULU

The capital city, Honolulu, is situated on the island of Oahu and is the hub of activity for government, commerce, and industry in the islands. It is a bustling, clean, modern American community with one of the highest per capita incomes in the Nation. The population of the city of Honolulu proper is estimated at 321,583 while some 144,819 persons reside in outlying areas. In addition, 56,000 military personnel are based in, or near, Honolulu.

Modern stores and shops offer a full range of both nationally advertised and locally manufactured merchandise. Added variety is gained by imports from the Orient.

Adjacent to Honolulu are two locations of worldwide renown: (1) Pearl Harbor, the Nation's largest naval base and headquarters for the combined military commands of the Pacific and Far East, and (2) Waikiki Beach, the operational center of Hawaii's tourist industry. It is because of the fame of these areas that Honolulu is so often referred to as "Hawaii" by mainlanders.

WEATHER

One of Hawaii's chief assets is her mild and temperate climate, relatively free of uncomfortable extremes. Tropical storms are not encountered. During an average year, there are 106 clear, 162 partly cloudy, and 97 cloudy days. The mean temperature over a 20-year period is 75.1 degrees with August as the hottest month. The average annual rainfall is 24 inches with December through March as the wettest months.

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS

No passport or inoculation (except for military personnel and their dependents) is required for travel between Hawaii and other parts of the Union.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Oahu is classified as a tight labor market area. This situation exists because of the lack of diversified industries and the relative immobility of the work force. Therefore, employment service officials advise that "the chances of getting a job in Honolulu in most occupations are slim."

Civil service positions with the State and county governments require 3 years of residence in Hawaii. Such also is the case of the public utilities. Although there is no residential requirement with the Federal Civil Service, the local regional office confines its hiring to those already established in the islands.

Private employers hesitate to employ personnel who are not available for an interview. For those coming to the islands in search of employment, the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu cautions that you have sufficient funds for return transportation in the event you are unsuccessful in locating suitable work.

Mainland students or others seeking "summer jobs" are cautioned that seasonal positions being few, they are adequately filled by local residents.

Information in these fields is obtainable from the following agencies, all located in Honolulu:

General employment, State employment service, 825 Mililani Street.

Federal employment, U.S. Civil Service, Federal Building.

Hotel, restaurant, and bar, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders' Union, 420 John Ena Road.

Organized labor, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 212 McCandless Building.

Construction, General Contractors Association, 1410 Kapiolani Boulevard.

Laws, Bar Association of Hawaii, Lewis, Buck & Saunders, Post Office Box 3117.

Real estate, Honolulu Realty Board, 934 Fort Street.

Teaching, Department of Public Instruction, Post Office Box 2360.

Specific information for, accountants, barbers, beauty operators, chiropractors, dentists, professional engineers, architects and land surveyors, doctors, nurses, opticians, osteopaths, pharmacists, and veterinarians may be obtained from Department of Treasury and Regulations, Post Office Box 3469 Honolulu, Hawaii.

WAGES

The 1960 survey of pay rates by the Hawaii Employers Council reveals the following average monthly full wage range for all industry as: Senior typist, $200–$425; stenographer, $170–$491; secretary, $175–$600; staff nurse, $275–$405; medical laboratory technician, $225–$490; licensed civil engineer, $500–$1,000; unskilled laborer, $1.00–$2.35 per hour.

TAXES

All Federal taxes are applicable in Hawaii. The State personal income tax follows the national pattern generally. Personal net income tax rates graduate from 3 percent on the first $500 to 9 percent on incomes in excess of $30,000.

The State levies a 3½-percent tax on retail goods and services (sales tax) and there are taxes on gasoline, liquor, tobacco, insurance premiums, public utilities, financial corporations, corporate income, and inheritance.

Each county sets its own rate for real property taxation within the limit prescribed by the State legislature. There are no municipal taxes or direct school tax, but a general excise tax is levied on gross income, and gross receipts or gross proceeds of sales on all business activities.

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

It is not practical for the chamber to offer advice concerning investment possibilities and opportunities for establishing or operating specific types of enterprises in Hawaii.

It is recommended that anyone interested in establishing a business in Hawaii first personally investigate local conditions before making a final decision or entering into definite financial obligations.

A statistical publication, "Hawaii Facts and Figures," with detailed, current information on many facets of the State's economy, is available from the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu for $1 per copy, including air-mail postage.

TRANSPORTATION

Major airlines and water carriers provide transportation to any major city of the Pacific coast, the Orient, and Australia practically on an any hour of the day or night basis. The five major islands of the Hawaiian chain are linked by two airlines which provide a schedule of daily service. A public transit system connects all sections of the city of Honolulu.

HOUSING

For those planning to establish new homes in Hawaii, housing authorities warn that because of the "low vacancy rate and high turnover," newcomers must be prepared to pay higher rentals than long-term tenants. In the better residential areas of Honolulu, furnished studio apartments will command from $115 to $165 a month. It is difficult to rent an unfurnished apartment or to purchase or rent a "small" house. The average cost of an unfurnished three bedroom home varies form $14,500 to $27,500 and this on lease land. There are no trailer courts or sites for "mobile" homes.

Information regarding real estate sales and rentals or real estate licenses is obtainable from: Honolulu Realty Board, 934 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Military families wishing to locate accommodations on Oahu are advised to contact: the Office of Armed Services Community Housing, APO 958, San Francisco, Calif.

COST OF LIVING

Hawaii's cost of living, while generally following trends similar to mainland indexes, is slightly higher in some respects because of the extra costs involved in transporting goods from the mainland. However, this is somewhat offset by the absence of heating fuel costs, and seasonal clothing requirements.

Utility rates (gas, water, electricity, and telephone) are determined by the Public Utilities Commission and are comparable to those of many cities. Modern appliances and conveniences are found in most homes. More than 70 percent if island families have television sets.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Islanders own more than 202,000 automobiles—better than 1 car to every 2.8 persons. All standard model cars, and many foreign made automobiles and repair parts are available. The cost of operating an automobile is slightly higher than on the mainland. The price of gasoline is approximately 40 cents a gallon with high-test gas costing about 43 cents.

To operate an automobile with mainland license plates, owners must present a State registration card and shipping receipt to the Treasurer's Office, City and County of Honolulu for a nonresident permit within 10 days after date of entry of the automobile.

Persons holding a mainland driver's license may operate motor vehicles for 90 days before obtaining a resident license.

SCHOOLS

The department of public instruction operates 111 public schools from kindergarten through high school, including technical and special training facilities on Oahu. As a special service, a number of community schools for adults and special schools designed for the care of retarded children and the deaf and dumb are also conducted.

Private and parochial schools number 139 from kindergarten through high school. In addition, there are a number of business institutes and vocational schools offering specialized training. Inquiries about the Hawaii public and private schools should be directed to: Department of Public Instruction, Post Office Box 2360, Honolulu, Hawaii.

The University of Hawaii, an accredited land-grant college is the largest institution of higher learning. The best source for information about the courses of study and academic requirements is: Registrar, University of Hawaii, Honolulu 14, Hawaii.

CHURCHES

Practically every religious sect and denomination can be found in the islands. There are 400 Protestant churches, 115 Catholic parishes, more than 100 Buddhist temples, and a Jewish synagogue in the State.

The Honolulu Council of Churches, Post Office Box 337, Honolulu, is the agency to contact for information concerning religious activities in Hawaii.

PET QUARANTINE

The islands are free of rabies and to continue to remain so, the Department of Agriculture requires all cats and dogs brought into Hawaii to be quarantined for a period of 120 days. A boarding charge of 75 cents per day for dogs and 50 cents for cats is levied at the State-operated quarantine kennels.

Inquiries pertaining to pets and plant life should be referred to: Department of Agriculture and Forestry, Post Office Box 5425, Honolulu, Hawaii.

MARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS

The legal age to marry in Hawaii is 20 years. However, a male may be married at 18 and a female at 16 if there is written consent. The State also requires a 3-day waiting period and a serology (blood) test before the marriage license is issued. The fee for the license is $5. Anyone who has any questions concerning Hawaii's marriage and divorce regulations should write directly to: State Department of Health, Kapuaiwa Building, Honolulu, Hawaii.

HOSPITALS

The newest State's enviable health record is attributable in part to its ideal climate, also to its excellent hospitals, outstanding medical profession, and stringent health laws. Registered with the State department of health are 25 general hospitals, also those institutions which offer special facilities for treatment of tuberculosis, Hansen's, mental, and chronic diseases.

NEWS

The two leading daily newspapers are: Morning: The Honolulu Advertiser, Post Office Box 3310, Honolulu, Hawaii; approximate monthly subscription rate to mainland, $2.25, regular mail, $18.75, air mail. Evening: The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Post Office Box 3080, Honolulu, Hawaii; approximate monthly subscription rate to mainland, $2.25, regular mail, $20, air mail.

There are also several weekly and monthly publications, plus 15 radio and 3 television stations in Hawaii, most of them located in Honolulu.

OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Business: Department of Economic Development, 1124 Miller Street, Honolulu; Department of Business Research, Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu; Economic Research Department, Bishop National Bank, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Neighbor islands: Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce, Hilo, Hawaii; Maui Chamber of Commerce, Wailuku, Maui; Kauai Chamber of Commerce, Lihue, Kauai; Molokai Chamber of Commerce, Kaunakakai, Molokai.

TRAVEL TO HAWAII

Most mainland travel agents can supply information on travel to Hawaii or can refer

such requests to mainland headquarters of the following: Hawaii Visitors Bureau, American President Lines, Matson Navigation Co., Pan American Airways, United Airlines, Northwest Air Lines.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Most school and public libraries contain encyclopedias and other reference books with general information about Hawaii. The "Reader's Guide" is suggested as a source for current magazine articles.

The American Medical Association Rebuts Labor's Demagogery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks considerable information has been made available exposing the role of the labor boss in seeking to force our aged into compulsory total retirement and to make our senior citizens totally dependent on the Federal Government for their subsistence. The labor leaders of our Nation have dedicated their political endeavors to making our aged subject to the dictates of a Federal bureaucracy.

One of the steps they have taken to distract public attention from this basic objective of enslavement of the aged has taken the form of a totally unwarranted attack on the American Medical Association and its membership.

Mr. Speaker, I submit my considered judgment that if labor had done as much for our aged as America's doctors have done, the senior citizens of our Nation would today be much better off than they are.

Labor's attack on the AMA took the form of a political memo issued by the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education, which is the propaganda apparatus of the labor bosses and the Americans for Democratic Action. This political memo was issued on February 1, 1960, and resorted to the most brazen demagoguery in attacking the AMA.

Dr. Henry I. Fineberg, in an article in the Long Island Press on Sunday, April 3, 1960, commented on medicine's reply to this unwarranted attack. At this point in the RECORD I will include Dr. Fineberg's column:

THE DOCTOR'S CORNER—AMA HEAD REPLIES TO LABOR

(By Dr. Henry I. Fineberg)

We are certain that most people, who have kept up with the status of the Forand bill, know that labor, in general, is in favor of the measure.

Recently, AFL–CIO officials, in an effort to win support for Forand-type legislation, attacked the American Medical Association, its 178,000 member-physicians and its affiliated State and county medical societies. This assault has aroused the physicians. The AMA president, Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., in an issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, has answered the charges that the AMA in past years has opposed beneficial health measures. Of course, that isn't so.

Dr. Orr refutes these allegations: that a generation ago, the American Medical Association, opposed the requirement that all cases of tuberculosis be reported to a public authority; that the AMA was against smallpox vaccination, immunization against diptheria, venereal disease clinics, tuberculosis and cancer clinics, blood banks, Medicare (the care of dependents of servicemen) and various other items.

The American Medical Association has advocated the reporting of all cases of tuberculosis since 1899 and as recently as 1944. The AMA has campaigned for compulsory smallpox vaccination since 1863. For over 80 years, our national medical society has cooperated with public health agencies for the prevention of contagious diseases. It has never opposed immunization against diptheria, whether it is done by private physicians or public health officials.

Back in 1874, the AMA took official action to fight venereal disease. We have never been against the creation of free diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer. As a matter of fact, we have cooperated in every way possible in this direction. The AMA has worked very closely with our Federal Government in providing medical care for the dependents of men in the Armed Forces, under the Medicare program.

It can be said without reservation that the AMA has participated in countless important projects designed for the welfare of the public and for the furtherance of medical science.

WDSU–TV, Winner of Television Highest Award for Editorial Policy, Comments on Penalties for Retired Officers Selling to the Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, last year WDSU–TV, New Orleans, La., was honored by the Radio Television News Directors Association, in cooperation with the Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University "in recognition of distinguished achievement in broadcast journalism."

In connection with the presentation of the award, the opinion of the judges was stated as follows:

Our first choice in the TV competition is WDSU–TV, New Orleans. We were all enormously pleased by the editorials submitted. They were professional, they were important, they were concrete, they were done with good taste and integrity, and they indicated a basic courage on the part of the station management.

On last Friday night Bill Monroe, news chief and editorial writer for WDSU–TV, wrote for broadcasting a timely and current editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HÉBERT VERSUS BRASSHAT SALESMEN

(The following editorial was broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU radio on April 1, 1960.)

Congressman EDDIE HÉBERT, of Louisiana's First District, has a battle ahead of him in Washington next week. He is pushing a proposal in the House of Representatives to cut down on influence peddling by retired admirals and generals.

Last year HÉBERT's subcommittee found that almost 1,500 retired military officers have taken jobs with big defense contractors. In some cases they have quit their military jobs on one day, then on the next day, at a fat salary, gone to work for a private company selling its products to their old friends in the Defense Department.

Even if there is no out-and-out dishonesty involved, this inevitably builds up a smog of suspicion over the whole multibillion-dollar process of defense spending. The taxpayers have a right to wonder, under such circumstances, to what extent their money is being spent to strengthen the country and to what extent it's being passed around among old friends.

Congressman HÉBERT wants to make it illegal for former officers to sell anything to the Defense Department for a 2-year period after they retire. Penalty: $10,000 and 1 year in jail.

A few months ago the entire Armed Services Committee of the House unanimously approved this idea. But later the powerful committee chairman, Congressman VINSON, apparently changed his mind. VINSON got a majority on the committee to approve a meaningless bill with no criminal penalties. So, to put the teeth back into the measure, HÉBERT is going to have to offer an amendment of his own containing the penalties.

The Louisiana Congressman's proposal would simply apply to military men the same principle now applied to certain civilians retiring from Government service. It would protect the taxpayer's dollar and the reputation of high officers. We hope he wins his battle.

The Case of the Disappearing Money, or Why Financial Writers Rise With the Government Bond Market or Vice Versa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks the Government bond market has been rising rather nicely. Interest rates have not been brought down to any major extent, but they have been eased somewhat.

Only a month ago the administration and the Federal Reserve were still waging an allout campaign to have Congress remove the traditional 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds. At that time both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were taking the position that if the Treasury attempted to sell any new bonds, it would push the yields on bonds already outstanding above 4¼ percent, and the bonds could not be sold.

The Treasury has, as we know, had a change of heart and is now offering up to $1.5 billion of a new 4¼ percent bond to mature in 25 years. This offer has not driven bond prices down as we were told that it would. On the contrary, the outstanding bonds most nearly comparable to the new issue rose by eight thirty-seconds of a dollar yesterday. This is the

Treasury 3¼'s of 1985, which, according to the Wall Street Journal this morning, were being bid yesterday at 86$^{24}/_{32}$, which would yield the buyer 4.11 percent. In other words, market yields on the 25-year bond yesterday were considerably lower than the 4.25 percent at which the new bond is being offered.

Why are Government bond prices now rising? The explanation we hear on all sides is that it is because the stock market is declining, and investors are putting their money into bonds rather than into stocks.

For example, a feature story carried by the Wall Street Journal yesterday puts it this way:

> The bond market has been winning investors away from the stock market. Stock prices surged to record highs at the end of 1959, buoyed by widespread forecasts of sharp gains in corporate sales and earnings in 1960. Since then, however, doubts have grown that this will quite measure up to the forecasts. In this atmosphere of uncertainty, many investors have been marking time by putting funds into bonds and other fixed income securities, rather than stocks.
>
> The enthusiasm for stocks in 1959 pushed prices so high that dividend yields in many cases sank below the yields available on bonds of comparable quality—in some cases to 1 percent or below.

And so on. This happy little explanation is what I call the "Case of Disappearing Money." It is based on a premise that money invested in stock somehow disappears. Normally we might think that when Mary Smith buys stocks from John Brown, John Brown will then have the money to invest in bonds or to put in the bank, in which case it will either be invested in bonds or free some third party's money for investment in bonds. But the financial writers obviously have a different theory, their theory being that when people are putting more money into the stock market, and thus driving stock prices up, that money somehow evaporates.

My point is the public is treated to all kinds of nonsensical explanations about money and financial markets. It seems to matter not to the explainers that their explanations today contradict the explanation of yesterday.

The "Case of the Disappearing Money" is exactly comparable with Chairman MARTIN'S recent boast which suggests that the high interest rates of last year brought about and stimulated a record increase in savings. This suggestion, which is now being reported as fact by some of the financial writers, rests merely on the fact that combined purchases last year of interest-bearing and dividend paper by individuals and nonbanking companies reached an alltime high.

Chairman MARTIN'S original statement on this matter—the one which made the headlines—was given before the Joint Economic Committee early in February. The extraordinary bit of news which he gave at that time was stated as follows:

> The activity last year of the nonbank public—meaning for the most part consumers and business concerns—in supplying borrowers with funds through the process of investment was truly extraordinary, and it did not stop with the purchase of Government securities sold by the banking system. The upswing in this activity shows up strikingly in the flow-of-funds data that I mentioned earlier. There, it appears that consumer and business investors increased the net amount of their purchases made directly in securities markets from about $4 billion in 1958 to almost $20 billion in 1959—a jump of 400 percent in a single year.
>
> The efficient and economically healthy flow of funds from savers to borrowers, directly and through intermediaries, did not come about without a price. The price was, of course, a rise in interest rates. These rates, representing a penalty to those who use someone else's money and a reward to those who save and risk their funds in loans and investments, rose in some instances to the highest levels in three decades. What happened is readily apparent: the pressure of demand for funds arising from a combination of forces converged to bring about a competition to borrow that drove interest rates upward; the rise in interest rates, in turn, operated to induce the savings and investment necessary to supply borrowing demands.

This statement comes very close to saying categorically that the high interest rates of last year were caused by an unusually high demand for credit, and, further, that the high interest rates of last year brought about an unusually large volume of savings. We need not debate the question whether the statement actually says these things or only suggests them. We need point out only that on the basis of the available evidence, what the statement suggests is contrary to fact.

Yes, there was an unusually large purchase of securities by the nonbank public, but what does this mean? It simply means that after the Federal Reserve drove the yield on 91-day Treasury bills up to astronomical heights, many nonbank corporations withdrew their demand deposits from the banks and put the funds into these short-term bills. But this does not mean that business firms and individuals saved any more of their incomes than in previous years, nor that the same funds would have not been invested in Treasury bills if the funds had been left in the commercial banks.

When interest yields on short-term Treasury bills are low, as they normally are, the industrial and utility corporations do not bother to draw their working funds out of the bank to invest them in these bills. Rather, they leave their working funds in demand deposits in the commercial banks and the banks use these funds to invest in the short-term bills.

But when the rate on Treasury bills goes very high, the nonbank corporations find it worth their while to take funds out of demand deposits, where they draw no interest, and put these funds into these bills. They can buy bills which mature in 3 months, 1 month, 1 week, or in any number of days they choose. In other words, they can buy a bill which will mature and return their cash at the time the cash is needed in corporate operations.

But does the fact that the nonfinancial corporations reduced their demand deposits with the commercial banks and bought more Treasury bills, because of the high interest rates, mean that more money was saved and less spent? Or does it mean that the demand for credit was greater last year than in previous years? It does not.

The flow of funds data which Chairman Martin has referred to as his basis for suggesting these things do not support his suggestions. These data, which are available only for the first 9 months of 1959, indicate that national savings last year, both on a net basis and on a gross basis, was a smaller percentage of the national income than was true in the years 1955, 1956, and 1957. Similarly, these data indicate that the demand for investment funds was a lesser percentage of national income last year than in the previous years I have mentioned, plus probably many other earlier years.

In other words, the high level of interest rates which the Federal Reserve maintained throughout the whole of last year simply meant that this Nation paid a higher price for the same amount of savings that would have been made in any case.

Why have Government bond prices gone up and interest rates gone down? I suggest that neither the theories advanced by the financial writers nor by the Federal Reserve people explain it.

It is not because stock prices have come down, because when one person buys stock from another, the money does not disappear.

And it is not because the Federal Reserve has now decided to encourage the American people to spend more and save less, for the simple reason that the Federal Reserve has had no luck whatever in changing this Nation's savings habits by raising or lowering interest rates.

The main reason that bond prices have improved and interest rates have gone down is that the political weather has been improving. It has been becoming more and more evident that Congress will not repeal the 4¼ percent ceiling on Government bonds, and it is becoming more and more evident to the people who buy most of the Government bonds that the long-term outlook is for a policy of more moderate interest rates. Their expectations of higher interest rates have declined and, inevitably, interest rates themselves have declined.

South Dakota—Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota continues to be a land of opportunity for young and old alike. Blessed with many natural resources, a stimulating climate, rich soils, and energetic, patriotic people, our State looks forward to the decade of the sixties with confidence and optimism. We invite to join us all good citizens seeking new challenges and new ventures in this growing State which still remains uncrowded and unspoiled.

An editorial in the Aberdeen American-News, published in Aberdeen, S. Dak., reflects the spirit and the confidence of the forward looking folks of this great State, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Aberdeen American-News, Mar. 27, 1960]

SIXTIES CAN BE GOOD FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota leaders and leaders in the Nation are looking forward optimistically to the decade just getting underway.

They expect the sixties to provide opportunity for individuals to continue the development of the resources of the United States. Some are saying this 10-year period will be known as the "Soaring Sixties." Others say it will be the "Sensational Sixties."

These leaders are encouraged by the years of peace. And with the peace has been a prosperity that, during times of peace, has never been matched.

It is good to hear from persons with faith in their State and faith in their Nation.

They offer relief from the faultfinders and those who blame the Government for what they don't like and at the same time look to the Government for more regulation of their daily lives.

South Dakota has two new developments on which to pin hopes for improvement.

One is well along its way. It is the Missouri River program which will be responsible for many benefits during this decade. It will give South Dakota a vast amount of water for multiple uses. And it will add to the supply of electricity as well as control floods and provide possibility for river navigation.

The economic values already felt will multiply many times in the years ahead.

A second major development that is anticipated during this new 10-year period is oil.

There is evidence that the same underground collection formations, that have helped North Dakota to rise to the 10th State in the Nation in oil reserve, exist in South Dakota.

The oil industry is aware of this. In due time there will be sufficient drilling of holes to locate the South Dakota reservoirs.

Progress in both of these fields—river development and oil exploration—will take some of the burden off farming as the State's leading industry while efforts are being made to assist agriculture in making adjustments in line with the changing conditions.

There is cause for optimism and it is good there are leaders in South Dakota who can see the good in the future.

Goldwater for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following is the headlines and lead paragraph of The State, Columbia, S.C.:

STATE REPUBLICANS ENDORSE GOLDWATER

U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, yesterday stampeded the South Carolina Republican Convention here and won support as a presidential candidate.

The tall rangy Arizonian chopped into liberals who, he said, wish to wreck the Constitution in order to enforce civil rights.

The following is from National Review of April 9, 1960:

It is generally assumed that conservative sentiment has no organizational or even personal vehicle around which to build, and that continues largely to be true. But the phenomenon of BARRY GOLDWATER may change that.

Last week, the Republican Convention in South Carolina heard Senator GOLDWATER deliver the keynote address. He championed (1) States rights; (2) decentralization of political and economic power; and (3) a conservative program for the GOP: "The right of center is the only place the Republican Party can stand today if it intends to win in 1960 and subsequent elections." The convention then voted to instruct South Carolina's 13 delegates to vote for GOLDWATER at the Chicago convention until such time as GOLDWATER releases them.

This astonishing fissure in the NIXON monolith within the Republican Party was widely and scandalously unreported in the major metropolitan newspapers.

The following is from Human Events dated Thursday, April 7, 1960:

The press has generally failed either to mention or to comment on the South Carolina action in favor of GOLDWATER for President. This press attitude confirms charges that Human Events has made. Last week, in an article "Enemy Columnists Hope To 'Help' GOP," James L. Wick, executive publisher of Human Events, ironically described how for many years "liberal" commentators and editorialists have sought to persuade Republican candidates that, to win, the latter should turn "liberal."

Today, they write similarly in respect to NIXON. This sort of performance (if NIXON continues to fall for it) might well—as in the case of Dewey and Willkie—result in a Democratic victory next fall. Such an outcome, of course, is just what the "liberal" men in the press seek to bring about.

No surprise, therefore, that these left-wing scribes have almost totally ignored the news from South Carolina, which by any standard should rate as news. Obviously, they give it "the silent treatment" for they fear NIXON may heed the portent. And they continue their game of polishing a "liberal image" of NIXON, so as to defeat him next November. As one observer put it this week, "The same old poisoned breakfast food is on the table every morning in the editorial pages of the paper."

Mr. Speaker, for a generation the American people have been denied a choice in presidential elections. Both parties nominated a liberal-radical, consequently millions upon millions refused to vote. Only 51 percent of our eligible voters went to the polls in 1948. They had no choice. Both candidates and platforms were pledged to more spending, high taxes, and socialism. The same was largely true in 1952 and 1956. This year if either party should nominate a forthright leader like Senator BARRY GOLDWATER or Senator DICK RUSSELL, that party would win. There is growing evidence the people may have a choice in 1960.

Toole County Student Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am taking this opportunity to direct the attention of my colleagues here in the Senate to an experiment in juvenile court. In Shelby, Mont., the Toole County Student Court of the Ninth Judicial District sits in judgment on law violators of their own age group.

The first court met February 17, 1959, and tried four cases. All who appeared pleaded guilty. Most who come before the court have been arrested for traffic violations by the highway patrol. Others are charged with curfew infractions by city police and some are accused of possessing alcoholic beverages.

This experiment has proven to be highly successful and the reason for the court's effectiveness was aptly described by State Highway Patrolman Gordon McDermid, when he said "Trying juveniles before a student court has great impact because teenagers do not like to show up badly before their own age group."

I ask unanimous consent to have a feature article from the magazine section of the Great Falls Tribune, March 6, 1960 printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Mar. 6, 1960]

STUDENT COURT AT SHELBY HEARS JUVENILE CASES

(By Clyde Reichelt)

SHELBY.—The Toole County Student Court of the Ninth Judicial District was in session.

The teenager settled uneasily into the chair facing a panel of serious youngsters from his own high school. Quickly he took the wad of gum from his mouth and straightened his already tidy hair with a nervous hand, for facing classmates about to judge your conduct does not induce a comfortable feeling.

A minute before he had been escorted into the courtroom by the bailiff, Gene O'Hara, a freshman. Then Verna Steyee, clerk of court, and a junior in Shelby's high school, had read the charges and he had signed a statement which read:

"I, the undersigned, do swear to tell the truth, being cited into this court to answer to the charge stated below. I hereby agree to waive all rights to appearance before a regular court of law, and to obey the findings, and penalties set by this court.

"I understand that such findings and penalties can be appealed to the ninth judicial district probation officer for Toole County."

Then he had given his driver's license to the bailiff.

As he settled into the chair, the moderator, Bill Greenup, read the charge: Failure to stop for a stop sign.

"Do you plead guilty or not guilty?"

"Guilty," was the answer.

Now the panel began shooting questions to determine the degree of guilt.

"Were you ever arrested before?"

"Yes."

"How fast were you driving when you went through the sign?"

"I don't know; about 35, I guess."

"Didn't you see the sign?"

"No."

After the questioning the bailiff escorted the boy out of the courtroom and the panel fell to discussing the degree of guilt and punishment.

The court panel decided to suspend the youth's driver's license and issue him a probationary license for 90 days. This meant that if he was caught in any traffic violation within that period his license would be suspended. In addition the boy was to prepare a 5-minute talk on reasons for stopping for a stop sign and present it before the panel at the next court session.

"Does the probation officer concur?" Greenup called. Mrs. Blanche Severson, Toole County probation officer, who was sitting in the audience, concurred.

Then the teenager was brought back before the court and Greenup read the penalty. The boy's driver's license was kept and sent with the court docket to Montana Highway Patrol headquarters in Helena which later sent the youth a probationary license.

Punishments vary to fit the crime. One girl who panicked and left the scene of an accident after sideswiping a car had to give an oral report on why one should never leave the scene of an accident. She also had her driver's license suspended.

A boy who was arrested for having liquor in his car made an oral report on alcoholism and another who was brought before the court for failing to dim his lights, in addition to other penalties, had to prepare a talk on why motorists should dim their lights when meeting other vehicles.

Forty-six cases were tried from February 1959, through last December. Fifteen of the cases concerned boys or girls who appeared on charges more than once. Only one case was referred from the student court to the Ninth Judicial District juvenile judge, W. M. Black.

The idea of a student court here originated with Duane Tooley, former Shelby policeman and Montana Highway Patrol examiner. Since its start, however, Mrs. Severson has called it to session and overseen its operation.

She enjoys her duties. She likes to help the boys and girls.

"The philosophy of the court is to help youngsters become better citizens—not only those who appear before the panel, but those who take part in the court as well," she said.

Organizing the court took the time and patience of several groups as well as individuals. Judge Black's approval was the first secured and the Toole County Juvenile Committee agreed it sounded like a good plan.

Mrs. Severson met with Tooley and Sgt. Al Buck, also of the Montana Highway Patrol, to decide which violators should appear before the student court and what the penalties should be.

Then the plan was taken to the superintendent of the Shelby schools, D. L. Johnson, and the principal of the high school, Don Driscoll. Both gave hearty approval.

After that the plan was presented to the most important group of all, the high school student body. The students grasped the idea with enthusiasm and decided the court's panel should consist of the members of the student council with the student body president as moderator. Each class also elected an alternate who sits in with the panel on all cases if he or she wishes to, and who is available if the regular member should be absent.

The first court met February 17, 1959, and tried four cases. All who appeared pleaded guilty or were found guilty. Most who come before the court have been arrested for traffic violations by the highway patrol. Others are charged with curfew infractions by city police and some are accused of possessing alcoholic beverages.

Most plead guilty but those who believe they are innocent tell their side of the story and present witnesses if they wish. The panel questions both the accused and the witnesses.

Some of the teenagers who have appeared before the court have tried to hide their embarrassment by showing disrespect for the panel. This was quickly noticed and taken into consideration when deciding punishment or degree of guilt. In the several times when this occurred Mrs. Severson talked to the offenders and convinced them their attitude and actions were wrong.

One boy had to be picked up by police and brought before the court after he had refused to appear voluntarily. He showed disrespect to the court and was taken before Judge Black. Black was convinced the boy's attitude was an attempt to cover up a feeling of inferiority. He talked to the youth, urging him to convince himself that he was as good as anyone, to throw back his shoulders and speak his piece.

By the next session of court the youth had changed. He appeared and apologized for his previous conduct.

Conduct also can be a bit of a problem for the members of the panel. The first group was badly in need of self assurance and guidance which Mrs. Severson was quick to note.

"Members of the panel can't chew gum, slump over their elbows, or be discourteous with the accused or witnesses. They must act and dress with dignity." Mrs. Severson said.

After the close of each court an evaluation session is conducted. Members of the juvenile committee, highway patrol, police department, and Mrs. Severson sit in with the panel. Action taken by the court and possible ways of improving its procedure and value are discussed.

Violations the court may hear and penalties it should consider have been changed as result of the discussions but no one doubts that the chief examiner of the State highway patrol, Gordon McDermid, pinpointed the reason for the court's effectiveness when he said:

"Trying juveniles before a student court has great impact because teenagers do not like to show up badly before their own age group."

Resettlement of Certain Refugees

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution under consideration is designed to implement the participation of the United States in what has been described as World Refugee Year promulgated by the United Nations Assembly in a resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom and cosponsored by this country.

In a proclamation issued on May 19, 1959, the President of the United States, in expressing the acceptance of the participation of the United States in the World Refugee Year, ending June 30, 1960, has outlined the extent of our participation, stressing the necessity of additional financial contributions for the rehabilitation of refugees and the need of more opportunities for their resettlement. A substantial financial contribution to the funds of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in the amount of $4 million has already been made by the President pursuant to the authority granted him by the Congress last year.

The legislation under consideration is primarily designed to eliminate the remaining camps in Europe in which numbers of refugees have resided for a long period of time.

The Committee on the Judiciary reported this joint resolution by a vote of 30 to 1, I believe.

In taking up this joint resolution the committee considered the ability of the United States to absorb more people, having in mind the rate at which our population is increasing.

We believe that we have written into this legislation the safeguard which will prevent violence from being done to our basic concept of the admission of immigrants. By that I mean that everybody admitted, assuming this joint resolution will be adopted, will be required to comply with the provisions of the basic law. In addition, we have set up a provision under which by action of either the House or the Senate the entire program may be terminated within 60 days after the filing of a report by the Attorney General.

The joint resolution is designed to offer resettlement opportunities under the existing law, to wit: section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to a number of refugees which will be determined depending on how many refugees are admitted by other cooperating countries.

Time is of the essence because the special refugee programs originated in the World Refugee Year should, of course, start in that year, if the participating countries are to implement what they have undertaken to do. Any delay in the enactment of this legislation will tend to impair the position of leadership which the United States has assumed in the field of internationally concerted humanitarian efforts.

In addition to that, there is a very important session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration scheduled for the early part of May of this year. That session is to convene in Naples, Italy, instead of the usual meeting place which is Geneva, Switzerland. The main reason for this change of meeting place is the desire of the 29 member nations of ICEM to dramatize the departure of the one-millionth migrant moved from Europe by the organization which began its operations in February 1952. It is quite important that this legislation be well on its way to final enactment by the time ICEM's council convenes next month.

There have been recently certain proposals made in the field of immigration which appear to be based on the idea

that the absorptive capacity of the United States is practically unlimited. The proposals I have in mind have apparently not been based on sufficient studies of the implications which the fast-growing population of the United States, the inadequacy of employment opportunities, and the lack of facilities for housing, education, and medical care have made urgently necessary. No study of these matters has been made prior to the submission of recommendations under which the United States population would be further increased by a very considerable influx of immigrants. It appears to me that the interest of the United States has not been taken into consideration by the authors of those proposals.

This legislation does not belong in that category. It does not provide for any sizable increase in our annual immigration intake while it opens our doors to a reasonable and assimilable number of desirable people who need a safe haven and an opportunity to start a new life and who deserve to benefit from the blessings of freedom and American opportunities.

How many will come under this resolution? The answer to that question depends on the extent of cooperation which this country will obtain from our friends abroad. For example, according to the latest report I received from the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, that organization transported from Europe to oversea countries in the calendar year 1959, a total of 42,166 refugees; 9,652 of them came to the United States under the now expiring provisions of section 15 of the act of September 11, 1957. Consequently, the number of refugees admitted in 1959 by countries other than the United States was 32,514. Assuming that all of these refugees were subject to the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and further assuming that in the year 1960 countries other than the United States will admit the same number of refugees, the Attorney General would be authorized to admit 25 percent of that number to the United States, which would be 8,126 persons. Provided, of course, that the Secretary of State has made that finding and has advised the Attorney General as to the precise number of those whom he may parole into the United States in each of the 6-month periods.

However, if the Secretary of State finds that the other nations have curtailed the size of their total semiannual intake of refugees of the category specified in this resolution, our intake will automatically diminish proportionately in the immediately following 6 months.

The legal concept of this resolution is based on the experience gained in 1956 and in 1957 when the very efficient administration and the successful results of the use of the parole provision of the Walter-McCarran Act has permitted us to assume the position of leadership in providing safety and resettlement of those who escaped the Soviet massacre of the heroic Hungarian revolution.

We have maintained then, and we still maintain, that position of leadership which we first assumed in providing resettlement for displaced persons and refugees in the years since 1945 up to the present time. I stress this point not because of a desire to boast about our achievements. I believe that it is necessary to remind certain facts, from time to time—not so much to our friends and enemies abroad who realize very well what the United States has done—but to some of our own people at home, who seem to tend too often to minimize our actions. As an example, let me remind you that just about 2 weeks ago it was stated in the other body that little Venezuela has done infinitely more for displaced persons and refugees than the United States. Suffice it to say that in the period of ICEM's activities, from 1952 until 1959, Venezuela has admitted 1,700 refugees while the United States has admitted 300,000. I do not say that in order to belittle Venezuela's contribution which has apparently done what she was able and willing to do, and we appreciate that, but to point out that the criticism of our own deeds by our people has about reached the high point of absurdity.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House and the other body will act promptly on this truly necessary and meritorious legislation. I am convinced that this resolution, after it is placed on our statute books, will be administered carefully and wisely, and that the required cooperation between the Secretary of State and the Attorney General will be as friendly and efficient as it was in the past. The functions of the Department of State and the Department of Justice in the administration of this legislation are of great importance, indeed. While the powers and duties of the Attorney General under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as well as under all pertinent provisions of that law and under this resolution are preserved intact and inviolate, the prerogatives and functions of the Secretary of State in the area of foreign relations remain equally intact under the opening paragraph of section 2 of the joint resolution.

I urge the House to vote overwhelmingly in favor of this legislation.

There has been much said about the problem of refugees. Many of the nations have issued stamps, but many of them, outside of the Iron Curtain, have made contributions. Funds have been raised from various sources.

In this legislation we deal with the camp population, with those people who are subject to the mandate of the United Nations, High Commissioner for Refufees, and nobody else. We are exposed, in my judgment, to about one-fourth of 22,000 people.

There has been much discussion as to the number of refugees, and conflicting figures are being presented from various sources all the time. Some months ago, I said there were 28,000 people in the camps. This caused considerable consternation in the ranks of those people who have made this business of moving refugees a very profitable one. Just this morning, I talked with some people at the United Nations in New York. I was advised that the number is not 28,000 but it is now about 22,000. As I said earlier, we have written into the bill a provision under which the number we take will be determined by the total number of defined refugees taken by other nations participating in this program. That number is readily ascertainable so that in the opinion of your committee, the maximum number that could be taken, assuming that everybody in the camps wants to move, and I am sure that is not the case, our share will always represent 25 percent of those moved elsewhere.

If my colleagues will indulge me for a moment, I would like to tell of a conversation I had with a cabinet minister of the appropriate agency of the Austrian Government. He pointed out that most of these people are old. He said that emigration is not an attractive thing when people are over 35—I am sure that is the case. As I was saying, the numbers that would be moved would be relatively small. In view of the fact that we have actually been a participating sponsor of this World Refugee Year, it seems to me we are almost compelled to adopt the kind of legislation which will indicate our desire to participate and also the limits within which that participation will take place.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand the situation, the type of people calculated to come in under this measure are old people—people who are sick and those ordinarily described as hard core refugees; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. May I say to the gentleman that everyone who is admitted for permanent residence will come under the terms of the basic code.

Mr. BURLESON. When we have had this type of legislation before this body on several other occasions, including the so-called Refugee Relief Act which has expired, the plea was that we should have that type of people in this country who would contribute something to the welfare of our country. Now this seems to me to be the very opposite. Is this strictly on a humanitarian basis?

Mr. WALTER. This is designed to meet the demand of some people that the United States do something in this field. May I say again in that connection, that just recently, in the other body it was stated that the United States had not done as well in the refugee field as little Venezuela. As I stated a few minutes ago, ICEM's records show that Venezuela had admitted since 1952, a little over 1,700 refugees in these categories and we had admitted over 300,000. Now, what useful purpose is served by minimizing our efforts, I do not know, but I would like to point out to the gentleman that ever since the cessation of hostilities in 1945, the United States has done its full share. We can certainly be proud of our efforts; but still, the

camps there remain. It seems to me that by the enactment of this legislation we will indicate to the world that we can eliminate them. When the question of the number arose, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] visited the camps in Europe, and as a result of his investigation we reached what we believe to be a proper conclusion with respect to the modus operandi of elimination of the camps.

Mr. BURLESON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that many of these 22,000 would not wish to enter this country or any other country?

Mr. WALTER. My guess is that only a small percentage would want to move, and a correspondingly smaller one will enter this country.

Mr. BURLESON. Then in that case the camps are not going to be eliminated.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, they will, because other nations and local economies will also be absorbing these people.

Mr. BURLESON. We contribute something through the United Nations to the upkeep of the camps?

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. And we would continue to do so. If they do not want to come to this country or any other country they would remain there and we would continue our contribution. I assume that that would eliminate the humanitarian angle of bringing them into this country.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to feel that after the enactment of this legislation the United Nations would take steps immediately to eliminate those camps. They have already eliminated a great many. People have been concentrated in just a few camps.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will yield further, you have a bill before the Committee on the Judiciary which deals with immigration, ordinarily referred to as the administration bill, which would about double the 154,000 annual admissions provided under present law. This number represents regular quotas, but as I understand that proposal, an unpredictable number of immigrants would be permitted to come to this country if the President so desired. How is this related to that legislation?

Mr. WALTER. May I say this to the gentleman, that before the subcommittee, of which I happen to be chairman at the moment, considers that legislation, we will complete studies that we are now undertaking to determine the capacity of the United States to absorb more people. Personally, I hope there will be no action before this study is completed. I am almost sure there will be no action at this session, because the studies will not be completed. It is very important in that connection to note, particularly in those areas where we have much distress, the coal fields of Pennsylvania, for instance, that a vast majority of people coming to the United States seeking new homes, come to those areas. We certainly are not going to relieve unemployment in the United States by bringing unemployed from other places in the world.

Mr. BURLESON. I am delighted to hear the gentleman's remarks on that subject. If the Federal Government is going to provide public housing, unemployment compensation, medical care, and all other benefits which flow from Washington, it would seem we do not need to bring more people in for that purpose.

Mr. WALTER. I agree with the gentleman completely, but we are talking about something entirely different now. We are talking about the participation of the United States of America in a worldwide movement to relieve a very bad situation.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if I could feel that House Joint Resolution 397 was purely a humanitarian act, certainly I would feel more kindly toward it. If it is humanitarian, then certainly our benevolence should extend to the teeming thousands of Arab refugees expelled from Israel. In this instance, our own policies contributed to this wholly unsolved, pitiable situation. I think there is no doubt that the refugees with whom we are dealing in this bill are cared for in luxury, as compared to these people living almost like animals with no hope for tomorrow.

It is difficult to obtain definite information as to the type of people remaining in the refugee camps in Europe. Some years ago before the Special Refugee Relief Act expired, the argument was made that we should admit people of special skills and abilities who would contribute something to our American life. The camps were supposedly drained of this type of individual, many of them coming to this country. I doubt seriously if very much has been contributed, and I opposed that legislation. However, the point to be considered now is why, after these several years, we are going back to the hard-core type which is left in the camps. If my information is correct, these people are mostly those who are diseased, with criminal involvement of some nature, or whose true status cannot be determined.

We are now going to take these people, which I have an idea is more or less on an indiscriminate basis, based on the challenge of other nations to take three-fourth of the total. They are being admitted on a permanent basis. They become eligible for permanent citizenship, and it is a circumvention of our immigration laws.

The most I can see coming out of this legislation is the hope that the administration's liberalizing bill now in the Committee on the Judiciary may get no further than it is at the present time.

It is difficult to understand why there are those who want to chip away and widen the breaches in the present Walter-McCarran Act. At a time when, in my opinion, we should be tightening immigration laws, we are loosening them up.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, in response to my query a few minutes ago indicated he was not for liberalizing our immigration laws as proposed and requested by the President of the United States. He further indicated that he recognized the inconsistency of admitting more people to the United States who will contribute to that group for which there is always a hue and cry for more welfare benefits of one sort and another. Do you want to bring more people into this country for more public housing, more unemployment compensation and all the welfare benefits which can be dreamed up by those who would take care of everybody and everything from Washington?

Mr. Speaker, it seems the most I can do at this time is to give notice that I shall oppose with every possible effort any further legislation which weakens and liberalizes our present immigration laws. I simply do not think it is in the best interest of our country, and further believe that it is already one of the principal taproots of many of the difficulties our Nation is now experiencing. I know very well that there are those who will say this is a narrow view. I know very well there are those who will want to say it is an attitude of anti-this and that. But, I know in my heart it is no such thing.

It is a matter of seeing that there are no more people in this country than are already here who do not understand the American system. There are those already here who do not distinguish between license and freedom. There are many who do not understand that responsibility goes with liberty. Mr. Speaker, this is not a flag-waving statement, because the record will prove it, and as to that matter, most any day a newspaper out of any of the big cities will prove it in their reporting.

I am not going to support this resolution, and particularly do I repeat that the bill now considered by the Judiciary Committee, which can more than double the present immigration quota, will be resisted. I trust that you here who believe as I do will indicate your attitude to the Judiciary Committee to such a degree that the committee itself will reject the proposed legislation.

Beef Imports—Prices Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, farmers and industrial workers are being threatened by foreign imports. The following article is from the Lancaster Livestock Reporter, Lancaster, Pa.:

CATTLEMEN FEAR IMPORTS WILL SLASH BEEF PRICES

DALLAS.—The SS *Mariposa*, a steamship with hefty hunks of frozen beef stacked in its cavernous holds, will said from Sydney, Australia, stop at Auckland, New Zealand, to take on more meat, and then set a northeasterly course for San Francisco.

Thousands of miles away, on a rolling, windswept prairie west of Cresson in central Texas, A. W. Slocum, a grizzled, lifelong rancher, will ponder the vessel's voyage toward the Golden Gate with considerable distaste.

"I'm feeding 2,500 head of cattle out there," rancher Slocum remarks, nodding toward the snow blanketed rangeland outside his snug ranch home. "I figure I'll have to take less money for them this year, even without considering imports. And imports," he adds, deftly rolling himself a cigarette, "could flat ruin us."

The Texas cattleman's concern is shared by nervous ranchers from Florida to the Pacific Northwest. They're fearful that the swollen tide of imports pouring into east and west coast ports, while U.S. ranchers are readying record herds of their own for market might trigger a price collapse like the one in 1952 that slashed cow prices in half and dug deeply into beefsteak tags, breaking many a rancher in the bargain.

USING UP THE CORN

Most traders, however, regard the recent price rise as temporary; they predict prices will turn downward soon. Many cattle feeders have sizable quantities of corn which is too moist to qualify for price support loans. Cattle are being held off the market to use up this corn.

Predictions of rosy prospects for meat market shoppers are based on the huge herds feeding on grass or grain around the Nation. The Agriculture Department recently reported that there were a record 101,520,000 of the critters on U.S. ranches and farms as of January 1—a hefty buildup of nearly 4.9 million head during 1959, piled atop an increase of 3.5 million head the year before.

Ranchers are planning to send record supplies of meat to market this year as they attempt to stem the growth of their herds.

Despite their reputation as long-time holdouts against Government handouts, the nervous beef raisers are asking the U.S. Tariff Commission to step in and take action under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act to keep beef imports from putting "an undue pressure on downsliding prices."

"DO SOMETHING NOW"

"We believe it's better to ask the Government to do something now, before it's too late," Mr. Slocum remarks at this Texas ranch.

The cattlemen claim imports accounted for more than 8 percent of U.S. beef supplies last year and the year before. Beef imports in 1959 totaled 1.3 billion pounds, more than five times the 1956 level.

While U.S. cattlemen press for tougher imports curbs, the normal workings of supply and demand show signs of starting to do the job for them. Exports from Australia have been so heavy they have driven meat prices there to record highs, leading Australians to keep more of their beef at home. Canadian exports have left some lush ranges vacant, slowing the flow of cattle to the United States and leading some U.S. ranchers to ship feeder cattle north across the border for fattening. And Mexican herds have become so depleted that some Mexican ranchers are buying cattle here to ship south.

Muñoz-Marín as Governor of Puerto Rico—Has Developed Commonwealth's Influence for Stability, Moderation, and Understanding in Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently I read a very fine article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of March 14, 1960. It referred to the action of the White House in injecting itself into the political affairs of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This was the first time in history that a national administration had taken such action.

This unprecedented action on the part of the White House is to be regretted.

The article follows:

A LESSON ON PUERTO RICO NOT IOWA

(By Price Day)

If the White House is to be credited with a new knowledgeability about Latin America it needs to revise its notion of what goes on in Puerto Rico.

On the word of Mr. James C. Hagerty, the President will support the candidacy of Mr. Luis A. Ferré for the governorship of Puerto Rico in the November elections. "Mr. Ferré is head of the Republican Party of Puerto Rico," the White House press secretary is quoted as having said. "He is also the Republican National Committeeman from Puerto Rico. Can you imagine the head of the Republican Party being against a recognized candidate of his own party?"

Mr. Hagerty, and Mr. Eisenhower, might take a moment to try to imagine it, after first consulting an ABC of Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is, shall we say, not Iowa. Its parties are not Iowa's parties. The insular political organization for which Mr. Ferré is the gubernatorial candidate does, as Mr. Hagerty indicated, have certain connections with the mainland Republicans. But besides being the Republican Party of Puerto Rico it is also the Statehood Party of Puerto Rico: It is the Republican Statehood Party.

Its opponents are the Populares, or the Popular Democrats, for two decades overwhelmingly dominant in Puerto Rican politics. They are led by the present Governor, first to hold that office by election, Luis Muñoz-Marín. They have no ties with any mainland party.

Unlike, shall we say, Kansas, Puerto Rico is not a State. It is associated with the United States in a unique arrangement as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico in this satus partakes of nationhood—though the Populares in the campaign already strenuously underway refrain from saying so, lest their statehood adversaries raise the false charge that the goal of the Populares is independence.

The statehood party holds that partaking of nationhood is bad; it makes Puerto Ricans second-class citizens. The statehood party brings forward figures from which the most earnest examination cannot remove the fuzz of vagueness, to dispute the Populares' contention that statehood with its Federal income taxes would bring ruin; that the island would be condemned indefinitely to the condition of poorest State in the Union. (Last fall the annual per capita income for Puerto Rico crept over $500: In Mississippi it is about $1,100). Anyway, the statehood party says, it is not a question of economics but of dignity and pride.

The Populares say that it is a question of pride, dignity, and economics all together, and believe that citizenship in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is more dignified than citizenship in a state of Puerto Rico would be.

They believe that in the past 20 years Muñoz-Marín and a group of able men around him have transformed the island from an economic and psychological colony-slum into a proud, free, prospering community: a lesson in U.S. good will toward Latin Americans, and an example of effective economic self-help.

This new Puerto Rico, they believe, has the duty of helping to show other peoples of the hemisphere—and beyond the hemisphere—what the United States is about. Dr. Arturo Morales Carrión, under secretary of state for the Commonwealth, has put it this way: "It is a place where the Latin American feels at home, where he sees the great impact of U.S. industrial culture on a Hispanic land, and yet feels that the land and the people have retained their identity, their dignity and their values and traditions."

Mr. Ferré, arriving in Washington last week as a guest aboard Mr. Eisenhower's plane, said substantially the same thing in other words: "Because of the ethnical similarities between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of Latin America, and the knowledge and experience the people of Puerto Rico have with American institutions, Puerto Rico is in an excellent position to cooperate toward the aims of better inter-American relationships."

Mr. Ferré quite naturally did not note the indisputable fact that it was the program of Muñoz Marín and the Populares that put Puerto Rico in that position, or the hardly less indisputable fact that without Muñoz Marín it would not have happened.

Nor, as his remarks were reported, did he on this occasion advance his own opinion that a Puerto Rico with U.S. Senators and Congressmen would have more influence in Latin America, not less, than Puerto Rico as a semination has.

Which of the two Puerto Rican points of view seems more reasonable to the White House?

Is the White House at all aware of Muñoz Marín's stature in Latin America, where the Puerto Rican ABC is thoroughly known? Does the White House understand how much influence for stability, moderation, and understanding he wields in the Caribbean?

Does the White House know that he is our most eloquent and respected advocate in all Latin America?

Does the White House perceive that to take sides in a Puerto Rican election will for some Latin Americans seem to have just a taste—considering Puerto Rico's degree of nationhood—of the interventive?

Is it the judgment of the White House that the value of Puerto Rican votes in New York next fall (both the Populares and the Statehood people in Puerto Rico think this the reason for the White House favors to Mr. Ferré) overweighs the disadvantage of backing in Puerto Rico a sure loser with no program but the perhaps not quite wholehearted one of statehood?

Would it even get the votes?

Looking ahead, does the Republican Party wish in effect to give to the minority of Puerto Ricans who sincerely want statehood soon a pledge that cannot in the foreseeable future be fulfilled?

A bit of rethinking seems indicated.

Wimmer Sounds Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Enquirer on March 28, 1960, carried a column by Mr. Ed Wimmer, the able and dynamic vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Mr. Wimmer has a wide grasp of current problems affecting American business. His article of March 28 entitled, "Paraproprietal Society Visioned by Experts," should be particularly sig-

nificant to Members of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under previous permission I insert the article to be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"PARAPROPRIETAL SOCIETY" VISIONED BY EXPERTS: "AMERICAN WAY" TO DISAPPEAR

The managing director of the Edison Electric Institute has made a statement to the effect, that the United States is "gradually adopting the Russian system, while Russia moves gradually in the direction of the American system." This ties in with a column we devoted to the subject some months ago, in which we pointed out that business and labor leaders, educators, and an increasing number of people in Government, are ready to throw in the capitalistic sponge—and let socialism take over.

Consider the statement of James Hoffa, that in the foreseeable future, "there will be no place in America for the small business, small union, or family farm." Weigh thoughtfully the prediction of Burton K. Homes, that in the next few years "Communism, in one form or another, will blanket the world," and—if this doesn't shake you out of your apathy, I call your attention to some words of advice, wisdom, and prophecy, from two German students, 145 years ago: "The choirs are marshalling on both wings of the world's stage. Russia is leading the one, and America the other, but a day will come when the contest between the two will end in the complete downfall of one, and victory for the other."

Paul Porter, former head of the War Labor Board: "All natural resources. All banks, insurance companies, public utilities, all basic industries, will become public property in the United States."

Robert Liebenow, Chicago Board of Trade: "We are being spoofed into a welfare state, a bite at a time."

Charles A. Beard (1932), world renowned historian: "We must eventually come to a system of cartels controlled by a national planning council controlled by labor, industry, and government."

Panel of Government economists: "The Federal Government is the only instrument we have for guiding the economic destiny of our country."

Dr. Ernest Fisher, Columbia University: "We ought to set up a local housing agency financed by Federal funds to buy and build pools of existing dwellings in urban renewal areas, to rent to low income families, and when a contractor cannot make a profit on the work, the housing agency construction crews should take over the job. Also, financial aid to landlords for property rehabilitation, if they do not raise the rent."

Do you believe that Lincoln was right when he said that America's destruction would "come from within?" Can you be aroused, or frightened, or be at least made aware of the threat to American liberty in student polls showing two-thirds voting clothes and sports "more important than patriotism"? With 63 percent in another poll voting "Government ownership of all big business and banking"?

In a new booklet released by the Twentieth Century, Paul J. Harbrecht, S.J., and Adolph A. Berle, Jr., have defined the "new system emerging" as the "Paraproprietal Society" in which the huge corporation, pension trust, huge union, and huge Government will be all-engulfing and be imbued with a new kind of "corporate, social conscience."

Reverend Harbrecht's new book, "Pension Funds and Economic Power," sees the big pension funds as the big capitalists taking over in the "Paraproprietal Society." He sees an almost complete end to economic influence by any "proprietorship" class, with all the power passing from the individual to "professional managers of great funds and corporations." Labor and Government, of course, would be the "counterbalancing powers."

Mr. Berle, one time avowed enemy of concentrated power, seems to accept this change as inevitable, although continuing to agree that genuine capitalism flourishes only in the "area of small businesses"—"no longer a dominant characteristic of the capitalistic system."

Since 1951, 6,000 American boys have given their lives in military air accidents, learning to "defend the American way of life." I ask what "American way of life"?

"Wheatland"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, "Wheatland" is a choral symphony writtend and composed at the suggestion of Kansas wheat producers. It has an interesting background, and both the music and the text have been written by talented individuals. I hope every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to pursue the thought behind this choral symphony as well as the symphony itself:

"WHEATLAND"

"Wheatland" is a choral symphony written and composed at the suggestion of Kansas wheat producers, and carried to completion with their assistance and lively interest in the work.

The premiere performance of the work is presented as the climax of a 3-day meeting of the National Association of Wheat Growers, in Wichita, Kans., December 10, 1959.

"Wheatland" was inspired by Henry D. Parkinson, of Scott City, Kans., wheatgrower, and vice chairman of the Kansas Wheat Commission. Mr. Parkinson conceived the idea of exporting art forms from Kansas, as well as grain, to carry the story of wheat. He suggested to Dr. David Foltz, professor of music, University of Wichita, Kans., that the cycle of wheat production might be used as the basis for a symphony or tone poem. "He described to me the union of words and music, tuneful and melodic, but respectable," says Dr. Foltz, "all of which, would tell of wheat, the glory of it, and what it has meant to man through the centuries."

More wheat producers became interested in this cultural approach to the story of wheat, and when Mr. Parkinson again contacted Dr. Foltz, the musician accepted the challenge, and "Wheatland" began to take form.

Dr. Foltz made special trips to wheat fields and to meetings of those interested in wheat. He was the guest of the Parkinson family during the 1959 harvest in the Scott City, Kans., area. First-hand looks at the flour mills, the elevators, the migrant workers during harvest—even a ride on a combine—were part of acquainting the composer with his subject of the plant, the land, the machines, the grain, and the people.

When considerable researching through the writings of poets such as Carl Sandburg and Walt Whitman failed to produce anything about the growing cycle of wheat, Dr. Foltz asked Dr. Geraldine Hammond, professor of English at Wichita University, to write the words for the choral symphony. She responded with a striking poem in eight phases suggested earlier by Mr. Parkinson.

The work was named from her poem, "Wheatland."

Dr. Foltz then contacted Mr. Joshua Missal, assistant professor of music theory and viola, for assistance in setting the poem to music. Mr. Missal wrote the orchestral parts, and Dr. Foltz wrote the choral sections.

"Wheatland" begins with a chorus, "Praise the land that gives us hope, that gives us life, that gives us wheat."

Narration is employed to tie the sections together. The narrator in the performance is cast in the role of a wheat farmer describing his life as a planter, his emotions as he watches the growth of wheat, his fears and prayers during storm and blight, his activity in harvest, and then his joy and happiness when the cycle is completed.

"Planting," "Waiting," and "Spring Greenup" build up to "The Storm." Then "Harvest" and "March of the Combines" lead to the joyous "Festival," bursting into American hoe-down music. All of this leads to the concluding section, "The Land of Wheat."

Credit for the completion and performance of "Wheatland" belongs to many, just as the success of the land of wheat belongs to many working together—to Dr. Foltz for writing the choral sections and guiding the entire production; to Mr. Missal for the orchestral work; and to Dr. Hammond for her beautiful interpretation of "Wheatland."

In addition, important assistance came from Dr. Margaret Vance, professor of music, Chico State College, Chico, Calif., and from Mr. William Bush, instructor of music, University of Wichita, both former students of Dr. Foltz, for arrangements; from Rodger Vaughan, instructor of music theory and appreciation, Wichita University, for orchestral arrangements; and from student copyists, who have been busily preparing the new music for production.

The work might never have been brought to completion without the constant interest of Kansas wheat producers and their producer organizations. And to the wheatgrowers also goes the credit for providing the setting for the premier performance at their national annual meeting.

Back of it all, inspiring and guiding the project to completion, has been Mr. Parkinson. His faith that this unique pool of talent at the University of Wichita could produce a new voice for wheat out of Kansas may have launched a permanent contribution to American music.

"WHEATLAND," A CHORAL SYMPHONY

(By Geraldine Hammond)

I. PRAISE THE LAND

Chorus

Praise the Land

The land of wheat,
Bright and wide,
Now we praise.
Praise the seeding,
And the growing.
Praise the greening
And the golden life
At harvest.
Praise the land
That gives us hope,
That gives us life,
That gives us wheat,
That gives us wheat.
Praise we the land.

II. PLANTING

Narrator

The Seed in a Man's Hand

The seed in a man's hand—
Like water—like sand—like gold.
Life, one seed,
A fact so simple that it is a dream,
And a dream so real that it is all truth.
For this seed alone,
Here in a man's hand,

Is the miracle of sun,
Of wide days,
And the turning earth.
Drop the seed, fling and scatter.
Space in rows precisely
By machines man builds
To stretch his faith
Wide on the fields.
Now tumble earth and gentle it
While sun lies golden on the trees
And strikes the river bright below,
And birds sing "Amen"
To a planter's faith.

Chorus

Hymn of Wheat

Bless the planting,
Watch the seed,
Bring forth the grain to harvest.
Give us wheat,
Our daily bread,
O give us wheat.

Solo

Song of the Planter

In the cool dark silence at the root
Now lies the miracle.
There in the blackness is a power,
A will, a thrust, a strength
So great it is a simple fact.
But I must stand here on this earth
To watch, to hope, to fear—
And wait,
And wait,
And wait.

Chorus

Hymn (Fragment)

Give us wheat,
Our daily bread.
O bless the seed
And give us wheat.

III. WAITING

Narrator

And Now the Waiting Grows

And now the waiting grows
And stretches out above ground too.
Bearing its own fruit, hope, fear, and silence,
While the field rests like a mother,
Quiet, knowing, winterwhile.

Chorus

Winter Prayer

Let the snow lie lightly,
Warm to the earth,
White winter waiting
Seal off the frost,
The bitter death of cold.
And keep the seed safe
For reaping joy
In spring time.

Narrator

A Man Stands Looking at His Work

A man stands looking at his work,
His partnership with earth,
And wonders how it came.
Who is he to spread the seed,
To care for life,
To tend the dream?
And then he turns away and knows
That seed is everywhere the same,
That wheat lies waiting in the ground
And holds its own life ready.

Solo

Waiting Song

Here on the earth I stand,
Waiting the winter while
To know the end of my beginning.
Is the enemy unseen now at the root
And deadly?
Has the cold crept to the heart
And I not knowing?
Help, O help uncertainty with trust,
And lay on waiting peace.

IV. SPRING GREEN-UP

Narrator

The Winter Waiting Is Over

The winter waiting is over
And snows to rivers run.
The mystery of seed,
The miracle,
Is green now, smooth and rolling.
Stretched like a sea,
Spread like a sky,
Soft with newness,
Rich with bounty,
Near for the hand
And far for the eye.
O praise the greening land,
The promise springing.

Solo

The World Is New

The world is new—
Who can resist its freshness
Running on the hills
And on the valley floor,
First light of day,
Morn of the year,
And life's beginning.
The greening comes unfolding
Plant by plant,
And fills the heart with joy
And gratitude.
Why did I doubt?
What did I fear?
I knew the blessed power of living.
And the promise that the seed gave,
Lying on the hand.

Chorus

The world is new—
Who can resist its freshness
Running on the hills
And on the valley floor,
First light of day,
Morn of the year,
And life's beginning.
Why did I doubt?
What did I fear?
I knew the blessed power of living.

V. THE STORM

Narrator

Before the Storm Comes Quiet

Before the storm comes quiet
But no peace.
The very fields are frightened
In the calm and eerie light,
A green, not spring's but fearful—
Fearful.
There in the sky the blackness
And the flash,
The blackness and the gash of danger.

Solo

Guard Us

There in the sky the blackness
And the flash
The blackness and the gash of danger.

Solo and chorus

What can protect us now?
How fend against so vast a foe?
The heart beats—beats—and beats,
But only the knee may bend.
Guard from lightning,
Guard from hail,
Guard from pounding,
Guard from fire.
Save, O save,
O save the wheat.
God the Father,
Guard the fields.
Bring forth the grain to harvest.
Give us wheat,
Our daily bread,
O give us wheat.

VI. HARVEST

Narrator

The Stalk Bends Now

The stalk bends now, fulfilled, bearing life serene
In a gentle rise and fall like breathing,
A world of gold and sunlight,
Swaying to the earth's deep music.
Wheat—standing to the harvest,
The golden spears of life,
The Staff,
The seed of daily bread.

Solo

Reaping Song

Let us bend now to the harvest,
Reap and bind,
Flail and gather.
Praise the sickle of our fathers,
Praise the dance of the threshing floor.
With joy now move to harvest.

Chorus

March of the Combines

Move to the field,
Take position,
Roll-roll-roll.
Lift and cut,
Lift and cut,
Gather—gather—gather.
Roll in rhythm,
Pounding rhythm,
The heart of the world
Beats today, beats today,
And the harvest
Takes the seed:
Dream to fact,
Fact to mill.
Give us
Give us
Our daily bread,
Give us
Give us
Wheat.
Give us
Give us
Our daily bread,
Give us
Give us
Wheat.

VII. FESTIVAL

Narrator

Joy of the Work

Joy of the work,
Joy of the waiting,
Joy now fulfilled,
So let the dance express it.
From hope came this harvest,
From seed came this joy.
Tell back to the earth
The pleasure of doing,
Peace of this fulfillment.

Solo

Festival Song

Join with me, friends,
Sing with our pleasure.
Thanks to the sky,
Thanks to the soil,
Thanks to the plow, to the harrow,
The reaper.
Joy for the work
And the cycle complete.

Chorus

Harvest Dance

Swing with the music,
Reel to the rhythm.
Send off the waiting like chaff.
Here is the harvest,
Here is the ending,
Here is the seed in the hand.

VIII. LAND OF WHEAT

From the Black Earth

From the black earth
Grew this green.
Under the white
Lay the gold.
All in time.
Weathered and watered
Tended and warmed,
Grew the seed.
The greening unfolded,
The gold stood tall.
From the hand to the earth
And back
A miracle goes.

Solo

Blest Be the Land

Blest be the land
That took this seed,

The seed to hold its dream.
Blest be the stalk
That bears its gold,
The staff of wheat,
The living bread,
The secret told.

Finale

Praise the land
For daily bread.
Praise the land
For golden wheat.
Praise we the land.

Joseph Sureck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, so very often we read and hear critical reports and comments of our public servants in their efforts to discharge the functions and duties of their offices. We seldom hear of the good that they do—of the lasting and appreciated impressions they create upon the community and those whom they have served. It is unfortunate, as Shakespeare put it, that "the good is oft interred with their bones."

In the State of Hawaii, we have been blessed with the presence of many men and women who, in the performance of the duties imposed upon them by the requirements of their public office, have acted over and above their postulated requirements, and in doing so endeared themselves to the people and community and brought new respect to the office they occupy.

Such a man is Mr. Joseph Sureck, district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Honolulu, who, after a year and a half in Honolulu is being transferred to the district office in Los Angeles.

Not wanting to merely have the "good interred with their bones," the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, on March 21, 1960, adopted Senate Resolution 26. I am happy to say that the resolution expresses the heartfelt gratitude of the Hawaiian community for the services of a dedicated, devoted, and inspirational servant of our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Senate Resolution 26, adopted by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Joseph Sureck, district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Honolulu, is being transferred to the district office in Los Angeles, culminating a highly successful administration during his tenure as district director in Honolulu from June 1957 to March 1960; and

Whereas he is a person held in the highest esteem and respect by all persons in every ethnic group, including Members of this honorable body, governmental organizations, counsular corps, aliens, and persons of every race, color, and creed; and

Whereas by his intense interest in encouraging eligible aliens to become citizens of the United States of America, he did expend and devote unsefishly and humbly all of his time, effort, and even his personal funds to carry out his dedicated interest; making himself available at all times to speak on the subject of naturalization to all interested parties, groups, and organizations throughout the islands; and singularly, through his wealth of talent and tremendous efforts, originated and carried through a highly successful statewide citizenship program at the Waikiki Shell on September 17, 1959, when the Honorable Hugh L. Black, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, addressed the huge gathering at the naturalization ceremony presided over by Judge Pope of the Ninth Appellate Court of the United States of America; and

Whereas as a public spirited citizen and administrator, he has served the people of Hawaii conscientiously, warmly, diplomatically, and with zeal, thereby bringing about a better understanding to his office and a more friendly approach to the encouragement of aliens to become naturalized citizens; and

Whereas his work is best expounded and exemplified by an editorial in one of our newspapers, which read in part that "his tour of duty here has been marked by friendly cooperation with other agencies and organizations and he has been particularly and commendably active in urging aliens eligible for naturalization to go through the necessary processes and become our fellow Americans. He has indeed exemplified the spirit and practice of public service above and beyond the call of duty"; and

Whereas by his transfer, the people of Hawaii have lost a great statesman, devoted administrator, dedicated citizen, and an eminent counselor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1960, That it extend its profoundest and heartfelt thanks for an excellent job done as our district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, highly commending him for his dedicated contribution to the people of Hawaii, and extend to him the best wishes for good luck and success in his new position; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Commissioner Joseph M. Swing of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; Hon. William Rogers, Attorney General of the United States of America; and Mr. Joseph Sureck.

Optional Retirement for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, enforced retirement can be a human tragedy, says George Meaney, president of the AFL–CIO. He seeks to negotiate "optional retirement provisions which are in the best interest of a free society."

Mr. Meaney's views were called to my attention after I introduced legislation involving amendments to the Social Security Act, designed to encourage optional or gradual retirement in place of the present arbitrary work test.

I believe the Members will be interested in this article, the sixth in a series prepared for Ray Henry which were published widely throughout the country earlier this year. I commend it to the attention of the Members.

The article follows:

OPTIONAL RETIREMENT FOR THE AGED
(By George Meany)

During the next 10 years AFL–CIO unions will continue to work to broaden and improve the retirement plans available to American workers. The efforts will be directed to both the negotiated plans and the Government social security programs.

In this way we will lend our support toward lifting retirement from a condition of poverty, privation, and dependency to one of comfort, dignity, and independence.

Today we have 55 to 60 percent of our union membership covered by negotiated pension plans. It was only 5 percent 10 years ago.

In those years, improvements in industrial pensions and social security have doubled retirement benefits.

Most early negotiated plans did not permit workers to earn benefits for service beyond 30 years. And benefits were scaled down so people with 20 years service received little or nothing above social security at 65.

In those early plans, improvements in social security payments provided no net gain for workers because social security was deducted from what they had coming under the negotiated pensions.

While the initial plans were modest, they did represent an important beginning.

Now, the social security offset has been eliminated, benefit formulae have been simplified and improved, eligibility requirements reduced, disability benefits added and portable pension rights introduced.

This last feature is the greatest single improvement over the early negotiated pension plans. A worker who meets certain minimum service and age requirements may now leave his employment with one company and carry with him his earned pension rights, payable when he reaches 65.

But we cannot rest on these advances. For most workers retirement still involves a big reduction in their accustomed standard of living.

Pension benefits must be more closely geared to wage levels prevailing at the time the worker retires and to the cost of living during his retirement.

We will try to remove some of the most restrictive age requirements still attached to the pension provisions.

We want to raise the disability benefits and seek to make eligible any disabled employe unable to hold down any regular job within the plan or firm covered by the agreement.

We want to correct shortcomings of the retired employe's widow. Under social security, she gets only three-fourths of her husband's primary benefit, and under most negotiated plans she receives no further benefits after her husband's death.

We still feel that enforced retirement can be a human tragedy, and we hope to convince employers that they should not insist in retaining a veto power over the employee who wants to continue working after 65.

Experts in aging confirm our belief that compulsory retirement is disastrous for many people. We hope to negotiate optional retirement provisions which are in the best interest of a free society.

If we nail down the principle of optional retirement and if we can negotiate benefits giving a decent retirement income, the problem of when an individual should retire will be simplified.

The ideal pension plan of the future will have optional retirement over a wide range of ages with benefits that increase with the age one chooses to retire.

Pension funds are now largely managed by employers, and labor will seek a more ef-

fective voice in their administration. We are concerned about the investment policy of some managements.

Workers have earned these pension reserves and they have an interest in their decisions. Financial prudence and diversified investment of pension reserves can include more attention to such programs as low-cost housing and construction and equipment of health centers.

Some of the $25 billion in funded pension reserves should be used for better purposes than bidding up prices in the stock and bond markets.

Some of our unions have reduced pension costs and extended coverage through establishment of multicompany pension plans. This makes pension programs possible for many small companies, facilitates transfer of pension rights, and generally paves the way to higher benefits.

There are many opportunities for future progress in the pension field through collective bargaining, but we must face squarely a disturbing fact.

Retired people are having to spend an increasingly large part of their pension checks on medical bills. Of what value are higher benefits if they are siphoned away from their primary purpose of maintaining a standard of living?

Health insurance plans for the aged are not meeting the need—they are too restrictive, too limited in their benefits, and too costly for what they offer.

We must use the greater efficiency of social security and add medical benefits to old-age payments. The addition of hospital and other health benefits would prevent retirement payments from being used up on medical bills.

The Forand bill, now before Congress, proposes this by adding medical care to old-age and survivors insurance payments. Its enactment this year on the 25th anniversary of the Social Security Act would bring the retired worker the kind of protection that would make his pension check a passport to decency and dignity.

An Informed Citizen Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, most of us are so used to verbal brickbats from constituents importuning us to support Federal aid for all sorts of projects that we are forced to our feet in amazement when out of the clear sky we receive a letter such as has just come to me from Mr. George O. Mark, Jr., of Lancaster, Pa.

Mr. Mark prefaces his letter with these words:

I am greatly disturbed, Mr. DAGUE, by the continuing expansion of Federal activity into what I feel should be local affairs.

And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such sentiments are so rarely encountered in this Treasury-raiding period as to be almost startling.

And then Mr. Mark goes on to indict local governmental leaders by pointing out that the first question encountered when a community improvement is contemplated is, "Are there Federal funds available?" To this observation this conscientious citizen adds that loading down our social security system with additional handouts in each recurring election year can only result in the equalization of our society at a common level, which is the end objective of all socialistic planners.

But why burden you with my personal comments. Here is Mr. Mark's letter in its entirety which I am including with these remarks so that it may have a permanent place in the records of this House:

LANCASTER, PA., *March 31, 1960.*

Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE,
Downingtown, Pa.:

I am greatly disturbed, Mr. DAGUE, by the continuing expansion of Federal activities into what I feel should be local affairs. The proposed Federal aid to schools (H.R. 10128) is an example as is the present policy of aid to sewer projects. I have no doubt but what you are familiar with the near-range pros and cons, but let me dwell for a moment on some of the long-range aspects.

I am a member of two planning commissions and am therefore involved in many discussions regarding public improvements. The first question asked is, "Are there Federal funds available?" There is something wrong with a society that is unwilling to spend their own funds for their own improvements. And there is certainly something wrong when people have become conditioned to feel that it is their right to expect that someone else's taxes should pay for their improvements. The "wrong" lies in the Federal policy of the past decade or so which has bred just such an attitude.

This policy has already destroyed the initative of many local governmental units. Their attitude is, "We need a few schoolrooms now but if we wait until the situation becomes serious the Federal Government will pay the bill." And the same thinking is applied to sewerage, housing, highways, etc.

Fortunately our basic thinking hasn't changed. My neighbor still doesn't expect me to pay for improvements to his house. It is only when he thinks of Federal or State programs that this "something for nothing attitude" prevails. So you see it is not too late to change our Federal policy.

First, let's stop the expansion of such programs, then gradually reduce them until the responsibility once again is in the hands of those affected.

Now some thoughts on another subject. The basic concept of social security was good. There will always be those who lack the foresight to provide for their old age. But with each election year, expansion of the program becomes less of a social security and more of a social equalizer. Adding all the Federal and State spending programs together, it isn't too difficult to visualize the day when everyone will be economically equal, the wealthly reduced to the mean by heavy taxes, the poor raised to the mean by giveaways. That is the day that all progress ceases. The frightening thing is that we are well on the way and running to get there.

I'm afraid I've already imposed too greatly on your time, but one more thought. My confidence in Congress was somewhat restored when you, at long last, removed the "temporary" excise tax on telephone service. I trust the Congress will see fit to reject the President's request that it be restored.

GEORGE A. MARK, Jr.

High Interest Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sylvia Porter began her column yesterday with this question:

Why has the cost of living, measured by the consumer index moved up again to the all-time peak set last fall?

Miss Porter then answered the question this way:

A key reason is that interest rates on home mortgages have soared to the highest levels in a generation.

Miss Porter was speaking of the latest available consumer price index, which is that for February; and the point is that the index had been rising through February, not because of increases in the prices of food and of clothing, but because of the increases in interest rates.

To illustrate, the cost of food in Febrary was 1½ percent lower than it was in February a year ago; and the price of food was 5.1 percent lower than it was in 1958.

The main reason for the rise in the BLS consumer price index in February was the increased interest rate on home mortgages. In other words, the Federal officials who manage interest rates had been pushing all interest rates up, up, and up. Just as the BLS index takes account of the cost of rent, it also takes account of the cost of mortgages on owner-occupied homes.

ONLY INCREASED COST OF HOME MORTGAGES CONSIDERED

Yet the point that Miss Porter has brought to attention deals only with the effects of high interest on home mortgage costs. And this is minor compared with all of the other price increases which have resulted from high interest. The high interest policy has raised almost all prices. All levels of business operate on credit and on borrowed capital; so when interest rates are raised, this increases costs all down the line. Costs are increased for the mining and other raw materials industries. Then the metal producers, the manufacturers, the distributors, the wholesalers, and finally the retailers all pay increased prices to cover the cumulative cost increases due to high interest, and add on, in addition, their own cost increases due to high interest. And the increased cost to the transportation companies and the utility companies are also added into the price of the goods. Then finally the consumer who purchases goods on credit must pay not only the increased cost of credit to the manufacturers, processors, and distributors, but his own increased cost of credit. When the Federal Government raises interest rates, it is inevitably taxing consumers, for the benefit of the

moneylenders, whether the consumer buys on credit or not.

COST OF MEDICAL CARE GOING UP

The second important cause of the increase in the consumer price index in February is that the cost of medical care jumped by almost 1 percent from the previous month. The cost of medical care keeps going up and up, and this is causing a severe hardship on retired people who must try to live on their small pensions.

Miss Porter's article, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star for yesterday, April 4, is as follows:

MORTGAGE RATES LIFT LIVING COSTS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Why has the cost of living, measured by the Consumer Price Index, moved up again to the alltime peak set last fall?

A key reason is that interest rates on home mortgages have soared to the highest levels in a generation.

You aren't feeling the higher mortgage interest load if you haven't bought a house with a mortgage, of course. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics must calculate the level of mortgage interest rates in the general level of housing costs. The Bureau of Labor Standards calculates its mortgage interest index only periodically. When it took its latest reading in February, it found that the index had jumped to 124.7 from 118.7 in September 1959. It estimated this index was up 8 percent over a year ago, was more than 24 percent above the base figure of 100 in 1952.

"This one factor of sharply higher mortgage interest rates accounted for over one-third of the entire rise in living costs from January to February," said Deputy Commissioner of Labor Statistics Robert J. Myers, during an interview. "Now mortgage interest rates won't influence the index until the next periodic check this summer."

MEDICAL COSTS RISE

Another key reason why the consumer price index went up again in February is that the cost of medical care jumped 0.8 percent, the biggest rise in almost a year and a half. The medical care index is up almost 4½ percent in the past year.

The climb in the cost of living did not reflect higher food prices. Presumably you are aware of this, but you may not be aware of the fact that on the official index food is 1.5 percent cheaper than a year ago, 2.4 percent cheaper than 2 years ago, 5.1 percent under the 1958 record high.

And the climb did not take place because the prices of most things are increasing at anywhere near the pace of rise in the prices of services.

It is imperative that we recognize these key points, for a read-and-run attitude toward the price headlines in coming months easily may mislead people into believing we're in another inflation—and we are not.

VITAL POINTS LISTED

Here are three vitally important points:

(1) The cost of living is heading toward alltime highs probably will be at new peaks right before the elections.

Service will continue rising in price. Most other costs will edge up a bit. And we're into the season when food prices normally increase—which alone would tilt the whole index upward.

(2) The prospect remains that the rise will not exceed the 1½-percent or so range of 1959.

This has been the reasonable prospect all along. Neither the extent of this rise nor the forces behind it indicate inflation. While a rise in mortgage interest rates directly raises the cost of living of the family buying a house, you cannot call a climb in interest rates inflation. While an increase in medical insurance premiums boosts the living costs of all of us, the increase reflects the expansion and improvement of medical services as well as higher medical costs. What is happening generally is not inflation as we define it.

(3) The probable rise in living costs this year will reflect relative price stability. And the odds are excellent that in 1960 we'll turn in one of the best price records of any major nation in the world.

Home Rule: The Leadership Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the interim report issued last week by the Washington Home Rule Committee fixed responsibility on the effort that must be made if the House discharge petition is to succeed.

There are many who feel that the record of this Congress on the right to vote issue will rest as much on the success of the home rule legislation as on the enactment of a meaningful civil rights bill. In any event, the record to this point on home rule should be clarified and I am reproducing below, as part of these remarks, recent editorials in the New York Times and Washington Post for that purpose. These editorials follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1960]

HAZARD FOR THE GOP

Whether or not they intend to do so, Republican Members of the House are strangling the local home-rule movement. More than 180 signatures have now been obtained to the petition to release the District self-government bill from the death grip of the House District Committee, but only 40 of these have been provided by Republican legislators. The recent drive for signatures resulted in the addition of 43 names to the home-rule honor roll, but only 7 of these legislators wear the GOP label.

This ought to be a matter of grave concern to President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON, as well as to the voteless residents of the District. The restoration of voting rights to 870,000 citizens of the District—through the home-rule bill as well as through the proposed constitutional amendment, to permit voting for President and for Delegates in Congress—is a civil rights project of foremost importance. Editors, lecturers, public servants, and a vast number of other persons have come to recognize that elimination of this blot of disfranchisement is essential to the good standing of the United States among the free peoples of the earth. The Republican Party cannot be indifferent to this local demand for justice and democracy without condemning itself in the eyes of mankind.

This throttling operation is the more amazing because it is the administration's bill that is being done in. How can Republican legislators stand by and watch their Democratic rivals claim nearly all of the credit for advancing this vital civil rights measure? The situation ought to be of special concern to Vice President NIXON in his capacity as the prospective Republican presidential candidate in the forthcoming campaign. * * *

It is said that about 25 additional Republican signatures are needed to dislodge the discharge petition and make home rule here a reality. The Democrats have done their part well. It is difficult to believe that the Republican leaders in and out of Congress will permit this civil rights venture to topple on their own heads on the eve of an election.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1960]

CIVIL RIGHTS: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

While the attention of Congress and the country is focused, as it should be, on the extension of civil rights to Negroes of the South, the civil rights of Washington's million inhabitants—both black and white—ought not be overlooked either.

The two questions are related, for the fundamental reason why the citizens of the Capital are at present totally disfranchised is that there are so many Negroes among them. This is a harsh and shameful thing to have to say, but it is true. There are many contributing factors to Washington's failure to have even an elective municipal government; but at bottom is the same fear of a predominant Negro vote that has throttled civil rights in so much of the South. But in both areas progress is being made.

A bill to grant home rule to Washington passed the Senate last year for the fifth time. Another, more limited, measure is now as usual stuck in a committee of the House. Only a discharge petition, a perfectly orderly and—under the circumstances—a necessary procedure, can break it loose. Less than 40 signatures are still needed. It is interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of the more than 180 Members who have signed thus far are northern Democrats. Where, then, are the Republicans? This is, theoretically, an administration-approved bill. Where is the administration? Where is the necessary pressure, which is the only thing that will bring a District of Columbia home-rule bill to the floor? Where is the leadership?

There is no good reason why the people of Washington, one of this Nation's 10 largest cities, should not be allowed to manage their own affairs. There is no good reason why Congress should be saddled with this absurd burden. There is no good reason why the best chance there has been in years to get a home-rule bill through Congress should be allowed to go down the drain through prejudice, pusillanimity or coalition politics.

Asparagus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I want to invite all House Members tomorrow to join me in enjoying some delicious, fresh, green, California asparagus in the House restaurant.

Asparagus, probably of Persian origin some 2,000 years ago, a spring staple in the diet of kings for centuries, and now one of California's major crops, is grown mainly in the rich San Joaquin Delta.

Today there are 72,466 acres of asparagus plants in the delta, growing a $20 million annual crop for world distribution by truck, train, plane, and deep-water vessel from the port of Stockton.

In order that you might better enjoy tomorrow's treat, I am putting in the RECORD the following history that was prepared for me:

Asparagus, the perennial vegetable that has served the needs of man for over 2,000 years, continues to be a vegetable of first importance in many parts of the world.

In vivaciously eating this wild plant and that, primitive man learned by experience that some plants agreed with him and some did not; some brought strength and exhilaration, and others illness, even death. It was in this fashion that our primitive ancestor learned to appreciate the properties of many wild plants and subsequently, as nomadic tendencies gave way to a desire for more settled existence, gave cause to introduce them into his garden that they might serve his needs. Thus it was with asparagus which was so named by Theophrastus of ancient Greece.

The original wild habitat of edible asparagus is not positively known, but it may possibly have been of Persian origin. It is now found naturalized throughout Europe, as well as in nearly all parts of the civilized world. tI has been cultivated in the North Temperate Zone of the so-called Old World since Greek and Roman times.

The average Roman of the earliest days lived on vegetables and in his garden patch raised them—asparagus, cabbage, endive, fennel, and leeks. Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 B.C.), the Old Sabine Farmer, in the earliest of Roman horticultural writings gave full detailed instructions covering the mode of cultivating asparagus practiced in Roman times. The substance of the directions contained in his writings are not unlike those appearing in standard works on horticulture through the centuries and of the present day.

Following the elevation by man and the muck-heap of the wild asparagus of the beaches of the north Mediterranean into the cultivated asparagus of the garden, Pliny (A.D. 23–79) relates that at the seaport town of Ravenna asparagus was grown so fine that three shoots weighed a pound.

Since it could be found in the wild indigenous state along the coasts of Gaul and Britain, asparagus from very early tribal times had been used as a medicine by Britons, Gauls, and Germans. However, its cultivation and use as a vegetable by these peoples apparently resulted from the conquering marches of the Roman legions. In any event it is believed certain that the cultivation of asparagus took place in France and England following upon the heels of the Roman conquests. Its culture is detailed in the earliest French and English writings on horticultural subjects in the early 16th century. In Tusser's English horticultural publication of 1573 cultivated asparagus is called sparage, or sperage.

The horticultural practice of forcing of asparagus was introduced into England in 1688 by the Dutch gardeners who accompanied William III to England. In fact it is related that King William personally taught some of his close English subjects how to cut asparagus in the Dutch manner. In 1697, Meager mentions "that the London market was, at that period, supplied with forced asparagus early in the year."

The cultivation of asparagus was introduced by the English into many parts of the world, including the hottest latitudes of the Tropics where daily irrigation is a chief essential. No precise date of introduction into the American Colonies appears determinable. However, it would appear obvious that such a valued perennial vegetable would have accompanied the colonists who established the first permanent English-speaking colonies.

A list of available garden and flower seeds, plants, grapevines, and fruit trees were given in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Daily Advertiser of March 8, 1793. Among those listed in that issue was "asparagus plants of the best sort."

Asparagus was grown commercially in a very limited way in Concord, Mass., as early as 1825. Mr. Edmond Hosmer is credited with having carried it to market in season on his milk wagon. However, it was not until 1872 that the first commercial bed of asparagus of any great size was set out in New England. Mr. George D. Hubbard is credited with that endeavor which with his subsequent plantings probably made him the largest commercial grower in Massachusetts for a period of over 20 years.

The growing of asparagus for market in California was underway prior to the turn of the century and in 1901 it was reported as "proving to be one of the most successful of its minor industries." California commercial asparagus farming in 1900 was initially limited to the reclaimed lands around the Bay of San Francisco, the marshy deltas of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers, and the peat-type lands of Orange and San Luis Obispo Counties.

Commercial asparagus growing in the United States after a long period of time characterized by rather limited beginnings and of restricted marketings has emerged since 1900 into a food producing enterprise of substantial economic proportions. Our delta section of northern California has been the leading asparagus district of the United States for a number of years. The principal commercial asparagus producing districts in our country at the present time are located in the Sacramento and Imperial Valleys of California, in the Upper Coastal Plain section of New Jersey, South Carolina, and in Illinois.

Jean de LaQuintinge, director of the King of France's fruit and kitchen garden, period 1679 and 1682, was able to set before the King of France fresh asparagus in the winter months of January and February. Likewise, Dr. Phillip Mazzei, an Italian who came to Virginia in 1773, was able to provide fresh asparagus on the table in March for such notables as President Blair of William and Mary College. Today our State of California provides wonderfully delectable fresh asparagus to yours and the Nation's tables in the early months of each year and makes it possible for you and me to eat in such respect like the kings of bygone days.

Eisenhower Republican Administration Most Expensive in Nation's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Ike: Alltime Alltime Champion Spender," which appeared in the Thursday, March 10, 1960, issue of the St. Louis (Mo.) Labor Tribune, an official weekly trade union newspaper affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Relations:

IKE: ALLTIME ALLTIME CHAMPION SPENDER

It is one of the ironies of history and evidence of the short memory of the people that President Eisenhower and his party ran for office on an economy program. GOP spellbinders reamed up and down the land denouncing the spendthrift, prodigal administrations of Roosevelt and Truman and promising if Ike and the GOP got the popular nod, thrift and national debt reduction would be the major concern of the party which would bring the best business brains into the Government to undo the wastreldry of the spendthrift Democrats.

During Roosevelt's administration, which included the greatest depression on record and a world war, a total of $375 billion was spent in 12 fiscal years.

Under Truman, faced by a postwar challenge even more menacing than winning the war, the so-called Marshall plan was put into effect. This, the cold war, and the Korean war made the 8 years of Truman cost the Nation over $395 billion.

While the national debt was about $20 billion in 1932, the year F.D.R. was elected, it has soared to the present $284 billion under 7 years of Eisenhower, who outspent both F.D.R. and Truman, although he was faced with no war or massive depression or a postwar situation which required an orderly transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and multibillion aid to Europe and Asia on the brink of communism.

The question the Eisenhower fiscal record poses is whether the United States can afford 4 more years of this kind of business administration. Frankly, we doubt it. It's time for a change.

White House Conference on Narcotics

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 431, resolution by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT. Said resolution was filed by him January 27, 1960, and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, from which committee it comes to the floor today with appropriate amendments embodied in the text. Whereas this very timely resolution, in effect, recommends to the President of the United States that he call a White House Conference on Narcotics, and asks that emanating therefrom said White House Conference on Narcotics should report back to the President of the United States and to the U.S. Congress setting forth recommendations with respect to the problem of narcotics as found to be, and the traffic therein, and any other pertinent and germane results of the deliberations of said White House Conference, I concur with and join with all of my colleagues who have previously spoken in favor of this resolution.

But, I wish to make further crystal clear that it is not only my native State of California which is afflicted with the smuggling of narcotics, and the illicit use thereof, but other States as well. The justification, of course, of this resolution

is that there has developed a very substantial traffic in the narcotics system itself in and across the borders of several other States. There being no question but that the traffic in and use of narcotics definitely contributes to juventile delinquency and adds materially to the expenses of law enforcement, to say nothing of the deterioration and destruction of the individual user thereof in his mental, moral, physical person, it should be crystal clear that such White House conference as is indicated in Congressman ROOSEVELT'S timely resolution should undertake to recommend to the President of the United States and to the U.S. Congress adequate and practical and feasible ways and means of obtaining substantial uniformity as between State and Federal enforcement of narcotics statutes and of their penalties, and in like manner to delegate the area and jurisdiction which must be occupied as between Federal, State, and local authorities on the subject. These and other related and germaine purposes are clearly set forth in the resolution before us and it is my sincere hope that the President of the United States, even though this resolution makes it entirely optional, of course, with the President to call such conference, may find it entirely appropriate to promptly call such White House Conference on Narcotics and set the machinery in motion to promptly organize and have such conference expedited and its results made known and put into practical effect.

The Federal Government and the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most stimulating and courageous speeches delivered in Washington in recent weeks was given by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK, at the George Washington University on March 28. His speech, entitled "Toward National Federalism," was one of a series on the subject "The Federal Government and the Cities." I do not recall reading a more incisive or more challenging analysis anywhere of the central problem of bringing the structure of American government into line with the realities of twentieth century American life.

Going directly to the heart of the fiscal problems now distorting Federal, State, and local relations, Senator CLARK probes behind the cliches and commonplaces of our current political debates. His appeal is directed squarely at all thoughtful Americans who wish to be honest with themselves and with public policy.

Clarity and candor are not in abundant supply in our national life today, but we can all be grateful to this speech and this speaker for giving us both. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Senator CLARK'S speech as follows:

TOWARD NATIONAL FEDERALISM

When we examine the picture of local governments in America, we see three trends:

First, metropolitan areas are expanding rapidly across city, county, and State lines.

Second, local budgets, tax rates, and bonded debt are shooting steadily skyward.

Third, despite these increases, the level of public services is far from satisfactory, and is in many cases dangerously deteriorating.

From these last two facts, we can draw a fundamental conclusion: That many billions of dollars must come from somewhere to raise the level of public services up to where it ought to be.

I am not going to pause long to argue the case for a higher level of public services. The need is obvious to anyone who looks about him.

Consider education. The White House Conference on Education estimated that the amount spent on education at all levels should be doubled in 10 years—from $20 to $40 billion annually. We are not gaining on the backlog of school construction needs. Teacher salary scales have been declining for years in relation to the rest of the community. The capacity of higher education institutions is not keeping pace with the number of able students who should be admitted.

Or consider housing. The Census Bureau found in 1956 that 13 million urban housing units were substandard—and about half of these are not even fit for rehabilitation. The Rockefeller Bros. Fund puts the urban renewal need at about $3 billion a year, or about seven times the current rate of renewal.

Or consider the losing fight our cities are waging against juvenile delinquency—or the inadequacy of public recreation—or the kind of traffic jams everyone of us encounters in going to work in the morning—or the poison in our streams and rivers. As Senator FULBRIGHT said the other day, we have toilet water at every drugstore and polluted streams in nearly every State.

Of course, there are always those who do not consider the deterioration of public service to be any kind of crisis.

But not all Americans, thank heaven, are indifferent. Some of us are fond of reiterating Mr. Justice Holmes' comment that "taxes are the price we pay for civilization." The mark of a civilized society is its concern for the common good as distinct from the individual good—a shared sense of responsibility for the larger community beyond the family and the tribal boundary.

My remarks today are addressed only to the civilized. Those who feel no distress at the appalling inadequacy of public services—or who think the ultimate purpose of an economy is to produce more consumer goods—may leave the room or permit their minds to wander. I have no message for them.

The first question is, How did the distribution of our resources come to be so distorted that we who boast the highest level of luxury consumption the world has ever known must be ashamed of our public schools, our public playgrounds, and our public welfare services?

I think there are two reasons:

First, the organization of local government is obsolete.

Second, the revenue structure of local government is obsolete.

Our units of local government—our cities, counties, townships—are with a few conspicuous exceptions, essentially the same as when the Nation was established.

And the basic revenue source of local government—the property tax—is fundamentally unchanged from colonial times, even before there was a United States of America.

Meanwhile, of course, we have passed through social and economic revolutions. A rural Nation has become an urban Nation. Metropolitan areas have spread pellmell across city, county, and State lines. A localized economy has become a national economy. The old America with its wealth and income in land has become an expense account, diner's club, charge-a-plate, no down payment, stock option, capital gains economy.

We will solve the problem of providing adequate local public services when we evolve new concepts of federalism in line with the realities of modern life—and not until then.

Let me speak first about finance.

There are some deficiencies in local government that more money alone will not cure—but few that can be cured without money.

Why are local budgets inadequate? Is it a lack of willingness to tax, or a lack of real resources? Undoubtedly some of both, but the latter is more important than the former.

The conservative organs of opinion are full of dire claims that it is Federal spending which is breaking the back of the American taxpayer. Yet the figures indicate otherwise:

Since 1946, Federal revenues have risen by 74 percent, which is considerably less than the economy has grown. But State and local revenues have more than tripled. The Federal Government still collects 63 percent of all tax revenues—but this is down from 77 percent in 1946.

Federal tax rates are high, but State and local tax rates have risen steadily, while Federal taxpayers have enjoyed tax reductions—the last one in 1954.

Since 1946, Federal indebtedness has risen 5 percent. But State and local debt has risen 309 percent—or 62 times as fast.

Clearly it is not the Federal taxpayer but the State and local taxpayer who is under the greatest strain.

Many units of local government have already reached the practical limit of their tax resources. Others would reach that limit long before they could, unaided, lift the level of public services to the point where public needs are truly met. This is especially true in areas of heavy unemployment, where the need for public services is greatest.

Seven of every eight local tax dollars are still collected from the real property tax. That tax was perhaps well suited to colonial America when almost all wealth was in real property and most income came from the land. Land by its nature was spread evenly across the country; each political subdivision had its share. A tax levied on a man's real estate measured quite accurately his relative ability to pay. Only a small fraction of wealth was in intangibles which escaped taxation.

Today, the situation is reversed. Today only a fraction of total wealth is represented by equities in real property. A poor man or a middle-class suburbanite, it is true, may have all his accumulated wealth in his mortgaged home. He will thus be taxed on his entire wealth, at least, and ordinarily on somewhat more property than he actually owns. Indeed, with a VA loan he may begin paying taxes when he has no equity at all. In some of our more modest suburban subdivisions, I suspect, the total property tax base exceeds the net accumulated wealth of everybody in it.

But the man who is better off—who has accumulated additional wealth—will have then additional wealth largely in a safety deposit box, in the form of stock certificates, or bonds, or other intangibles. And the local property tax does not penetrate the secret confines of the safety deposit box.

In short, while the rich man pays local property taxes on what may be a tiny fraction of his accumulated wealth, the average-income man pays on what may be 2 to 10 or more times his accumulated wealth. As

it affects individuals, a more inequitable tax system could hardly be devised. And because the property tax is thus inversely related to ability to pay, its limit is reached early—when it strikes too hard at the resources of the lower-and-middle-income groups who bear the brunt of it.

Corporations, of course, pay their share of property taxes. But with the growth of large concentrated industries, corporate real property is distributed most unevenly across the land. One of the largest industrial plants in the world, located in my Commonwealth, pays property taxes to only one small school district. It does not contribute to the support of the schools to which most of its employees send their children, because they live across the district line.

Faced with the defects and limitations of the property tax, local governments have found two other broad based taxes—the wage tax and the local sales tax. But together they provide less than 10 percent of local tax revenue, and both, like the property tax, are regressive in their effects. The wage tax is levied upon the entire income of the wage earner but only a part of the income of the higher bracket person who has earnings from dividends or rent or interest as well as salary. And the sales tax is ill-suited for local application because of competition between city and suburban merchants.

So much for local taxes. Every State of the Union, by now, has recognized their limits and is providing some State money for the provision of local services. In some States, more than half the State budget consists of local grants. Yet what kind of taxes do the States reply upon?

Over half of all State tax revenue now comes from sales and excise taxes, which, as I have said, are regressive.

In my own Commonwealth, our sales tax has just been raised to 4 percent. It is hard to believe that it can be pushed much higher. Yet we are still forbidden by our constitution from levying a progressive income tax. And every effort to change the constitution has been defeated.

The competition among the States to get and keep industry within their boundaries is so keen—and particularly so as long as we continue to tolerate a less-than-full-employment economy—that no State dares shift the burden to progressive taxes.

Some years ago, Governor Williams, of Michigan, proposed a new corporation tax to pay for education. The following day, General Motors announced that if the tax were passed GM would never build another plant in Michigan. Within a matter of hours, other auto manufacturers had joined in this campaign of blackmail. The reaction of the State legislature was predictable.

In Wichita, Kans., a city election turned on whether an industrial area should be deannexed from the city because of reports that the packing company located there would move elsewhere if it had to pay its share of city taxes. The packing company won.

This year, the State of Mississippi cut the top bracket of its personal income tax from 6 to 3 percent. The announced purpose? To persuade business executives to move their plants and come to live in Mississippi.

Industrial journals these days publish comparisons of the "business climate" in the several States. What this euphemism means is the extent to which the corporations and their executives escape taxation.

I personally doubt that industry would flee wholesale from a State that raised its business or individual income taxes, but it can certainly threaten to—and ordinarily the threat suffices. Certainly the chance of getting new industry is adversely affected if a State develops the reputation of having an adverse "business climate." So State governments, like local governments, are putting greater and greater loads upon limited, regressive, and inequitable tax structures.

The Federal tax system, by contrast, is well adopted to a modern industrial economy. Its corporate and individual income taxes seek out the main earning streams of the economy, wherever they happen to be located. General Motors could conceivably flee from Michigan to escape Governor Williams' tax, but it cannot flee the United States. If the corporation executive is enticed to locate in Mississippi, he may escape New York's heavier income tax but his Federal tax liability goes with him. The industrial plant I spoke of may not pay much property tax to its school districts but it pays half its income to the United States. And the Federal tax system makes no distinction between income invested in property and income invested in paper encased in a safety deposit box.

I hasten to add that, year after year, loopholes and inequities have been written into the Federal tax laws, to favor the same corporations, investors, and executives who have so successfully fought State taxation. Yet these can be corrected. And even with its faults, the Federal tax structure is still highly progressive and adapted in general to the realities of the organization of a modern industrial society.

Let me summarize at this point. I have suggested three conclusions:

First, spending for public services, particularly in metropolitan areas, must continue to increase.

Second, many States and communities have reached or are approaching the practical limit of what can be raised through existing State and local tax structures.

Third, the Federal tax structure is far more productive, far more equitable, and under far less strain.

From these three propositions a fourth flows automatically. The Federal tax system should be used to an increasing degree to finance services which have been heretofore strictly State and local.

You may ask: Isn't there an alternative? Cannot Federal tax sources be relinquished to the States to permit them to finance the functions themselves?

As a former mayor, I can testify that the organized mayors and the organized Governors never ask for Federal aid until they have first demanded that the Federal Government return tax sources which it has usurped so that the States can take care of themselves. Indeed, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee was recently created for the express purpose of identifying taxes and functions that could be returned—or, to use a more accurate word, abandoned—to the States. The utter failure of that committee to find either should be enough to persuade discerning people that it can't be done. Yet I note that Mr. Robert Merriam, who preceded me upon this platform, expects the new Commisison on Intergovernmental Relations to undertake the selfsame mission of futility.

My fourth proposition is, I admit, heretical. The deliberate expansion of Federal aid runs counter to all that all of us learned American federalism. It runs counter to what Mr. John Kenneth Galbraith calls the in school about the concepts underlying "conventional wisdom." Decentralization, home rule, local self-reliance, government close to the people, States rights, "that government is best which governs least"—all of the slogans and symbols of the American tradition are against my proposition.

Of course, we often act in accord with my proposition. But we do not openly acknowledge it.

Thus we disguised our 1958 education act as the National Defense Education Act. Similarly, when the Federal Government took over a 90 percent share of the cost of our major highways, it was also in the guise of national defense—even though the Defense Department just now found out that the bridges on the new highways will not clear its military vehicles.

Another disguise is to call our aid programs temporary emergency measures. Thus the National Defense Education Act carries a 4-year limit. The general aid to education bill the Senate passed this year only received the winning margin of votes when we put a 2-year limit on it. The Airport Act, the Stream Pollution Control Act, the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, the Urban Renewal Act, all carry time limits, on the theory that thus no permanent damage is being done to our traditional concept of federalism.

Any one of you who could spend a day going through a Senator's incoming mail would be surprised at the incessant repetition of the States rights cliches. Writer after writer, particularly those writing under business or professional letterheads and editors of small town newspapers, demands that the Federal Government stay out of education, housing, or what have you, and let the States and cities take care of themselves.

Their views are derived from chamber of commerce bulletins, trade associations or bank newsletters, civic club speeches, and all the newspapers and magazines which collectively may be termed the "organs of plutocratic opinion". And these in turn publicize such authorities as Budget Director Stans, who in his recent widely reprinted speech said, "We carry on massive Federal programs which States and local governments could do better".

You may be wondering, don't these people, all the way from Mr. Stans to the local businessman, understand the stringent limits on State and local taxes and the great superiority of the Federal tax system?

The answer is: Of course they do. Nobody understands it better.

That is what the shouting is all about.

I realize that it is not considered quite nice to refer in America to anything like a "class struggle". That is too Marxian. In America, it is considered nicer to pretend that, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country."

Yet the tax issue is at heart a class issue. The brunt of Federal taxation falls upon the corporations and the upper-income families. State and local taxes fall far more heavily upon the average-and-lower-income families.

My Republican colleague in the Senate from Pennsylvania loves to point out that under Federal aid programs, Pennsylvania taxpayers pay more than Pennsylvania gets back. Hence, he argues, they pay more than they would if the State itself paid for the service. But what he does not point out is that it is not the same taxpayers. The breaking point in our State is about $6,000 in family income. Even though we pay more than we get back, families under $6,000—and that is about two-thirds of our families—pay less when programs are financed through Federal aid. It is only the one-third with incomes above that level who pay more.

This is what the great political issue between the "spenders" and the "savers" really amounts to.

When we passed the aid-to-education bill, the same editorials which attacked the Senate as "reckless" and "extravagant" admitted that the money for education must be spent.

Then why do they hate the Federal Government so and love local governments so? Is it truly a reverence for the ideas of Thomas Jefferson? Is it a genuine affection for the town meeting and government close to home? Is it a sincere belief that city councils and school boards are inherently wiser than the Congress?

Not at all. These are smokescreens. They hate the Federal Government and love local government because the former taxes them heavily and the latter lightly. Federal aid redistributes the wealth downward. A shift of responsibility to the States would redistribute the wealth upward. It is that simple.

The corporations and high-income taxpayers own the journals of opinion; they control the taxpayers' leagues and the business organizations; they finance the civic club lecture circuits; they even influence, I am afraid, some of the colleges and universities which they help finance. Through all these means they create the conventional wisdom about Federal-State-local relations.

Fortunately, there are voices on the other side. The cry of States' rights is not being shouted by progressive Governors concerned about the level of public services. Local self-reliance is not being praised by mayors who have seen that only the Federal Government can make real the vision of urban renewal. Local autonomy is not defended by educator groups and parent-teacher associations who know how local tax limits can limit the horizons of education.

Those who support Federal aid are, I believe, the authentic voices of democracy. And the issue is one older than our country—whether democracy or plutocracy shall govern.

An essential aspect of my proposal for expanded Federal aid is that administration of these programs should, to the maximum extent, remain local.

In this regard, I am a traditionalist. I do not believe that local governments will always make wiser decisions as to how money should be spent. But the reverse is certainly true, also. And I do believe that if the details of local programs are reviewed in Washington the relationship will tend to become unworkable.

In the recent Senate education bill, we wrote in a flat prohibition against Federal control of any kind over curriculum or any other phase of school operations. We were attacked, of course, by those who said that despite this protestation Federal control was inevitable. I was also challenged by a Pennsylvania editor who said school districts should be supervised because otherwise they would waste the Federal money.

I disagree with both points of view.

As long as there is a substantial local financial stake in the total spending, the local share can be designed so as to remove any incentive toward waste.

We do make a mistake, I believe, if we use the equivalent of a cost-plus-percentage contract. The interstate highway program is a case in point. In that program, the effective point of decision on matters affecting costs is in the States, yet the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the total cost. Thus, for every $1,000 that costs are increased, $900 comes into the States from the Federal Government. This positive incentive to higher costs will, I am afraid, embroil the highway program in scandal sooner or later—if indeed it has not done so already.

The urban renewal program has a one-third local share, plus careful Federal review and approval of individual projects. So far, both the Scylla of waste and the Charybdis of onerous Federal review procedures have been avoided—although the accumulation of redtape must constantly be guarded against.

Our education bill proceeds on still another theory. Money is allocated to the States according to a fixed formula, the only requirement being that the States increase their contributions also. Because the Federal share is fixed, the marginal expenditures are financed 100 percent by the States and local school districts. Any savings accrue wholly to them, and any waste comes wholly out of their funds. Under these circumstances, I do not see the need for any Federal control at all, beyond a minimal reporting for accounting purposes. While every program differs, I think we should move in the direction of fixed grants, as in this bill, given without controls.

It is noteworthy, I believe, that of all aid programs the highway program has the largest Federal proportion, while education is scarcely yet accepted as a Federal responsibility. This distinction can be assuredly traced to the fact that major business interests—not mere children—are the direct or indirect beneficiaries of highway building. Principles about States rights yield readily to self-interest, even among the plutocracy.

Perhaps Federal aid must be authorized separately for particular programs—at least for a while—in view of the readier acceptability of some functions of Government. But I believe we might well look toward the eventual development of grants not restricted as to purpose, as is now the case in some foreign countries and in some States.

The essential point in constructing our new federalism—which we might call "national federalism"—is to look separately at taxing and spending. Revenues should be collected preponderantly at the Federal level because a national tax system can best tap an economy that is national in its character. But where decision-making can best be made at the local level and national uniformity is not essential, then the scheme should be so designed that—as in our education bill—the money can safely be distributed to the States and localities for administration. The Swiss system, whereby all taxes are, I believe, collected centrally and then shared among all levels of government, deserves our careful study.

I shall deal more briefly with the second great handicap to the provision of local public services—obsolete organization—because most of its aspects do not come under the heading of federalism.

The problems have been oft-described. Numerous, overlapping governmental units—most of them too tiny to be effective in dealing with metropolitan problems; the irrational pattern of State boundaries, which slice through rivers and valleys and metropolitan areas; the absence of any layer of government coterminous with the metropolitan areas; the proliferation of special purpose authorities; obsolete city charters; outmoded political machines—these defects are generally beyond action at the Federal level, although there may be an occasional avenue through which the Federal Government can exercise influence. We might, for example, borrow the "workable program" idea for urban renewal and make certain grants or loans conditional on the development of a workable program on a metropolitan scale. If this were the case in regard to Federal aid for mass transit, the financial incentive might force the municipalities that comprise a metropolitan area to get together for effective area-wide transit planning. Water development, which can be rationally organized only by river basins, surely demands greater Federal participation, which might be conditioned on new forms of organization among the States and their local governmental units.

The States, likewise, cannot be reformed from Washington. Urban underrepresentation in State legislatures; obsolete State constitutions; limited tax structures—these can only be dealt with by the people of the several States. But there is this safety valve: If the States cannot be made effective participants in dealing with metropolitan problems, they can always be bypassed—as they have been, generally, in such fields as housing and urban renewal.

But what we at the Federal level can do is reorganize the Federal Government itself for purposes of the new federalism. Our structure, too, is obsolete. A visitor from another planet, studying the makeup of our Government, would surely conclude that ours is still a rural nation. We have a Department of Agriculture, with a budget of $6 billion. We have a Department of the Interior concerned with millions of acres of empty land. But we have no department of the Government concerned with the problems of the metropolitan areas where most of our people live and where the need for expansion of public services is so heavily concentrated.

I have prepared and will introduce this week legislation to create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs, to consist of the present Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would be given, in addition to its operating functions, a general role as spokesman within the Government for urban communities.

I have reviewed the attack which Mr. Merriam made upon proposals for a new department. With all due respect to Mr. Merriam, I must say that he indulged in the old trick of setting up a strawman and then knocking it down. He ridiculed the idea of putting the Federal Aviation Agency, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Public Assistance, and the Corps of Engineers in a Department of Urban Affairs. But I know of nobody who has made any such proposal.

Under my conception, these functions of Government which serve the whole population, urban and rural, would remain in their existing departments. Assigned to the new Department would be only functions which relate directly and either exclusively or predominantly to cities and metropolitan areas, and these have already been clustered in an agency which is bigger than several of our existing departments—the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This Agency administers not only the programs to spur homebuilding, but such generalized urban programs as urban renewal, loans for community facilities, and aid to urban and metropolitan planning.

You may ask, why a department? Why not a coordinating committee such as Mr. Merriam advocated?

Frankly, because we need a vital center of thought and action, and—again with all due respect—committees just are not suited to that purpose. A committee is the sum of its members, nothing more. It has no life of its own. What is needed is an executive and a staff with a broad responsibility for studying the problems of metropolitan areas and for thinking creatively about the role of the Federal Government in the solutions. If no member of the committee has such responsibility, then the committee will not have it. A committee can, in Mr. Merriam's illustration, make sure that the highway builders have been introduced to the urban renewal administrators, but it can do little more.

The cities of America need a voice at the summit equal in status to the voice of agriculture. A Department headed by a Secretary is suited to that purpose. A committee, consisting of 20 busy men taking time our periodically for a meeting or a quick luncheon together, is hardly a suitable substitute.

An alternative suggestion, advanced by Louis Brownlow among others, has more merit. That is to create an agency in the Executive Office of the President with staff of its own and with a planning and coordinating responsibility. Yet it is my experience that the most productive planning is that which is closely associated with the vitality of action programs. An agency which daily administers planning grants, urban renewal and slum clearance, public housing, and community facility loans can best nourish the creative thinking that is the missing ingredient.

Let us promote the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level and rename it a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs, with a broad charter to concern itself with the problems of metropolitan living and to conduct research, develop ideas, and initiate legislation and program recommendations. If there were still need for Mr. Merriam's committee or for a coordinating unit in the Executive Office of the President, I would see no objection. But I suspect that once the Secretary of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs were seated at the Cabinet table, the demand for additional coordinating mechanisms would quickly disappear.

The great weakness of democracy, and the ever-present threat to its survival, is political lag. A dictatorship can quickly remold its institutions, save only the institution of dictatorship itself; a democracy cannot. A democracy inevitably lumbers along, therefore, with outmoded and creaky machinery. Unfortunately, short of a crisis it rarely modernizes its machinery. But those who see the need cannot do other than keep trying.

Our traditional concept of federalism—outmoded in the last century by the nationalization of our economy and in this century by the urbanization of our society—is a case of political lag which urgently deserves our attention. I hope that university communities such as this one, located here in the Nation's Capital, will assume leadership in rethinking and reshaping our concepts of federalism to accord with the realities of modern life.

Philippine Sugar—Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, an examination of the hearings on the 1956 amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, will disclose that many Members of the House and Senate representing tobacco-growing States were very critical of the Philippines for their Government's curtailment of the importation of Virginia burley leaf tobacco. During the hearings, the representative of the Philippines explained that the Philippine Government in doing this was following the recommendations of the so-called Bell Economic Mission which was sent to the Philippines in 1950 by the U.S. Government to make, after study, certain recommendations to help the Philippine economy. Among the recommendations of the Mission to the Philippine Government was the curtailment of the importation of luxuries, including Virginia burley leaf tobacco, in order that the fast-dwindling dollar reserves of the young republic would be conserved. It directed the Philippines to foster and promote to the fullest their own tobacco industry.

At the time of the approval of the last extension of the Sugar Act, the only foreign area denied participation then to share in the increased consumption provided for all other foreign countries was the Philippines. This was due to a large measure by the opposition of the representatives of tobacco-processing and growing areas in the United States.

In connection with the extension of the Sugar Act with which we are faced in this session of the Congress, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues representing tobacco-producing or processing States an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, April 3, 1960, entitled "Smokers of Cuba Miss U.S. Brands." Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the subject article:

SMOKERS OF CUBA MISS U.S. BRANDS—CASTRO TO EASE IMPORT BAN ON CIGARETTES BUT PLANS TO IMPOSE HIGH TAX

(By Tad Szulc)

HAVANA, April 2.—A Cuban gentleman stared enviously at the table occupied by a U.S. family at a restaurant here one night this week.

As the family got up to leave, the man got up from his table and intercepted them. With an embarrassed smile, he said: "I am terribly sorry to do this, but I noticed you have American cigarettes. It would be a great favor if you could offer me just one to smoke with my coffee."

At the bar of one of Havana's fashionable but now empty tourist hotels, the cigarette girl saw a pack of American cigarettes in front of a visitor. She looked into her tray, filled with many brands of Cuban cigarettes, and sighed: "You are lucky to have such good things to smoke."

Almost everywhere in Cuba U.S. cigarettes have become a badge of distinction and a social asset a bit reminiscent of the days in Europe immediately after World War II.

U.S. CIGARETTES BANNED

The Cuban Government, in its concern to save precious dollars, has banned the imports of U.S. cigarettes, which for generations have come here at the rate of millions of packs annually.

Many Cubans preferred U.S. cigarettes which were one of the many former economic and cultural dependence of Cuba upon its big neighbor. The government picked them as one of its first targets in the curtailing of nonessential imports.

Yet acquired tastes are not easily lost. The regime, as a concession, has decided to authorize the entry of several large shipments of U.S. cigarettes.

A Ministry of Commerce spokesman said that seven foreign exchange permits for cigarettes had been approved by the National Bank.

The cigarettes are expected to retail for about 70 cents a pack as the regime has every intention of taxing them heavily.

Last year, a pack could be purchased here for about 40 cents. Local brands average 10 to 15 cents.

Cigarettes are only one of many items in short supply here as a result of barring most nonessential imports from the United States.

Automobiles and electrical appliances can be imported only with hard-to-get import licenses and are subject to heavy taxes. Spare parts of all types are hard to find and, as a result of growing complaints, the regime has indicated it would soon import shipments of replacement parts.

Wednesdays are chickenless days in Cuba because of shortages of chicken. In the past, chickens were imported from Miami. Butter, formerly imported, is on the list of acute shortages.

This situation indicates the extent to which Cuba under past governments allowed her economy to become dependent on the United States. With her own fine tobacco, she imports cigarettes. With large dairy and cattle herds, she imported powdered milk, cheeses, meat, and fowl. Consumers preferred the imported rice to the local variety.

All this, evidently, had the effect of stunting Cuba's economic development.

It has given weight to charges by Premier Fidel Castro that Cuba has been an economic colony of the United States, using the bulk of her sugar earnings to pay for imports of consumer goods.

For his own reasons, Dr. Castro has declared a war on luxuries, privileges, and wealth. He contends that they have led to these economic distortions and the poverty of the Cuban masses.

White House Conference on Narcotics

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be both a member of the California Delegation Subcommittee on Narcotics and a member of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary, which reported out this bill favorably. At first I was not very sympathetic to this approach. I would remind you this is a very serious problem, in California in particular. We approach this problem, because of that fact, through the California delegation. Five of us who sat on that committee did not make an investigation into the proper action that should be taken, but we made that kind of survey directed to what should be the proper approach to the problem. After we had testimony from the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics and the attorney general of California, and we heard such disparity in the report of the sources, we decided that there certainly had to be some better coordination and centralized direction available to us. The device of the White House Conference was suggested. I have been skeptical as to that device solving much of anything. I think the findings usually go into the files and simply make excellent matter for somebody to write a paper on later.

But this will be a different kind of White House Conference, because it will be composed of people who have special qualifications by virtue of the experience in the office they hold and by the fact that the membership of the Conference and scope of subject matter will not be comparable to the conferences on other subjects. We will be dealing with a limited specific problem. People with special experience to offer in this field will be heard. I think we can expect that out of this kind of a conference we will get some specific recommendations which will have powerful persuasive power. We can get something in the nature of a tacit agreement between the various governmental entities.

Surely we can expect there will be a resolution of differences on very important matters, such as the question of where the narcotics come from. We learned that the Maline process of determining addiction was hardly known outside of California. California has much to offer. Ohio has certainly contributions it can offer to the State of California.

The cost involved in this, as White House Conferences go, are really negligible; and in the light of the magnitude and seriousness of the problem which it is designed to confront it is infinitesimally small. Therefore, I urge, Mr. Speaker, that this House pass this resolution which merely urges the President of the United States to use a device that has been invented for him, is available to him, and which he has used on other occasions for proposals no more serious, and with far less prospect of accomplishing worthy results.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Disturbing Changes in West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, still another disturbing aspect of the situation in Germany, specifically West Berlin, is reported in the following article by Joseph C. Harsch from the Christian Science Monitor of March 30, 1960. Mr. Harsch points out that certain changes occurring in West Berlin suggest that it may soon have lost its bargaining value on the diplomatic level.

I submit the article which follows for the RECORD:

AT THE STORM'S CENTER
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

There has been an important change in the Berlin story.

This reporter has gone to Berlin for a visit after a 4-year absence. The change is striking. It can be summed up in the single statement that the vitality of West Berlin, which for a decade has been one of the most stirring and dramatic features of the world scene, is largely gone.

On the surface the old story survives. The contrast between East and West Berlin continues. The Communist side is drab, dusty, and cheerless. The Western side is bright by day with the colors of superb modern buildings and bright by night with neon lights.

In West Berlin the streets are broad and clean and tidy. Shiny modern cars flow virtually everywhere. Old palaces and museums have been superbly restored and await the summer tourist rush. New hotels invite occupancy. New office buildings send their glass facades into the sky. For the tourist weary of overcrowded Western cities, West Berlin is a heaven and haven.

In West Berlin one can find a hotel room, get a table at a restaurant without reserving ahead, always find a taxi waiting outside one's hotel door.

But beneath the shiny surface there has been a significant change. It shows through in many ways. Public buses, streetcars, and trains are less than crowded even at rush hours. Traffic congestion never even approaches New York, London, or Paris density. Schools are less than crowded.

Children and young people are rare. Vibrant teenagers, who dominate the scenery of any other great Western city, are few and far between. Smart cafes and restaurants are full, not of smart young people but of middle aged and older. The architectural face of West Berlin is fresh, young, and modern. The human face of West Berlin is aged.

The population figures tell the story. To this day more people come into West Berlin than leave it. Yet, the total population is shrinking. It grew steadily from the end of the war until it reached its peak in 1957. It shrank by 2,000 in 1958 and by 20,000 in 1959. For the death rate not only exceeds the birth rate but also the excess of immirant over emigrant. It is becoming a city of people with no place else to go—of the older generation living on pensions.

Those who stay constitute the labor force for the great factories plus those who have retired. The retired stay on partly because it is home and partly because housing is more plentiful. Aid from the West has expanded housing facilities for what is now a dwindling population. Those able to work can find work more easily in West Berlin than in more crowded West Germany.

Washington continues to claim stoutly it never will abandon the people of West Berlin. American diplomacy in West Berlin proclaims as loudly as ever, almost more loudly, the doctrine of unceasing devotion.

The phrases are unchanged from the days when West Berlin was a vast bustling advance base for the great crusade against Communist Europe. But the words no longer convince the people. The young and eager have gone west. Those who remain have lost faith.

West Berlin is still a besieged and blockaded city. Most of its people never have left it since the war. The promise by which they have lived has been the promise of release into a reunified Germany. When a siege goes on so long unlifted, those who wait the day of release grow discouraged. The promise has been so long unfulfilled.

The West Berlin of the cold war was vibrant with rising life and vitality. It was a great forward base. It was pervaded by an atmosphere of purpose and positive intent.

West Berlin today is pervaded by declining hope and a declining sense of purpose. The war destroyed its function as a capital city. The cold war gave it the new function of the outpost of the West. The decline dates from the new policy of East-West relaxation.

Moscow once feared the power of West Berlin to infect the Communist world with Western ideas. Moscow once demanded the dismantling of the "forward strategy" elements which based on Berlin. East Germany once looked to Western Berlin for the signal to rise. The signal never came. Like some of our other forward bases its value has been eroded by changing times and conditions. If we intend even to use West Berlin as a bargaining counter in diplomacy, we should use it soon or, like our air bases in Saudi Arabia and Morocco, it, too, will have lost its bargaining value.

Lynn, Mass., Engraving Plant Develops Process for Inspection of Precision Component

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a very interesting article which appeared in the magazine Industry for March 1960:

LYNN ENGRAVING PLANT DEVELOPS PROCESS FOR INSPECTION OF PRECISION COMPONENT
(By Fred Goddard)

Throw a high, hard one at Commerce Engraving, Inc., up in Lynn and they're liable to knock it out of the park. It's really not so unusual—Lynn has developed more than a dozen major leaguers and, as an industrial center, it has hit its share of technical homeruns as well.

What is unusual is that the company should in a matter of only 3 years take a significant place in the concerted drive for knowledge of outer space. The problem, thrown at the parent company's management by an acquaintance in industry was to investigate the possibilities of establishing a local source for the manufacture of precision layouts and optical inspection components.

That was 3 years ago, says Bob Borck, the youthful president of the company. Trained in the engraving field by his father and key company personnel, Borck took to the problem with energy and imagination even though, as he puts it, "we didn't know the first thing about the field."

Now a subsidiary of Commerce Engraving, known as Visual Inspection Products, does business with General Electric, Raytheon, C. B. S. Hytron, Stocker & Yale, Magnesium Casting Co., Sylvania Electric, and scores of others. It is the first and only company of its type in the Bay State.

A relatively new field, the visual inspection of finely machined parts, rather than the longer and less accurate manual inspection, is fast coming into its own. This method of inspection is well known to major industries; it is only recently that its value and simplicity have been recognized by smaller industrial concerns.

In brief, it works like this. A company makes thousands of tiny parts for jet engines, for example. They all have to be painstakingly inspected by hand. With the use of optical inspection techniques the dimensions of the tiny part can be blown up 10, 20, 50, or even 100 times and translated to a glass, plastic, or metal chart. The actual part is fitted to a staging fixture and its silhouette is magnified to compare with the magnified, highly precise enlarged image.

If the silhouette fits correctly, the part is perfect and another part can be inspected. The saving in time as well as the cost of expensive gages is enormous, according to Borck. With proper accurate glass charts almost anyone can use an optical comparator efficiently. When the magnified image of the particular part is thrown on the glass chart or screen, tolerances as close as three-tenths of a thousandth of an inch can be obtained—a necessity in this age of electronics. Special staging fixtures hold the part in place and, not only can an operator of one of the optical comparators accept or reject a part, he can tell where a part is good or bad and how much it varies from the acceptable tolerances.

Error and the human factor are virtually eliminated under the process. Another advantage is that parts too tiny or too irregular to be examined by hand can be held firmly in the staging fixture for careful inspection. Parts too large to be inspected as a single unit can be examined section by section on a multiple-position screen.

With their background in photoengraving, Commerce found the problem of developing its own process a challenge. After several months of experimentation the final process was developed. Most of the work was done at night in a vacant building adjacent to Commerce Engraving. Its success was determined by the combined knowledge of the firm's corps of engravers, the assistance of one of the top design engineers in the area and a tremendous amount of research.

"It was a real moonlight project until we began to get the hang of it," Borck declares.

The demand for even more and more precision in the manufacture of machine tools, jet engines and rocket components, has brought into focus the value and economy of visual inspection. Although comparators have been a valuable tool in the machine shop and inspection room for a number of years as a measuring device, the modern manufacturing technology has created a wide diversity of parts that can only be successfully made and inspected by comparison techniques.

It is in this area that Visual Inspection Products is making such an outstanding contribution to the overall space age program.

Still in its infancy, Visual Inspection Products has already become an institution in the field of optical inspection fixturing and comparator chart creation. All alone on the ground floor of the process in Massachusetts, VIP enjoys more than just its premier advantage.

Location is, and will continue to be, an important factor in the growth of the subsidiary company. "We're only a hop, skip, and a jump from the dozens of research plants along Route 128," Borck points out. "If a company has a problem we can square it away in a matter of hours by personal contact rather than through the mails or over the long distance wire."

Previously, firms had to be dependent on companies located in other sections of the country for visual inspection information and consultation. Then, too, the company is designing and manufacturing the coordinated fixtures demanded by its customers. Although a few are standard, the great majority have to be custom-designed. Visual Inspection Products has the advantage of the great technical labor force in the area and occasionally draws upon it for assistance.

The opportunities facing the new firm are almost limitless. Charts for inspecting radar elements for radios, automotive parts, and aircraft engine and missile components are a few of the orders filled in recent months. Not only large manufacturers, but small machine shop operators are finding the optical inspection process a boon.

Carried by a competent sales force, the name Visual Inspection Products is becoming more and more familiar to Massachusetts industry. "Give us a few more years," states Borck, "and VIP may well outgrow its parent company." If initiative and enterprise count for anything, the prediction looks like a certainty.

Air Service From Pacific Northwest to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to award permanent certificates to Pan American Airways and Northwest Airlines to fly between Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest is sound, logical, and one to be highly praised. The question of whether one airline should enjoy a monopoly on the route or whether the status quo of a 10-year duration should be maintained is now permanently settled with the Board's recognition that competition is, has been, and always will be essential to good service on this route. With an eye toward President Eisenhower's Executive order that the interests of the Pacific area, from the standpoint of traffic growth potential, be carefully considered in decisions affecting air traffic routes, the announcement has been heralded as being in support of the President's directive.

The far-reaching effects of this decision can be instantly realized. Even now Pan American jets are winging across the Pacific to Hawaii cutting in half the time once required by piston aircraft. With the impetus of competition Northwest Airlines expects to add jet equipment next year and both carriers are ever increasing their schedules to accommodate the extensive traffic growth fomented by population expansion in these regions. Hawaii's new statehood, and the interest thus germinated made it, even more than ever, a focal point of travel enthusiasm.

East coast cities, once a formidable distance from Hawaii, are now brought close by the jet age and it is to be hoped this is a forerunner of CAB decisions bringing to reality the dream of one carrier, direct service from the major cities of the East to the Orient beyond. As underscored by the CAB decision, competition generates productive activity with the public as beneficiary, whereas monopolistic certification as still exists on some routes from the East to the Orient tends to stifle our Nation's air supremacy and frustrate planning for future transportation development and expansion. The CAB is to be congratulated for a decision which will maintain for this country a preeminent position in the airlanes of the world.

Pacific Northwest-Hawaii Renewal Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to associate myself with the Governor of Hawaii and the two Senators of the 50th State in protesting the report of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner which would have drastically curtailed air service between the mainland and Honolulu.

A grateful Hawaii now commends the CAB for its infinite wisdom in voting, unanimously, to continue to have the excellent services of both Pan American World Airways and Northwest Orient Airlines on the route from Seattle and Portland to Honolulu.

Rather than comment on the obvious inequities of the examiner's report I prefer to express myself on the final findings of the CAB. Certainly nothing has excited the imaginative traveler as much as the new accessibility to Hawaii and the Pacific generally. Air service to Samoa, to Tahiti, to the Fiji Islands, and on to the great and beautiful countries of Australia and New Zealand has whetted the appetites of mainland travelers. Fortunately for us in Hawaii, virtually all of these people will be processed through Hawaii. Once there, we believe they will either remain or will immediately make plans to return.

Now that both Pan Am and Northwest will be operating on permanent certificates the travel potentials between Honolulu and the mainland are limitless. Now, from Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle there exists the best possible air schedules. I am told that there are on drawing boards supersonic aircraft which will be able to operate from the east coast of the United States to Hawaii in 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, there is often a tendency to criticize the CAB—and other quasi-judicial bodies, I might add—for ultimate decisions which are unpleasant to at least a few of the interested parties. In the current instance, however, there seems to be unanimous feeling that the Board acted with economic and judicial forthrightness.

As far as Hawaii is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to learn that the great Pacific Northwest will be only as far from Hawaii as the Pan Am jets of the present and the Northwest jets of the future make us.

United States Should Halt Import of Mexican Labor by 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial by Msgr. George G. Higgins, director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, which appeared in the Pilot on April 2, 1960:

UNITED STATES SHOULD HALT IMPORT OF MEXICAN LABOR BY 1966

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins)

The Mexican farm labor program, authorized under the terms of Public Law 78, will automatically expire on June 30, 1961 unless it is extended at that time by the Congress. It would appear, however, that certain influential supporters of the program are unwilling to wait until 1961 for Congressional action on Public Law 78.

They wanted the program extended as soon as possible and, for that reason, they welcomed the unexpected decision of a Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee to conduct the open hearings, on Public Law 78.

These hearings, incidentally, were so abbreviated and were scheduled on such a short notice that many interested parties (including the present writer) who wanted to testify before the subcommittee were unable to so for lack of time. Consequently they had to resort to the unsatisfactory alternative of presenting their views in writing.

NOT STACKED

This is not to imply that the subcommittee deliberately stacked the cards in favor of the growers. Because of the preparations

necessary for various harvesting seasons, the Congress could justify acting on Public Law 78 this year instead of waiting until June 30, 1961.

I think, however, that the subcommittee should have stayed in session long enough to accommodate all those who wanted to testify either pro or con on the extension of the Mexican farm labor program. After all, there was no good reason for the subcommittee to be in such a hurry about the matter, for, as I have already noted, Public Law 78 doesn't expire until next summer.

Critics of the Mexican farm labor program are fearful—and with good reason—that it may be renewed too hastily and without any constructive amendments. This, I think, would be a disaster.

I am not saying that the program should necessarily be abolished, once and for all, in 1961. I do think, however, that it ought to be phased out as rapidly as possible. I would be willing, however, reluctantly, to have it renewed in 1961 for a stated period of time—with the explicit understanding that at the end of that period it would be terminated.

It should not be renewed, however—even for a limited time—unless and until it is substantially amended along the lines of H.R. 11211 and a number of companion bills introduced within the past 2 or 3 weeks.

H.R. 11211 was introduced by Congressman McGOVERN of South Dakota. This bill would:

1. Put into effect all of the recommendations made by Secretary of Labor Mitchell's Committee of Consultants on Public Law 78.

2. Reduce the number of Mexicans imported as farmworkers by 20 percent each year and permanently terminate the importation program on June 30, 1966.

Some students of the Mexican farm labor program are severely critical of the McGovern bill. One of them in particular—a dedicated individual who has given the better part of his life to achieving a measure of justice for U.S. agricultural workers—has actually gone so far, in a recent circular letter, as to characterize H.R. 11211 as a complete sellout.

I don't happen to feel that way about it. On the contrary, I would be willing to settle for Congressman McGOVERN's bill, with certain reservations, as the lesser of two evils. By that I mean that H.R. 11211 would appear to be our only immediate hope of improving the Mexican farm labor program.

If this bill is rejected by the Congress, the labor program will not be terminated. Contrariwise, it will probably be renewed for an indefinite period of time and without any constructive amendments. This, I repeat, would be a disaster.

MATS Airlift Obsolescent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Big Slam/Eye Opener," which appeared in the March 28, 1960 issue of the Belleville (Ill.) News Democrat:

BIG SLAM/EYE OPENER

The joint Air Force-Army exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine, in full swing for the past 2 weeks, officially ended today. The ambitious maneuvers were carried off without a hitch. Indeed, the high coordination of the Military Air Transport Service and the Army far surpassed expectations in this simulated national emergency.

All things considered, Big Slam was well worth the strenuous effort poured into it, for the lessons it clarified might well influence our national survival.

Big Slam demonstrated many things. It revealed some strong points of national defense planning. But it also bared and emphasized certain salient weaknesses. Distressingly, these are of very serious nature—the kind which, unless immediately rectified, could conceivably precipitate disaster.

No chain is stronger than its weakest link. And Big Slam made it abundantly clear that Uncle Sam's ability to put up his dukes fast leaves much to be desired.

Big Slam was a lot like Aesop's mountain that labored so mightily and brought forth a mouse. In the entire 2-weeks, round-the-clock shuttling of huge transport planes between the United States and nearby Puerto Rico, only a little more than one partially equipped division of combat troops was moved.

By today's standards that isn't near quickly enough. Yet the arduous, all-out effort lavished on Big Slam demonstrated that this is the best we can do.

Inevitably, all this reflects adversely on MATS. However, it is Congress, the national administration and Department of Defense—not MATS—which merit full blame for our deplorable and dangerous state of unreadiness. For it is they who have been derelict in providing MATS with the tools it must have to do a first-rate, satisfactory job.

The sad truth is that the bulk of MATS airfleet is woefully obsolete, superannuated junk. The C–124 Globemaster, workhorse and mainstay of the MATS airlift was jim dandy when it was built back in 1948. But since then the weapons of war have changed drastically and time has been compressed by the jets. Bluntly, we've not kept abreast of the times in this respect, much to the detriment of our national security.

Washington has invested billions of dollars to develop and build rockets and ballistic missiles. But it hasn't spent 1 cent to speed their haulage to forward launching pads. Today it takes tedious hours to shoehorn an Atlas missile into an air transport that was old before the Atlas was even conceived.

We've got rockets and missiles galore. And troops and guns, super ammunition and everything else it takes to win—except the ability to put them where they'll do the most good.

Big Slam has slammed home the realization of how extremely vulnerable we really are. It has vindicated the critics and made believers of the scoffers. Now let's have vigorous action on the long overdue modernization of the Military Air Transport Service's flying machines.

Imports Jumping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House who supported a 4-year extension of the phony Reciprocal Trade Act should read the following article from the Lancaster Livestock Reporter, Lancaster, Pa.:

ARE YOU JUMPY THESE DAYS? KANGAROO MEAT FOUND IN PENNSYLVANIA

In announcing that the Department of Agriculture has uncovered evidence that Pennsylvania firms have been importing kangaroo meat, Attorney General Anne X. Alpern said:

"The Department of Agriculture had done an outstanding job in ferreting out the use of kangaroo meat in Pennsylvania, in violation of State laws and regulations.

"While kangaroos are intriguing animals in zoos, there is nothing amusing about the use of kangaroos shot in Australian fields and shipped to Pennsylvania without the normal veterinarian examinations made in the case of all other animals."

The Department in its investigation found that kangaroos are killed in the field in southwestern Australia and then are transported from the field under inadequate refrigeration.

Kangaroo meat is not used generally as a food in Australia today.

At least 33,000 pounds were shipped to Pittsburgh in 1958. There were at least 3,000 pounds stored in Pittsburgh in 1959. Over 5,000 pounds were delivered in Philadelphia in 1959 and seized by the Department of Agriculture.

A shipment of 6,360 pounds of kangaroo meat went from Pittsburgh to Wilkes-Barre in late 1959. The Department has received reports that as much as 2 million pounds of kangaroo meat has been imported by a Pennsylvania firm.

There is rigorous inspection in Pennsylvania of meat that is slaughtered for human consumption and careful supervision of meat destined for use by animals.

None of the kangaroo meat has been sold over the counter as kangaroo meat. It has been used without disclosure as to the nature of the meat.

Violators of Pennsylvania meat regulations will be given a hearing by the Department of Agriculture. If no proper explanation of the violation of basic meat regulations is received, action will be taken by the Department of Justice.

Our Fourth Shore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the main subjects which is before the Congress of these United States is the subject of the conservation of our good natural resources, for without them, we might not enjoy the good position that our American people have brought us to with these resources.

I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the people of America an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Monday, April 4, 1960. Written in connection with the publication of the report by the Department of the Interior on our shorelines, in this case the Great Lakes. I believe the facts outlined in the editorial deserve further consideration.

The editorial follows:

OUR FOURTH SHORE

As part of a long-range survey of waterfront recreation opportunities in the

United States, the Department of the Interior recently released a study of the shoreline on the American side of the Great Lakes. Aptly titled, "Our Fourth Shore," the new report represents another in a series devoted to shoreline conservation. Reports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts have already been issued.

The new study, like its predecessors, shows how little of our shoreline is held in public ownership for the benefit of great masses of people who cannot hold title to waterfront property in order to enjoy it; even if they could afford it, there isn't enough such land to go around. The Great Lakes study also notes that this inland shoreline (like the seacoast) is "being threatened by the encroaching rumble of bulldozers; bulldozers designed to level, to scar and to alter forever our national lakeshore heritage."

Among the facts presented in the study are that:

The American portion of the Great Lakes shoreline including that on connecting waters, totals 5,480 miles.

Some 1,480 miles of the total is on offshore islands.

Only 694 miles of lake shoreline (197 miles of it on islands) is now in public ownership.

Of the 4,786 miles of frontage in private ownership, 426 miles possess important remaining opportunities for recreation and other public benefits.

The survey, conducted by the National Park Service with the aid of other agencies, observed that the 426-mile shoreline suitable for recreational use is made up of 66 individual areas: 40 in Michigan, 8 in New York, 7 in Wisconsin, 6 in Ohio, 2 in Minnesota, and 1 each in Illinois, Indiana, and Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania area is composed of 1.5 miles of Lake Erie frontage at the mouth of Elk Creek.

As used by the report, the term "recreation" envisages scenic, scientific, and historical values as well as those of active recreation. Since State and local governments, in addition to the Federal Government, can help to preserve such values, the new study should be widely helpful. Though only 5 of 66 special areas are mentioned for possible inclusion in the national park system, all or most of the other areas should be acquired for public use by some echelon of government, if the report's recommended minimum of 15 percent in public frontage is to be attained.

Legislation to enable the Interior Department to acquire some coastal and Great Lakes areas as national seashores is now in the Senate Interior Committee.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the death of April 3 of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, who formerly headed the Veterans' Administration, is a source of personal sorrow and I extend my sincere sympathy to his devoted wife, his son, Frank T. Hines, and to his brother, Brig. Gen. Charles Hines.

General Hines was identified with the affairs of our veteran population beginning with his appointment in 1923 by President Harding as director of the United Veterans' Bureau. From 1930 to 1945 he served with the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It was during his regime as head of the Veterans' Administration that my friendship with General Hines began. In the early 1930's, during the three terms I served as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I had frequent contact with General Hines whom I regarded as a mentor and a personal friend. It was my good fortune to be able to rely on the guidance and inspiration he funished in meeting many of the problems that confronted the leaders of organized veterandom during the early days of the Veterans' Administration.

In the death of General Hines the veterans of the Nation lost an old friend who in the years of his activity in solving their problems was always willing to lend an ear and try to provide a means of working out the best possible solution.

In paying tribute to the character and administrative ability of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, I wish to include at this point the following obituary which appeared in the April 4, 1960 issue of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star which outlines the career of a distinguished American who served his country in many capacities during a long and fruitful life.

GEN. FRANK T. HINES, 81, EX-HEAD OF VA, DIES

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, who was administrator of veterans' affairs from 1930 to 1945 and onetime Ambassador to Panama, died yesterday in Mount Alto Veterans' Administration Hospital.

He was 81.

General Hines had been a patient at the hospital for about a year.

He and Mrs. Hines, the former Nellie Vier of Salt Lake City, whom he married in 1900, lived in the Westchester Apartments. They have one son, Frank T. Hines, Jr., who lives in the Tower apartments.

He also leaves one brother, Brig. Gen. Charles Hines, of 2800 Quebec Street NW.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Wednesday in the Fort Myer Chapel. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

A SOLDIER'S SOLDIER

A soldier's soldier who rose from National Guard private to brigadier general in 20 years, General Hines had been recommended for the Medal of Honor before he was 21.

His first application for a commission in the Regular Army was rejected because of his youth, although he had 22 engagements in the Philippines in his service record at the time.

At his death, his service record was stalwart testimony to a military man's career in public service—first as the man charged with untangling the logistics of World War I, next as the prime organizer of the present Veterans' Administration; then as the man asked to plan refitting 10 million World War II veterans for civilian life, and, finally, as a diplomat in Panama.

From his action against the Spaniards to his last illness, the dark, trim, undemonstrative general was a busy man.

CAPTAIN BY WORLD WAR I

He was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, on April 11, 1879, the son of Frank L. and Martha (Hollingsworth) Hines, and had just passed his 19th birthday when he enlisted in the Utah Light Artillery.

A battle-tried veteran by the time he obtained his commission in 1901, he was a captain at the outbreak of World War I. He was in Europe for the Bethlehem Steel Corp. as a technical adviser on coast defense to the Greek Government. He was in Athens when the United States declared war on Germany. He started home, but War Department orders caught him in Rome, directing him to take charge of evacuating Americans from Italy. Within 2 months, 3,100 citizens had been returned to the States.

It was in this role that he developed an organization that moved the American Expeditionary Force to France, getting 2 million troops to Europe in 18 months and later bringing them back home in 8 months.

President Harding called him back to public service to direct the United Veterans' Bureau in 1923.

In February of 1944, General Hines was named retraining and reemployment director by Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes. Three days later, President Roosevelt issued an Executive order creating that position within the Office of War Mobilization.

ADMINISTERED GI RIGHTS BILL

The closing days of World War II found the busy general administering a bureau with more than 50,000 employees, scores of hospital facilities, and more than 100,000 claims from veterans of the war awaiting action.

They also found him in charge of administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the GI bill of rights. President Truman named Gen. Omar N. Bradley as the man to modernize the Veterans' Administration.

His appointment as envoy to Panama came in August 1945. In December 1947 it was announced he would retire the following February.

ACACIA CO. DIRECTOR

Following his return to the States, he spent a brief period on the west coast. On his return to Washington, he went to the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. as a director, member of the executive committee, and military consultant.

General Hines held the Distinguished Service Medal awarded by the Navy as well as the Army and decorations from five other countries. He was a member of the Military Order of the World War, the American Legion, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, the Congressional County Club, and the Temple Noyes Lodge, No. 32, of the Masons.

He also was a member of and a vestryman at St. Thomas' Episcopal Church.

A Lady Grand Marshal Will Lead Parade Up Fifth Avenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years New Yorkers of Puerto Rican origin have a parade up Fifth Avenue in the spring. The main purpose of this parade is to demonstrate to the people of New York that their Puerto Rican neighbors are no different; that their interests and their loyalties are the same; that they are not second-class citizens. It is an excellent idea and has brought about better understanding of the problems confronting these people

and a better relationship in the community as a whole.

Usually the grand marshal of the parade is a man who is very prominent in the city's civic, political, or economic life. This time a lady was chosen as grand marshal of the Puerto Rican parade, which is taking place on Sunday, April 10, and, as far as I can recall, she is the first woman grand marshal of a New York parade.

She is Mrs. Celia M. Vice, who is from my congressional district, where she and her husband are coowners of a real-estate and insurance business. Mrs. Vice came from Puerto Rico as a child and has lived in Brooklyn ever since. She is widely known for her manifold activities as a social and welfare worker in the community. Her activities extend also into the fields of education, civic affairs, youth, women's groups, and politics.

A woman of her talents and interests is truly a great credit to our fellow citizens of Puerto Rican origin. It is no wonder that they have chosen her as their grand marshal of the parade next Sunday, April 10. I congratulate her upon this distinct honor.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article from a recent issue of the New York World Telegram and Sun about Mrs. Celia M. Vice:

SHE'LL BE THE FIRST LADY GRAND MARSHAL—PUERTO RICAN PARADE LEADER IS HOUSEWIFE

(By Alma Hart)

When Celia M. Vice, Williamsburgh housewife, steps out as grand marshal of the Puerto Rican parade Sunday, April 10, she may be breaking a 300-year-old precedent.

"They tell me I'll be the first lady grand marshal in the history of New York," she said.

The vivacious blonde, coowner with her husband of the Marcy Real Estate & Insurance Co., was chosen for her extensive civic activities. She is executive director of the Council of Brooklyn Organizations, vice chairman of the Education Committee of Bushwick District Health Committee, chairman of the Inter-Relations Group of the Committee for the Betterment of Williamsburg, and a member of the Leadership Forum League of Women Voters, Seneca Club, Youth Council, and the local school board.

NOT MUCH CREDIT

"This year the parade is dedicated to the women of New York," she said. "Most of them do an awful lot and don't get much credit for it."

Mrs. Vice is looking forward to her duties, April 10. She said that last year's parade brought out 100,000 watchers and this one should be even bigger. Far from merely overseeing the proceedings, she will march right up Fifth Avenue from 62d Street past the reviewing stand at 87th to 96th.

"I did it last year in heels," she recalled. "And I didn't feel a thing."

Basic purpose of the parade is to remind New Yorkers that their Puerto Rican neighbors are not second-class citizens. This is a subject on which Mrs. Vice puts firm though gracious emphasis.

THOSE WHO DON'T

"We are too quick to play up the Rodriguez who go wrong on the city streets. How about all those who don't?"

She doesn't have much sympathy either for the typical New Yorker's ambiguous view of her country—a postcard vision of superresorts overlooking some squalid slums.

"The majority of Puerto Rican towns," she explained, "have beautiful little homes and gardens.

"Economically they are still in trouble, with prices far exceeding wages. But in the past 6 years many new industries have started and eventually this cross-migration of American tourists and Puerto Rican laborers will have to end. Right now you see so many Americans down there and so many Puerto Ricans right here," she laughed.

FIERCELY LOYAL

Mrs. Vice first came here as a child. She attended Brooklyn public schools and met her husband in a Williamsburgh church group. She is fiercely loyal to New York but recent trips to her birthplace have convinced her that it is becoming a paradise.

Back of her desk in her Flushing Avenue office, which is a gathering place for the neighborhood, is a mural of a tropical scene. A tall palm tree, which she says is a cross between a banana and a coconut tree because neither she nor the artist remembered what either really looked like, bends above a cerulean lake.

"I used to sit facing it," she said. "But I had to turn my desk around."

Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial written by Mr. Parker M. Merrow, publisher and editor of the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N.H., on Friday, April 1, 1960, entitled "Library Week":

[From the Carroll County Independent, Apr. 1, 1960]

LIBRARY WEEK

As a rule we do not lift either an eyebrow or a little finger when some week is announced. People belonging to this or that group are forever running to the Governor and asking him to proclaim some special week. Since it costs only a few dollars, will do no harm, and prevents the members of the group in question from becoming political enemies, the Governor, no matter what his inclination or party, is always glad to proclaim the week.

So we have, figuratively speaking, weeks in memory of the tomcats that lost their lives in the Chicago fire; a be kind to the birdies week followed by a shoot more crows week; there is a fire prevention week followed by a clean up and burn week; there is a help the farmer and eat more butter week followed by a watch your diet week; there is a help mentally retarded children week followed by a week to accelerate the near-genius child; there is a world peace week followed by a bigger ballistic missile week.

And so it goes.

But we do feel very strongly that the library week is well worth mentioning and well worth considering.

Gone, "where the woodbine twineth and the whangdoodle mourneth not" (as the old-timers used to say) is the town library of yesteryear.

There was a fine file of annual agricultural reports and reports of the State treasurer and an antique set of encyclopedias and rebound books cast off from big city libraries. No matter how conscientious the librarian or how interested in her work, there was just not enough money available to make the library attractive and useful to a good percentage of the community.

Now the picture has changed dramatically. With the enthusiastic cooperation of the State library, with the bookmobile service, with the help of various trust funds, with the newly awakened interest in higher education, the town library is becoming an integral part of community life.

Both grammar school and high school pupils find adequate reference material to help them in their assignments. If the desired material is not at hand, the librarian will secure it. If an adult wishes to study bee keeping, coin collecting, bird watching, amateur carpentry, or soil drainage, the librarian will secure the material through the State library, or if budget permits, buy the books for the local library.

Realization has come that the town library should be a cheerful, stimulating center where all ages from the fourth grader through to the folks in retirement can secure books for reference, instruction, and recreation. A well-managed town library, with adequate funds, has a very strong impact on the life of the community.

Buy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make reference to certain remarks I made on the floor on March 29 concerning my profound feeling with reference to the protection of our American industry and our people against foreign competition. In my address, I specifically cited the case of the Plymouth Locomotive Works of the Fate-Root-Heath Co., a fine small business located in my congressional district, which is faced with losing an order for 39 towing locomotives for the Panama Canal to the Mitsubishi Co. of Japan.

It seems that on the same day certain remarks were made in the other body which indicate a fundamental misunderstanding of the facts surrounding this procurement. I have reference to the concern expressed lest foreign bidders feel mistreated if their bid be disqualified. In this connection, I feel that a fine American small business has already been mistreated.

It should be noted that the present invitation to bid, issued by the Panama Canal, is the second invitation issued covering the same equipment. The Plymouth Locomotive Works has expressed great concern with respect to the preferential treatment accorded the foreign bidder in the rebidding. This bidder while not technically responsive to the first bid invitation, was permitted to participate in the rebid, thereby receiving nearly 90 additional days in which to prepare a new responsive proposal.

At this point, I feel it is well worth our while to consider the background and surrounding circumstances relative

to this procurement. Approximately 1 year ago the Panama Canal Company had two representatives call at the plant of the Plymouth Locomotive Works in an effort to obtain ideas and proposals regarding their requirements for new modern towing locomotives and locomotive cranes. It would appear that recognition should be given to the technical engineering and consultation provided, without remuneration, by the Plymouth engineering staff. Plymouth sent engineering personnel to the Canal Zone and designed at their own expense a locomotive which meets all requirements. A prebid conference was held in Panama and two of the Plymouth representatives attended this meeting. Prior to this meeting neither the Japanese nor any other prospective bidders had ever been to Panama to study the problem in any detail.

On August 28, 1959, the first bids were opened in Panama. Mitsubishi of Japan was low bidder, but did not meet the technical requirements of the bid invitation and thereby were disqualified. Fairbanks Morse was the next low bidder, but Plymouth was the lowest bidder that met, or exceeded, all significant requirements of the specifications.

After a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company in the Pentagon in October, the Panama Canal Company officials offered to negotiate with the two low responsive bidders. Plymouth offered a substantial price reduction and allowed an official survey of their plant facilities to be made by a member of the Army Engineers. This gentleman submitted a favorable report to the Panama Canal Company and Plymouth was led to believe that they would be awarded a contract on a negotiated basis, since they were most nearly responsive to the Canal Company's requirements. However, approximately 10 days later all bidders were notified that all bids were rejected "for varying degrees of nonresponsiveness." Plymouth was never given an official explanation of why their first bid was rejected. They were never told on what details their proposal failed to meet specifications.

In December 1959 new invitations to bid were issued by the Panama Canal Company. The locomotive described in the new specification was fundamentally an exact copy of the locomotive offered by Plymouth in their first proposal.

At this point, through some misunderstanding of policy, Panama Canal Company officials in Panama allowed the technical portions of Plymouth's first bid to be opened for inspection by their competitors. This gave the competitors the advantage of studying the Plymouth design in detail. This also put Plymouth at a disadvantage in that they would have to again quote the same locomotive lowering their price to try to compete with a low foreign bidder who had been given over 90 days to prepare a new responsive proposal. We must keep in mind that this foreign bidder also had an opportunity to inspect the Plymouth specifications.

On February 12, 1960, the new bids were opened in Panama. Mitsubishi was low bidder, but had raised their price by approximately $1 million. Plymouth was the low domestic bidder and had lowered their price approximately $1 million by cutting costs and profits to an absolute minimum. After evaluation of the bids, it was determined that both Plymouth and the Japanese were technically responsive.

No mention was made in the other body of the fact that Plymouth is a small business employing less than 250 people, and are bidding in this instance against the Mitsubishi combine of Japan, one of the world's largest monopolies with one of the world's cheapest labor supplies.

A further point which was passed over is the fact that Federal, State, and municipal tax revenue which will be lost if this contract is awarded to a foreign bidder will more than equal the difference between the two bids in question.

It seems to me that one of the most vital factors to be considered in the awarding of this contract should be the availability of and access to an assured source of supply for spare parts, maintenance, and service. This consideration takes on added significance when it is related to the strategic importance of the Panama Canal to our national defense, as well as to the orderly conduct of shipping and commerce.

From my own personal knowledge, I am aware that there is a critical labor situation building up in the Plymouth area. This fine small company desperately needs this order, since it has already found it necessary to cut back to a 35-hour week and to dismiss some of its help.

I think it would be well for our colleagues in the other body and for the administration to first make sure that American industry is being treated fairly and accorded every consideration which it deserves. In keeping with this policy and with the present efforts of our Government to halt outflows of vital gold reserves, it would seem that this contract, amounting to almost $5 million, should be awarded to the low domestic bidder.

Tribute to the National Herald, a Greek-American Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the helter-skelter of our daily living we more often than not overlook those who silently help foster unity and understanding among our populace.

One of our "silent" partners in this great endeavor is the National Herald, a Greek-American newspaper in my district, which is celebrating this year its 45th anniversary of publication.

A fitting tribute to the National Herald's management and staff for splendid public service is the message by the President of the United States which, I include in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1960.

Mr. B. J. MARKETOS,
Publisher, the National Herald,
New York, N.Y.:

Through Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY, I have learned of the 45th anniversary of the National Herald, and it is a pleasure to join in the observance of this event.

Over the years, the National Herald has contributed much to the life of our Greek-American community. In the tradition of democracy, printing the truth with freedom and responsibility, this newspaper has performed a splendid service for its readers.

Congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Time To Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of Friday, March 25, 1960. The editorial, entitled "Time To Start," sets forth clearly and succinctly the reasons for a thorough and searching examination of the Federal Power Commission by the Congress of the United States and by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and/or one of its subcommittees.

The questions raised by the recent revelations on the Federal Power Commission changing an opinion contemporaneously with calls from an industry representative to and upon members of that quasi-judicial agency have raised the gravest questions of propriety of behavior of members of the Commission. It appears that public confidence in that agency, as well as its usefulness to regulate the industry in the public interest, may well be enormously impaired until such time as the whole matter has been cleared up. Certainly, it is the duty of members of the Commission, both to themselves and to the consumers whom they are supposed to represent, to seek to have the fullest exploration of the matter in order to exonerate them from any question of impropriety so that they may regain full public confidence and do their work without this shadow of doubt hanging over their deliberations.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO START

Misbehavior ranging from impropriety to rascality continues to come to light before the congressional committees. A Senate Agriculture Subcommittee has found two Agriculture Department employees who had private interests in conflict with their Government jobs. One of them drew $83,500 out of a grain-storage concern in which he was a silent partner during his employment by the grain-storing branch of the Federal Government. He quit and his boss also quit rather than face charges of "deception" in another matter.

This kind of open-and-shut conflict of interest is nothing new, is covered by pres-

ent law, and raises no puzzles. In an area more uncertain still than it ought to be is the conduct of the Federal commissioners. Only the other day Chairman John C. Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission was forced out of office because he had accepted some luxurious hospitality from a man with recurrent business before his Commission. Now Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall of the Federal Power Commission concedes that in a recent case he had out-of-court contacts with Mr. Thomas G. Corcoran, lawyer for a firm petitioning the FPC for authority to build a gas pipeline.

The FPC case differs in detail from the yacht-and-fun episode that disposed of Mr. Doerfer. But the essential impropriety is identical and should merit the same penalty. Federal Commissioners are quasi-judges and they should no more have private contacts with parties at interest in their semicourts than should the real judges in the regular courts.

But can a new statute cure the repeated inability of some of these officials to see this elementary fact? No doubt the pending proposal to bar off-the-record contacts by law would do some good. But surely the longrange remedy is the growth of a sharper fastidiousness among the Commissioners. They must try harder to see in advance the way their private contacts will look on the front pages of all the newspapers after their shabby confessions before the various congressional committees. It took a good many years for the judges to evolve the codes which keep them out of trouble. The Commissioners have simply got to start evolving. The best way to encourage this evolution is to drop them as fast as they are exposed.

Need for a 5-Year Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the value to business, industry, community service movements, and all levels of government of the statistics which will be developed from the decennial census now in progress is well-known and uncontroverted. Since the first such census in the then young United States of America in 1790, the information thus gained has been eargerly awaited and rapidly put to use.

The United States of today, however, with its exploding and highly mobile population, is a far cry from the infant Nation of 3 million persons of 1790. Yet we still make this population count only once every 10 years—and within less than half of each decade, the information thus gained is obsolete.

For that reason, I have sponsored during the past two Congresses legislation authorizing a census of population, employment, and housing every 5 years. This 5-year census idea is not new; nor is it original with me. It has attracted considerable support in recent years, however, and I am hopeful that it will receive favorable consideration before 1965.

I would point out for the benefit of my colleagues in the House that it would not change the present method of reapportionment of congressional seats. This would be done every 10 years as presently.

The Yuma Daily Sun, whose editor, Jones Osborn, is an outstanding Arizona newspaperman, discussed the importance of this legislation recently and under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

When the census takes comes to your house next month, it may be the last decennial census in history. For it is apparent that a census only one each 10 years is failing to provide the up-to-date information Americans need.

Since 1790, the Government has taken a population census once every 10 years. But this year a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives plans to consider a new bill. This bill, if enacted, would provide for a 5-year census on population, unemployment, and housing.

Congressman UDALL'S idea is shared by is sponsoring the bill. He maintains that "continuing important and rapids shifts of population" make 10-year census figures outdated long before another census can now be taken.

Congreesman UDALL'S idea is shared by several top Government officials. Both the Budget Bureau and the Commerce Department have suggested that a congressional study be given to the needs "for more up-to-date population data."

Dr. Robert W. Burgess, Director of the Census Bureau, likewise concurs. "We think a 5-year census of population could be very valuable," he said.

Because the 10-year census so obviously fails to keep up with growth and shifts in population, no less than 1,516 cities have had special population censuses taken at their own expense since the 1950 census. They do so to obtain a greater share of State funds to which they are entitled if they can prove their population is larger than the 1950 census figure.

One of the most spectacular gains was made by Garden Grove, Calif. It was a community of about 3,900 persons when the 1950 census was taken. But by 1959, its population and jumped to 68,866.

Arizona has enjoyed its share of population growth during the last 10 years, also. To break out of the 10-year freeze of the decennial census, no less than 14 cities have upped their populations, either by interm census or by annexation.

Yuma for example, had 9,145 in the 1950 census. But it today has an official listing of 12,981. Phoenix jumped from 106,000 to 201,000. Tucson climbed from 45,000 to 68,000.

In addition, Arizona in 1960 can boast of eight incorporated cities which it did not have in 1950. (They are Clarkdale, Fredonia, Hayden, Huachuca City, Mammoth, Peoria, Show Low, and Sierra Vista.)

All of this growth and development in Arizona is but a small part of what has happened on a national scale, during the past 10 years. Clearly, the 10-year census is not doing the job. We hope Representative UDALL'S bill will receive the favorable consideration it deserves.

Alma Mater, 1970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an address given by Dr. Paul F. Sharp, president of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, located in the 11th District which I have the honor to represent.

Dr. Sharp's address, entitled "Alma Mater, 1970," was delivered on February 1, 1960, in Akron, Ohio, at the kickoff dinner for the highly successful fund raising campaign of the Ohio independent colleges. Dr. Sharp is one of the leading educators of the United States and has been a leader in the national efforts to preserve the small colleges of this country. His words should be of great value in bringing to Members of the House the seriousness of the present-day threat to the private colleges.

The address follows:

ALMA MATER, 1970

(Address by Dr. Paul F. Sharp)

"Liberal Arts Colleges Threatened."
"Private Colleges in Trouble."
"Financial Crisis Menaces Colleges."
"College President Warns of Crises in Education."

These or similar headlines greet us almost daily in our newspapers and magazines. From every side we hear dire predictions that higher education in this country faces crises almost too difficult to master. The floodtide of students soon to be upon us, the growing shortage of qualified professors, and the constant need of adequate funds threaten to reduce our standards, to impair our programs, and to send some of our American colleges into limbo before this new decade has run its course.

Contrast this gloomy future in higher education with the buoyant optimism in every other field in our national life. Economists, journalists, and pundits of varying qualifications join to herald the "sizzling sixties" we have just entered. The "fabulous fifties" were only the appetizer preceding the feast that lies ahead. The good life will be ours and our Nation faces a future of unprecedented growth with a dynamically expanding gross national product, with an unparalleled distribution of goods and services and with scientific achievements that leave the prophets somewhat breathless.

All of us are sensitive to the irony underlying these contrasts. But it may also be true that in our zeal to present a strong case we have exaggerated our troubles. Some of our educational Jeremiahs appear to be counseled by their fears and to have lost sight of the opportunities to educate more students, more effetcively. In no area of American life is the shift from optimism to pessimism in this century so apparent as in education. Nineteenth century educators founded our colleges and faced greater problems than ours with fewer resources but with confidence and enthusiasm. There is every reason for us to confront our problems in higher education today in the same spirit.

Sometimes we forget our own past. Like the "hipsters" that the novelist Norman Mailer wants us all to become, or the bearded beatniks of Venice West, we forget the meaning of the past to live entirely in the present. When we do this we deny ourselves a valuable experience. Viewed in historical perspective our problems come into clearer focus. Nor do I mean that we have to return to our Founding Fathers to do this.

Every college represented here this evening is a stronger institution than it was only 10 years ago. A decade from now every college in our Independent College Alumni Association will be stronger; will be more effective in reaching its educational goals; will possess higher academic standards, and will serve our society more usefully and purposefully than it does today.

In the face of so many dark predictions for our future, how can we argue for optimism?

Why do we make such apparently rash predictions? Numerous facts crowd in upon us to argue that our colleges will be stronger not weaker, possess higher not lower standards, and be more capable of fulfilling their tasks rather than flabby or incompetent.

Our Ohio colleges live with a heritage of high standards of academic achievement. We are nationally respected and honored for our role. I am confident that for our "very name's sake" we can and will meet every crisis the future may hold for the liberal arts institutions. Our campuses are a treasury of imagination, energy and skill dedicated to the serious purposes of education.

Indeed, our campuses comprise a kingdom of the mind. Numerous institutions share with us our concern for the enrichment of the personal, emotional, and spiritual lives of young men and women. But only on the campus is the community uniquely dedicated to intellect, to the power and dignity of ideas. Here the life of intellect is made attractive; here our inheritance of candid thinking gets full play—or it is nowhere.

Raymond Fosdick's recent tribute to Woodrow Wilson as teacher reminds us all of the finest traditions on our campuses: "I speak only as a single student at Princeton of over 50 years ago. For me Wilson lit a lamp which has never been put out. All my life I have remembered him as the inspiring teacher who introduced me to the kingdom of the mind, and held up before our eyes what Whitehead later called 'an habitual vision of greatness.' "

Because our colleges emphasize this tradition the future is more than ever favorable to our course. Our alumni and our friends see more clearly than ever the close relationship between our colleges and our national survival. Our standards are a matter of national welfare, not just a cultural nicety or a social advantage to a few favored students.

Our strength will call forth greater strength in the years ahead. Not only because of our seriousness of purpose but because we emphasize the search for knowledge in its basic and fundamental aspects. We believe that fundamental theory better equips students to live in a world of changing techniques. Systematic discipline in pure knowledge lays a foundation on which the student can rest the superstructure of practical skills and professional achievements.

A recent experience of the committee planning the forthcoming world's fair in New York graphically illustrates our case. The theme of the famous 1939 World's Fair, you may remember, was "Tools for Tomorrow" and the exhibits emphasized this by displaying the most modern techniques and tools. Much to their surprise the current committee discovered that 85 percent of the "tools for tomorrow" so proudly displayed in 1939 are now obsolete and already discarded.

II

Last year a curious thing happened. Issues and controversies that for many years were the property of educational specialists became the subject of public discussion and analysis. This we should all welcome, and most especially those of us vitally interested in higher education. We all need to remind ourselves, to paraphrase an old saying, that national surivival is much too serious a matter to leave to specialists.

Yet it is true that our colleges and universities are a treasure store of imaginative, energetic and vital educational leadership. We owe a great debt in this country to the devoted men and women such as yourselves who have looked after, supported and encouraged our private colleges.

One of the great surprises to greet me as I emerged from the shelter of the classroom, I must confess, was the selfless devotion of trustees and alumni to the welfare of our colleges and universities. I am confident in our future because I simply cannot imagine this reservoir of good will and affection unequal to the tasks ahead of us.

Today, as seldom in our history, our colleges and universities are making decisions vitally important to society as well as to particular constituents. Confronted with the prospect of 3 million more young people seeking entry into our colleges and universities during the next decade, higher education may well become, to use a familiar economist's term, a scarce commodity.

Obviously, our private colleges and universities will not and cannot make the major contribution in meeting this challenge of numbers. Rather our role will be to serve our constituents as effectively as we can within the limits of our resources and our determination to improve standards.

Inevitably this means greater selectivity in students and higher standards of academic performance. This is more particularly true when we take into account the improving academic standards of our high schools. In great ferment already, our public schools will be under increasing pressure to elevate their standards and more adequately prepare Johnny for college.

Parents are not only asking whether colleges will be ready for Johnny, they are also increasingly concerned that Johnny will be ready for college. With many students already coming to us with advanced placement and with this number steadily increasing, we will obviously devote less and less time to courses traditionally regarded as part of the freshman curriculum. Thus, pressure from below, as well as our own policy, determines an upgrading of academic quality in our colleges.

We will increasingly be engaged in the education of an educational elite as Chancellor Kimpton recently pointed out. Just what an elite comprises in a democratic society I shall wait with great interest for each college and university to determine. We can agree that our role as private colleges and universities is to identify and educate ability. But we violate both reality and the humility of scholarship if we pose as the only institutions engaged in this task. Prestige and pride of place are ours, but intellectual arrogance is a false facade, as unworthy of our heritage as it is unnecessary to our purposes.

III

In our crisis-ridden educational world the problem attracting most attention is finance. Here the greatest pessimism prevails, but with less reason, in fact, than in other areas. It will be far more difficult for us, for example, to educate a sufficient number of teachers in time to meet the needs of our students than to find economic resources.

America is a wealthy society. Our visitors from overseas are always confused when we speak of a financial crisis in our colleges and universities. It is beyond their understanding. Proudly we hail the greatest accumulation of wealth and the widest distribution of goods and services in history. Somewhat conscience stricken we acknowledge our luxury in a world of poverty and want. It is against this background of affluence that we must consider our problems.

Perhaps what we need at this hour is the fluent pen and eloquent voice of a Henry George. This latter-day George, with the same moral passion and public conscience of his 19th century model, would touch our consciences and sing to our hearts with a message of hope as well as of urgency, of faith as much as of necessity.

What title could be more appropriate to his analysis of higher education than "Progress and Poverty"? His first sentence might well have a familiar ring to it. "Society is wealthy in this great land, but everywhere higher education the creator of wealth and the handmaiden of culture is poor."

This modern Henry George, of course, would avoid the trap of an over-simplified single tax solution. Indeed, if I catch the spirit rightly, he would express genuine fears of the overweening ambitions of governmental power with its red tape, its disclaimer oaths and its well intentioned efforts to do good by stifling local freedoms.

Truly this modern George would invest the dry bones of financial analysis with the flesh of human understandings. Think of his chapter on faculty salaries. I can well imagine the poignancy with which he would describe the economic fate of those most devoted to the welfare of our young during recent years. Those famous charts illustrating the dramatic increases in real income for all professions since 1940 while the real incomes in the academic profession declined would come to life.

Think of the gentle irony this successor to Henry George might use in speaking of the role of sacrifice in teaching. In his traditional expression of Puritanism, of course, he might only refer to it as "foregoing." But, however, he referred to it, our gratitude to those who gave so freely of their thought and lives would place us forever in their debt.

This is not the age for a Henry George of course. Today we speak calmly of the allocation of resources to socially useful goals, but I hear the spirit of Henry George rustling the dry leaves. With impressive charts and graphs we present the economic data clearly, the statistical evidence convincingly, and the quantitative factors of need fully. What then is lacking?

An affluent society such as ours enjoys the rare luxury of a wide latitude of choice. Every wealthy society in the past has had a wider choice than those burdened with poverty. Our real question then is what choices are we going to make for our wealth in the soaring sixties.

Past societies as we all know have often chosen comfort and luxury rather than investment in education, religion, and social welfare. And there have been those historical Khrushchevs ready to bury such societies at the first opportunity.

Society's choices, after all, are those of its individual members. Your presence tonight reassures us that we will indeed underwrite our educational institutions with resources adequate to our tasks. Time, energy, and money are never so honored or rewarded as in their expenditure for the education of the next generation and in the search for truth that enlarges their world of understanding.

We hail your presence as evidence of the growing spirit of cooperation among our colleges and universities. This new spirit promises to solve many of the problems that vexed the past. We welcome it as positive assurance that the parochialism so many of us experienced as undergraduates is fast vanishing from our campuses. We welcome it as a guarantee that the accumulation of wisdom, experience, and vision on our many campuses will increasingly be directed to our mutual service.

Above all, we hail your presence as alma mater's truest friends, her alumni. All of us are familiar with the Hollywood versions of alumni and their role in American society. These caricatures picture our alumni with racoon coat, hip flask and full of free advice for harassed administrators and phony reminiscences for bored undergraduates.

These types exist, of course, and every college president privately thinks he has more than his share. But their numbers are few and their influence limited. Contrast the caricature with the reality.

Your role as alumni is that of linchpin between alma mater and society. You are the tie between things present and things past, between today's plans and tomorrow's realities. Through your good offices we prosper, in your good works we take pride, with

your goodwill we reach our institutional goals.

We welcome you as faithful allies in our current tasks. To fellow alumni you have an exciting story to tell. Your message is a success story of a decade of progress on the campus during the fifties. Your account is of faithful stewardship, not alone to a specific constituency, but to the causes of higher education itself. Your report is a prophecy to follow alumni of growing strength and enlarging services at alma mater during the decade ahead.

In all this we wish you well. In the successes of this campaign in Akron, and through many years ahead, we shall truly sing your praises as we continue to measure our performance against the straightedge of your hopes and our achievements against the altimeter of your dreams.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 2, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Representative Russell Mack, of Washington, dropped dead while answering a quorum call on Monday, and the House adjourned in his memory. Truly, he died with his boots on. We shall miss him. Eleven Members of the 86th Congress have now passed on.

The Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) appropriation bill passed 362 to 10. Actually, the $4.2 billion bill provided the money to finance two departments—Labor ($542 million) as well as HEW ($361.9 million). This amount exceeded the budget by $184 million, and last year's expenditures by $128 million. I opposed the bill for a number of reasons. (1) $183 million over the $4 billion budget figure which was more than enough. (2) Various programs financed by this bill are subject to criticism, including water pollution, school construction and school payments in lieu of taxes in "impacted areas." I cannot understand the reluctance of many in Congress to say no to any spending for projects which sound good. Take medical research, for example. Of course, we are all for medical research of all kinds, as we are all interested in the welfare, health, and education of our people. It does not follow that recognition of such needs means in every case more Federal law, spending, and control.

Many Members want to protest but wonder how you go about opposing a $4 billion "package", larded with boondoggle, when it also contains worthwhile projects and others that sound equally good—all for the general welfare of the people. How? Simply by voting against it. A vote "against" need not mean a Member is against trying to solve that need—rather that (1) it is not a matter of proper Federal concern, or (2) there is already enough money in the program without adding more, or (3) we can delay here and there until we can afford further spending.

For my part, I intend to remember my pledge of preserving fiscal responsibility by (1) balancing the budget, (2) reducing the debt, and (3) revising and reducing taxes. This course also assures keeping the dollar worth a dollar. True, it may not always be as appealing politically as the proffer of Federal money to constituents. In this cold war year, I suspect most Dallas folks would question, as I did, the urgency, if not the need, for Federal expenditures just now to finance studies on (1) the circulatory physiology of the octopus, (2) biological effects of parental age of mealworm beetles, (3) aging and ovaries of cockroaches, and (4) causes af alcoholism.

The White House Conference on Children and Youth brought to Washington a number of representatives from Dallas, as it did from all over the Nation, to discuss various problems affecting the Nation's youth. Capital newspapers reporting the event abound with suggestions for parents, educators and all levels of government. Federal aid to education, desegregation, birth control, and juvenile delinquency were in the forefront of attention. I couldn't help but wonder at some of the speeches I read—assuming they were reported accurately. It seems to me that in trying to solve some of these problems, action by the Federal Government should be a last resort because Federal action always imperils local initiative. Could it be that some of our trouble stems from too heavy a reliance on government already—that we have tried inappropriately and foolishly to solve all our problems by transferring parental and community responsibility to the Washington bureaucracy? It is well to study our problems in a conference like this. It is my hope, though, that we do not end up expecting more Federal aid and direction to solve them. I wonder, too, if the conference will recognize the spiritual base on which our society and government rests. Will the conference even mention America's greatest strength throughout our history, our spiritual beliefs and the individual responsibility that, by definition, accompanies them? Surely nothing could be more ludicrous than for a people who have all but banished any word of God from our public schools to turn, then, to seek wisdom and guidance from the Federal bureaucracy.

This week's TV feature (WFAA, Sunday, 10:30 a.m.) was Dr. Keith Glennan, head of NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) who discussed our space programs. The United States is making rapid strides in all areas, and concedes only a temporary lead to Russia in but one field, that of "launch vehicles."

Correction of last week's newsletter—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's speech on foreign affairs was made in Washington, not Dallas where he spoke on labor management before the Public Affairs Luncheon Club.

In Defense of Freedom From Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as you are probably aware a sizable part of my constituency residing in Lancaster County, Pa., consists of members of the Amish and Mennonite faiths. They are known locally as the plain people and they enjoy the respect of their neighbors because of their industry, their peaceful habits and their unshakable religious faith.

At the request of these dedicated people I have introduced H.R. 1245, presently referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, which would allow anyone to decline social security benefits on conscientious grounds. In urging the enactment of my bill I have always held that if it is right and proper to grant exemption from military service for religious reasons we should accord the same relief to those who refuse to accept handouts from Government because of qualms of faith.

A number of Amish bishops have presented me with a statement of principles which sets forth their conviction that the regulations of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act abridge their faith and doctrine. They further join in a petition to their Government for relief from this onerous edict to which they have set their lawful signatures. It will be noted that the signatories come from many States but since they are all speaking through Bishop David Z. Fisher of my congressional district I am pleased to include their statement as a part of these remarks:

AN APPEAL TO THE ESTEEMED MEMBERS OF THE DIFFERENT BRANCHES OF OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

To Whom It May Concern:

We as a group of humble subjects, do feel obligated to thank God, and to feel thankful toward all who have exercised and endured much to have a Nation on earth wherein a people can live according to the dictates of their consciences.

Now it is clearly evident, that not all people are of the same opinion, but according to the Constitution and its amendments each person has a right to express his opinion, and should give his grounds for it.

In the 16th century our forefathers were living in parts of the old country, and there with great care and much study (by the help and grace of God) they adopted a doctrine based on Jesus Christ and His apostles' teachings.

Early in the 17th century they wrote articles of faith, according to their doctrine and many old bishops signed them, but they soon found out they were not permitted to live up to their doctrine there, so many journeyed to this country.

Here many God-fearing people labored hard and long to establish a government free from other countries, and based it on the grounds of God's word.

Capable men wrote the Declaration of Independence, and one colony after another ratified it. Then the Constitution was written and signed, which was hard for the people to understand how it was to work. It was not perfect so amendments were added, 10 of them, which were called the Bill of Rights.

So the Government was formed, and ever since it took much legislation to keep things (as problems arose) in line with the Constitution.

So we feel the foregoing statements are satisfactory evidence that the Social Security Act (the OASI) is abridging to our faith, and doctrine which is older than this Government, and always has, and does yet prove entirely satisfactory, and we feel grieved that this said act is forced upon us, and we ask you to consider the foregoing as an appeal of deep concern.

Therefore we feel justified to do all in our power, with the guidance of a Supreme Being, and the Holy Ghost, to defend and protect these costly pearls, and not trade them for an old-age and survivors insurance,

Now we hope and trust, there is not a members of this esteemed Government who would ask us to recant on this subject.

David Z. Fisher, Christiana, Pa.; Henry N. Miller, Middlebury, Ind.; Neil J. Hershberger, Burton, Ohio; Aaron Esh, Bird-in-Hand, Pa.; Andrew J. Weaver, Fredericksburg, Ohio; John D. Schmucker, Medford, Wis.; Ben. L. Shetler, Conewango Valley, N.Y.; Emanuel J. Mullet, Fairbanks, Iowa; Eli S. Miller, Dover, Del.; Bishop Leander S. Kevin, Haven, Kans.; Simon M. Yoder, Guthrie, Ky.; Samuel J. Stoltzfus, Charlotte Hall, Md.; W. P. Miller, Centerville, Mich.; Joseph L. Schwartz, Monroe, Ind.; Joni F. Byler, Volant, Pa.; Abe C. Gingercik, Arthur, Ill.; Ira Hissley, Kolona, Iowa.

Preserve the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to present for the reading of the Congress a copy of the resolution adopted by the department executive committee of the Louisiana department, the American Legion, in support of the Connally amendment to the World Court resolution. This is a most patriotic group which is vitally interested in the welfare of our Nation and I feel the action taken by the committee is most significant.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING RESCISSION OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT TO THE WORLD COURT RESOLUTION OF THE U.S. SENATE

Whereas in 1945 the Senate of the United States, without adequate debate, ratified the pact known as the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the attendant publicity featured two key points in this charter: (1) To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; and (2) to deny the right of the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state; without which the charter would not have been accepted by the United States; and

Whereas, on August 2, 1946, the Senate of the United States ratified the United Nations World Court resolution but in so doing, in line with our system of constitutional government, provided that the United States would not accept compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States, the last six words being known as the Connally amendment.

Whereas, since May 1, 1958, there has been a subtle campaign by internationalists of various types aimed at rescission of the Connally amendment; and

Whereas the rescission of the Connally amendment would expose the United States to serious judicial dangers before an international court of 15 judges, only one of whom can be from the United States.

Whereas Communist nations have judges on the Court but do not and will not accept its juridiction; and

Whereas the damages inherent in such rescission would expose various U.S. domestic issues to judicial interpretation of such international tribunal; and

Whereas the compulsory jurisdiction of such tribunal would endanger not only the constitutional powers of Federal agencies as delegated in the Constitution of the United States but also those powers reserved to the States and to the people; and

Whereas various resolutions now pending in the U.S. Senate would by repealing the Connally amendment, remove that safeguard against usurpations by an international judicial tribunal; and

Whereas the United States is the object of envy of many nations of the world and many peoples. Our Treasury is most attractive to them. Immigration to our shores is something they dream of. We do not favor making it possible for the International Court of Justice to decide whether a question of immigration to our shores is a domestic question or an international question. It is a domestic question, of course; but the Court might contend it is international in character; and

Whereas we oppose submission to the International Court of the question whether we have a right to levy tariffs and duties and to regulate any other matter of that kind such as navigation of the Panama Canal. They are purely domestic questions, and we do not favor the International Court having jurisdiction over them; and

Whereas we believe that the repeal of the amendment which reserves to the United States of America the sovereign right to determine what matters are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States would be most unwise; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the department executive committee, department of Louisiana, the American Legion assembled in New Orleans, La., on this 27th day of March 1960, That (1) rescission of the Connally amendment would jeopardize the Constitution of the United States and impair the powers reserved to the States and to the people; and (2) copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all members of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress, to the national commander and national executive committee of the American Legion, and to the Governor of Louisiana, the Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana, and each member of the Louisiana legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby urge the Louisiana legislature to adopt a similar resolution.

UNICEF Stops Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, no organization at work on the day-to-day challenges of world affairs deserves our gratitude and warm-hearted support than does UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund. From close personal experience, both inside and outside the United Nations, I have developed the most profound respect for the effective way in which UNICEF pursues its good works.

Last week here in Washington, the Friends of the United Nations Children's Fund held a meeting to illustrate the importance of new foods, including breadstuffs made from peanuts, sesame seed, cottonseed, sunflower seed, dried fish, soybean powdered "milk," and dried buffalo milk. Children from Chile, India, Indonesia, Italy, and Mexico demonstrated the foods.

Of the estimated 1 billion children in the world today, three-quarters, 750 million of them live in economically underdeveloped countries. The Chairman of the UNICEF Executive Board told the meeting: "Of all the staggering problems the children face in these developing countries, the chief one is hunger."

The Children's Fund, in collaboration with other U.N. agencies and with various technological, research, and private bodies in this country, is pressing the discovery, development, and processing of these new foodstuffs, also supplying plants and equipment to countries that are already producing edible peanut flour and soybean powdered "milk."

Among the countries presently developing or producing such foodstuffs as were sampled at this reception were: Brazil, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Moroco, Nigeria, Senegal, the Philippines, and the United States.

All these foods, it is found, have a long storage life in heat and humidity, and are regarded by expert nutritionists as "hidden" assets on the lands where they are indigenous because they have never been used to any sizable extent as human food. Some of them are in the final stages of development awaiting only confirming experiments before they can be produced in commercial quantities.

Congressional and Washington sponsors of the occasion included: Mrs. Christian Herter, Senora Dona de Sevilla-Sacasa, Mrs. Avraham Harman, Senator Theodore F. Green, Senator and Mrs. Alexander Wiley, Senator and Mrs. J. William Fulbright, Representative Frances P. Bolton, Mrs. Homer Ferguson, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Mrs. Harold H. Burton, Mrs. Francis B. Sayre, and Mrs. Bowles and myself.

The reception was held officially to honor Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr., the gifted and energetic President of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF, and Minister Dr. Felix Schnyder, chief of Switzerland's Permanent Observer Mission at the United Nations, and chairman of the UNICEF Executive Board.

Minister Schnyder's remarks at the Washington meeting last Friday, April 1, deserve a wider audience, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include his speech as follows:

SPEECH BY MINISTER FELIX SCHNYDER, CHIEF OF SWITZERLAND'S PERMANENT OBSERVER MISSION AT THE U.N. AND CHAIRMAN OF UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD

Let me tell you first of all how pleased I am to have the opportunity of being present here in this distinguished gathering.

It was certainly a magnificent idea to think of organizing such a meeting in Washington where leading citizens of this great country of yours join their best efforts for fostering the development of international relations.

From the point of view of the United Nations Children's Fund, it is very gratifying indeed because UNICEF needs good friends all over the world, and certainly here in Washington. I am, therefore, very happy to join in this endeavor and to say a few words about the Fund which I presently have the privilege of serving as Chairman of its Executive Board.

By way of a preface I should just like to mention the remarkable proclamation which the last, the 14th session of the General Assembly, unanimously adopted: the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, designed to insure the protection and the well-being of children of the world.

I believe that there is no other international organization which could be more suitable and better equipped than UNICEF to contribute within the framework of its activities to the ideals and aims expressed in that declaration. I am sure, looking around at you, and looking, too, at the list of distinguished friends of UNICEF who are here this afternoon, that there is nothing new that I can tell you about the history or the general work of the Fund.

You probably all know that most of the children of the world face a short life, a sick life, and a hungry life; that of the estimated 1 billion children in the world today, about three-quarters or 750 million live in economically underdeveloped areas. In these countries, in four cases out of five, the parents of these children rarely earn more than $100 a year.

Of all the staggering problems the children face in these developing countries, the chief one is hunger. It is not always because there isn't enough food to go around; it is also because people in those countries either don't produce the right kind of food, or don't know what makes a healthy diet, especially for very young children, even though the ingredients are often readily available right in their very midst, underneath their own feet, in the country's own soil or growing on trees or bushes that they pass by every day.

In addition, traditional beliefs, social or religious taboos seriously restrict the diet in many parts of the world. So does lack of knowledge and education about food, nutrition, and diets. And these restrictions bear heaviest on children. All this is, of course, quite an old situation. But there is something new about it these days—the fact that something is being done to try and remedy this situation.

If you look around this room you will see one of the ways in which UNICEF is trying to help, UNICEF, of course, in collaboration as always with other members of the U.N. family, such as the World Health Organization or the Food and Agriculture Organization, and in particular, with various U.S. technological and private bodies in this country. Before sitting down you all had an opportunity to look at and taste some of the hitherto undeveloped rich ingredients that can be added to children's food. The increasing discovery and development of these foodstuffs such as flour made from peanuts, from cottonseed, from sesame, from sunflower seed, and even from fish, is of tremendous importance. All these new foods that I have mentioned are in a way a form of unmined wealth present in most of the underdeveloped countries whose children are the principal victims of hunger or malnutrition.

But some of this unminded wealth has already been tapped with good results. For instance, soybean milk has been produced in Indonesia for the past couple of years. UNICEF this month allocated more funds to help enlarge the output of a plant to make this soy a product that it helped originally to build. The Board also approved funds to help a plant in India to tun out edible peanut flour. There are laboratories and plants with people busily working to produce and experiment with flours all over the world, and nearly all with help from UNICEF. Places where this work is going on, for instance, include Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and elsewhere in Central America; Brazil, Chile, and other countries of South America; in Africa, Nigeria; Senegal, Morocco, and territories of East Africa; in India; in Indonesia; in Japan; in the Philippines, where they are even experimenting with coconuts—and in other countries in Asia.

It's all very well discovering and producing all these excellent supplementary and substitute foods, but UNICEF also comes into the task of generating individual as well as community interest in better nutrition needs. Of actually getting these things accepted and fed to children. This calls for a carefully thought out program of education to be adapted to different local circumstances and different educational levels. This is an important part of UNICEF's expanded nutrition program. I wanted particularly to say these few words about our work in this field of nutrition because of the special attraction that we have here today. For I cannot stress too much, and I am sure you will agree, that it is in this field that lies very much a solution to some of the problems that must arise from the enormous growth in population in parts of the world.

What UNICEF seeks to do in cooperation with governments is to make certain that when a child is protected in infancy from diseases and from other dangers that can cause it to grow up a weakling, stunted, crippled or in some way unfit, this child can have every chance to develop into a healthy and productive individual able to play his economic part in the development of his community and of his country.

And, of course, it is not only in our nutrition and nutrition education projects that UNICEF is helping to bring this about. For the past 10 years since the UN General Assembly asked us to go in for programs of long-range benefit to children, we have been helping governments build up and extend their network of child care clinics.

In concluding, it is difficult not to refer to the importance of more adequate financing of UNICEF. Our work, as you all know, is basically dependent upon annual voluntary contributions by governments which make up some 90 percent of our income. Many of them, including the United States, which has pledged a contribution of $12 million for 1960, have so far been generous. It is clear, however, that there are far larger opportunities for effective use of aid to children through UNICEF.

UNICEF is still confronted with large unmet needs of children. UNICEF, as a result of the more comprehensive planning which governments are now undertaking for their people, is also confronted with larger opportunities for effective use of its aid.

UNICEF, given increased resources could not only press forward with its present endeavors, but celebrate each successive year with new and better ways of helping the world's children.

The Meaning of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in 1957 Random House published "Atlas Shrugged," by the noted author, Miss Ayn Rand. In this fine novel is a superb exposition of the values and virtues of the American private enterprise system. This section has been reprinted by permission of Random House, Inc.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the section of "Atlas Shrugged," to which I have referred, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

"So you think that money is the root of all evil?" said Francisco d'Anconia. "Have you ever asked what is the root of money? Money is a tool of exchange, which can't exist unless there are goods produced and men able to produce them. Money is the material shape of the principle that men who wish to deal with one another must deal by trade and give value for value. Money is not the tool of the moochers, who claim your product by tears, or by the looters, who take it from you by force. Money is made possible only by the men who produce. Is this what you consider evil?

"When you accept money in payment for your effort, you do so only on the conviction that you will exchange it for the product of the effort of others. It is not the moochers or the looters who give value to money. Not an ocean of tears nor all the guns in the world can transform those pieces of paper in your wallet into the bread you will need to survive tomorrow. Those pieces of paper, which should have been gold, are a token of honor—your claim upon the energy of the men who produce. You wallet is your statement of hope that somewhere in the world around you there are men who will not default on that moral principle which is the root of money. Is this what you consider evil?

"Have you ever looked for the root of production? Take a look at an electric generator and dare tell yourself that it was created by the muscular effort of unthinking brutes. Try to grow a seed of wheat without the knowledge left to you by men who had to discover it for the first time. Try to obtain your food by means of nothing by physical motions—and you'll learn that man's mind is the root of all the goods produced and of all the wealth that has ever existed on earth.

"But you say that money is made by the strong at the expense of the weak? What strength do you mean? It is not the strength of guns or muscles. Wealth is the product of man's capacity to think. Then is money made by the man who invents a motor at the expense of those who did not invent it? Is money made by the intelligent at the expense of the fools? By the able at the expense of the incompetent? By the ambitious at the expense of the lazy? Money is made—before it can be looted or mooched—made by the effort of every honest man, each to the extent of his ability. An honest man is one who knows that he can't consume more than he has produced.

"To trade by means of money is the code of the men of good will. Money rests on the axiom that every man is the owner of his mind and his effort. Money allows no power to prescribe the value of your effort except the voluntary choice of the man who is willing to trade you his effort in return. Money permits you to obtain for your goods and your labor that which they are worth to the men who buy them, but no more. Money permits no deals except those to mutual benefit by the unforced judgment of the traders. Money demands of you the recognition that men must work for their own benefit, not for their own injury, for their gain, not their loss—the recognition that they are not beasts of burden, born to carry the weight of your misery—that you must offer them values, not wounds—that the common bond among men is not the ex-

change of suffering, but the exchange of goods. Money demands that you sell, not your weakness to men's stupidity, but your talent to their reason; it demands that you buy, not the shoddist they offer, but the best that your money can find. And when men live by trade—with reason, not force, as their final arbiter—it is the best product that wins, the best performance, the man of best judgment and highest ability—and the degree of a man's productiveness is the degree of his reward. This is the code of existence whose tool and symbol is money. Is this what you consider evil?

"But money is only a tool. It will take you wherever you wish, but it will not replace you as the driver. It will give you the means for the satisfaction of your desires, but it will not provide you with desires. Money is the scourge of the men who attempt to reverse the law of casuality—the men who seek to replace the mind by seizing the products of the mind.

"Money will not purchase happiness for the man who has no concept of what he wants; money will not give him a code of values, if he's evaded the knowledge of what to value, and it will not provide him with a purpose, if he's evaded the choice of what to seek. Money will not buy intelligence for the fool, or admiration for the coward, or respect for the incompetent. The man who attempts to purchase the brains of his superiors to serve him, with his money replacing his judgment, ends up by becoming the victim of his inferiors. The men of intelligence desert him, but the cheats and the frauds come flocking to him, drawn by a law which he has not discovered: that no man may be smaller than his money. Is this the reason why you call it evil?

"Only the man who does not need it, is fit to inherit wealth—the man who would make his own fortune no matter where he started. If an heir is equal to his money, it serves him; if not, it destroys him. But you look on and you cry that money corrupted him. Did it? Or did he corrupt his money? Do not envy a worthless heir; his wealth is not yours and you would have done no better with it. Do not think that it should have been distributed among you; loading the world with 50 parasites instead of 1 would not bring back the dead virtue which was the fortune. Money is a living power that dies without its root. Money will not serve the mind that cannot match it. Is this the reason why you call it evil?

"Money is your means of survival. The verdict you pronounce upon the source of your livelihood is the verdict you pronounce upon your life. If the source is corrupt, you have damned your own existence. Did you get your money by fraud? By pandering to men's vices or men's stupidity? By catering to fools, in the hope of getting more than your ability deserves? By lowering your standards? By doing work you despise for purchasers you scorn? If so, then your money will not give you a moment's or a penny's worth of joy. Then all the things you buy will become, not a tribute to you, but a reproach; not an achievement, but a reminder of shame. Then you'll scream that money is evil. Evil, because it would not pinch-hit for your self-respect? Evil, because it would not let you enjoy your depravity? Is this the root of your hatred of money?

"Money will always remain an effect and refuse to replace you as the cause. Money is the product of virtue, but it will not give you virtue and it will not redeem your vices. Money will not give you the unearned, neither in matter nor in spirit. Is this the root of your hatred of money?

"Or did you say it's the love of money that's the root of all evil? To love a thing is to know and love its nature. To love money is to know and love the fact that money is the creation of the best power within you, and your passkey to trade your effort for the effort of the best among men. It's the person who would sell his soul for a nickel, who is loudest in proclaiming his hatred of money—and he has good reason to hate it. The lovers of money are willing to work for it. They know the are able to deserve it.

"Let me give you a tip on a clue to men's characters: the man who damns money has obtained it dishonorably; the man who respects it has earned it.

"Run for your life from any man who tells you that money is evil. That sentence is the leper's bell of an approaching looter. So long as men live together on earth and need means to deal with one another—their only substitute, if they abandon money, is the muzzle of a gun.

"But money demands of you the highest virtues, if you wish to make it or to keep it. Men who have no courage, pride, or self-esteem, men who have no moral sense of their right to their money and are not willing to defend it as they defend their life, men who apologize for being rich—will not remain rich for long. They are the natural bait for the swarms of looters that stay under rocks for centuries, but come crawling out at the first smell of a man who begs to be forgiven for the guilt of owning wealth. They will hasten to relieve him of the guilt—and of his life, as he deserves.

"Then you will see the rise of the men of the double standard—the men who live by force, yet count on those who live by trade to create the value of their looted money—the men who are the hitchhikers of virtue. In a moral society, there are the criminals, and the statutes are written to protect you against them. But when a society establishes criminals-by-right and looters-by-law—men who use force to seize the wealth of disarmed victims—then money becomes its creators' avenger. Such looters believe it safe to rob defenseless men, once they've passed a law to disarm them. But their loot becomes the magnet for other looters, who get in from them as they got it. Then the race goes not to the ablest at production, but to those most ruthless at brutality. When force is the standard, the murderer wins over the pickpocket. And then that society vanishes, in a spread of ruins and slaughter.

"Do you wish to know whether that day is coming? Watch money. Money is the barometer of a society's virtue. When you see that trading is done, not by consent, but by compulsion—when you see that in order to produce, you need to obtain permission from men who produce nothing—when you see that money is flowing to those who deal, not in goods, but in favors—when you see that men get richer by graft and by pull than by work, and your laws don't protect you against them, but protect them against you—when you see corruption being rewarded and honesty becoming a self-sacrifice—you may know that your society is doomed. Money is so noble a medium that it does not compete with guns and it does not make terms with brutality. It will not permit a country to survive as half property, half loot.

"Whenever destroyers appear among men, they start by destroying money, for money is men's protection and the base of a moral existence. Destroyers seize gold and leave to its owners a counterfeit pile of paper. This kills all objective standards and delivers men into the arbitrary power of an arbitrary setter of values. Gold has an objective value, an equivalent of wealth produced. Paper is a mortgage on wealth that does not exist, backed by a gun aimed at those who are expected to produce it. Paper is a check drawn by legal looters upon an account which is not theirs: upon the virtue of the victims. Watch for the day when it bounces, marked: 'Account overdrawn.'

"When you have made evil the means of survival, do not expect men to remain good. Do not expect them to stay moral and lose their lives for the purpose of becoming the fodder of the immoral. Do not expect them to produce, when production is punished and looting rewarded. Do not ask, 'Who is destroying the world?' You are.

"You stand in the midst of the greatest achievements of the greatest productive civilization and you wonder why it's crumbling around you, while you're damning its life-blood—money. You look upon money as the savages did before you, and you wonder why the jungle is creeping back to the edge of your cities. Throughout men's history, money was always seized by looters of one brand or another, whose names changed, but whose method remained the same: to seize wealth by force and to keep producers bound, demeaned, defamed, deprived of honor. That phrase about the evil of money, which you mouth with such righteous recklessness, comes from a time when wealth was produced by the labor of slaves—slaves who repeated the motions once discovered by somebody's mind and left unimproved for centuries. So long as production was ruled by force, and wealth was obtained by conquest, there was little to conquer. Yet through all the centuries of stagnation and starvation, men exalted the looters, as aristocrats of the sword, as aristocrats of birth, as aristocrats of the bureau, and despised the producers, as slaves, as traders, as shopkeepers—as industrialists.

"To the glory of mankind, there was, for the first and only time in history, a country of money—and I have no higher, more reverent tribute to pay to America, for this means: a country of reason, justice, freedom, production, achievement. For the first time, man's mind and money were set free, and there were no fortunes-by-conquest, but only fortunes-by-work, and instead of swordsmen and slaves, there appeared the real maker of wealth, the greatest worker, the highest type of human being—the self-made man—the American industrialist.

"If you ask me to name the proudest distinction of Americans, I would choose—because it contains all the others—the fact that they were the people who created the phrase 'to make money.' No other language or nation had ever used these words before; men had always thought of wealth as a static quantity—to be seized, begged, inherited, shared, looted, or obtained as a favor. Americans were the first to understand that wealth has to be created. The words 'to make money' hold the essence of human morality.

"Yet these were the words for which Americans were denounced by the rotted cultures of the looters' continents. Now the looters' credo has brought you to regard your proudest achievements as a hallmark of shame, your prosperity as guilt, your greatest men, the industrialists, as blackguards, and your magnificent factories as the product and property of muscular labor, the labor of whip-driven slaves, like the pyramids of Egypt. The rotter who simpers that he sees no difference between the power of the dollar and the power of the whip, ought to learn the difference on his own hide—as, I think, he will.

"Until and unless you discover that money is the root of all good, you ask for your own destruction. When money ceases to be the tool by which men deal with one another, then men become the tools of men. Blood, whips and guns—or dollars. Take your choice—there is no other—and your time is running out."

Vigorous Road Chief: Dwight R. G. Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have long been impressed by the wholesome philosophy and sincere dedication of our New Jersey State Highway Commissioner, Mr. Dwight R. G. Palmer, and I was pleased immeasurably to read in today's New York Times the following profile story of this great American:

VIGOROUS ROAD CHIEF: DWIGHT R. G. PALMER

TRENTON, April 4.—"My philosophy has always been to play at my work and work at my play," Dwight R. G. Palmer says. He really means that work and play have always been synonymous in his thoughts.

A glimpse at his career provides ample evidence of this. Since the turn of the century, when he was knee deep in water from dawn till dusk snaking cypress and pine logs through Louisiana's swamps with the aide of a mule team, he has found little desire or need for hobbies or holidays.

When called upon to make an exhaustive study of the commuter transit problem and come up with a solution, the 73-year-old State highway commissioner accepted as though it were a minor chore. The result: a report made public today.

He tackled the job the way he had his job in the logging camp. Eighteen months after entering the camp he was its manager. Then with but a diploma from a high school in St. Louis, he went on to become a successful salesman, learned every facet of the cable and wire business and rose to become president and board chairman of the General Cable Corp., largest concern of its type in the world.

Through skillful mergers he made the cable concern predominant in its sphere. He retired after wiping out its $13,500,000 indebtedness, increasing by $16 million its earned surplus and putting its common stock on a dividend basis for the first time.

His vacations had always been brief and far between; his work day, 14 to 18 hours. They still are.

Six feet tall, he weighs 185 pounds. He is a fastidious dresser with a polished, military mien. Though his voice is soft, Mr. Palmer speaks with unmistakable authority and seems able to convince an audience that he must be right even when he isn't.

DEATH ON COFFEE BREAKS

Efficiency is an obsession with him. And State employees have felt his ban on coffee breaks, petty payola, railroad passes and the indiscriminate use of State autos.

Since becoming highway commissioner in 1954 he has conceived and directed one of the most ambitious road building programs in New Jersey's history. He has reorganized the highway department and uncovered malpractices and reorganized the Delaware River Toll Bridge Commission.

At 7:30 a.m. Mr. Palmer is at the wheel of his convertible en route from Short Hills to Trenton. For 9 hours after reaching his desk he is embroiled in conferences, paperwork, poring over maps and making decisions that often involve millions of dollars.

His lunch is usually consumed in the heat of discussion. At home in the evening he is again involved in a maze of paperwork. Weekends he drives about the State to view conditions he may have to deal with in the coming week. He sleeps no longer than 6 hours a night and appears to thrive on the arduous schedule.

His friends know that he delights in improvising humorous, satirical, and philosophical verse and reading it to anyone who will listen.

But none of his friends—or foes—knows what his middle initials stand for.

"They stand for legitimate family names," he says, "but I have never used them, and I will not reveal what they represent."

Mr. Palmer long has been associated with the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the National Urban League. President Harry S. Truman appointed him to the Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services and named him chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contract Compliance.

Mr. Palmer married the former Helen Banister in 1916. They have a son, 3 daughters, and 13 grandchildren.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Ike Uninformed? Record Disproves It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am the ranking Republican member, has been stimulating public interest and constructive thinking on the problems involved in recruiting and utilizing the best men and the best methods for coordinating the great strengths of America on the all-important business of winning the cold war and maintaining our national defense posture and policies sufficiently well to discourage the likelihood of a shooting war being launched against us by imperialistic communism.

Many editorials and columns have been written about the work of our committee and the evidence accumulating from our public hearings. The discussion has been penetrating and productive. Nothing is ever so good in this world than it cannot stand improvement. Our subcommittee will continue its attempts to be useful in gathering and relaying information which we hope will result in steadily improving methods of employing America's resources and strength to protect the peace and to provide our world leadership with the tools and talents required to encourage other free peoples to hold fast to freedom and to exert themselves to protect it.

An interesting insight on how President Eisenhower handles some of the functions of his office in this whole theater of responsibilities was recently written by Phil G. Goulding of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. For the information of the Congress and the country I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 25, 1960]

IKE UNINFORMED? RECORD DISPUTES IT

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON.—At 8:59 yesterday morning President Eisenhower left his desk, crossed through the secretarial office of Ann Whitman and walked into the Cabinet room to the weekly meeting of the National Security Council.

This was the 326th session of the NSC in the present administration.

It was the 296th over which Mr. Eisenhower has presided.

The statistics are without meaning, except as applied to current charges that the Chief Executive is not informed on major policy issues and that he is a captive of a staff system.

Such allegations began in earnest after recent Capitol Hill testimony by Robert A. Lovett—a lifetime Republican, a Wall Street banker, a 30-year friend of the President and a man of national prestige and respect. He was both Under Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense for Harry S. Truman.

PRESIDENT AGGRAVATED

Mr. Eisenhower has been aggravated and his top aides infuriated by what they think were distortions and misinterpretations of the Lovett testimony. The President made one sharp reference to this on his South American trip. He had hoped to discuss the subject more thoroughly at his last news conference, but reporters did not question him about it.

In public and secret testimony, the latter since released in full, Lovett made these points:

The NSC cannot function properly in a mass atmosphere of many members and it should confine itself to few major policy issues.

It is a disservice to the President if these issues are not debated in front of him. The President must be informed by his aides, not protected by them. His load is not lightened if he is offered agreed-upon papers requiring only his approval or rejection.

NOTES 8 YEARS OLD

Lovett was testifying on the subject of national policy machinery. He was not talking about Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Truman, or Mr. Lincoln. The questions, fairly put by the Democratic chairman of the subcommittee, and Lovett's answers, were geared to the philosophy of Government.

Earlier in his testimony, in fact, Lovett emphasized that he was speaking from notes made 8 years ago. It should therefore be clear, he said, "that none of these observations is intended to be critical of any individuals or of operational decisions."

Yet many accounts of Lovett's appearance applied his generalities to Mr. Eisenhower's particular case. On the floor of the Senate, for example, the chairman of the foreign relations committee said this:

"In executive session, Mr. Lovett indicated his belief that President Eisenhower leads a dangerously sheltered life as Chief Executive of the Nation. For, he said, the National Security Council, 'protects' Mr. Eisenhower from the debates that precede policy decisions."

The record shows that the witness said no such thing.

Completely apart from the Lovett philosophy or the misinterpretations of his remarks, here are the facts on how the NSC has operated under the Eisenhower administration:

Its statutory members are the President, Vice President, Secretaries of State and Defense and Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Other participating members usually include the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Treasury Secretary and Budget Director, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President's Scientific Adviser.

Meetings are attended by 10 to 12 persons, not 75 as has been written. (There are rare exceptions for special briefings rather than routine NSC sessions. One of these was the presentation of the Gaither committee defense report. Sixty-nine were present, including 29 committee members and a second echelon of staff.)

Issues are confined to major policy matters. The NSC does not deal in tactics. It decided, for example, that U.S. policy toward Cuba should be one of "restraint and forbearance." It did not determine the tactics of when the Ambassador should be recalled for consultation.

IKE JOINS IN DEBATES

President Eisenhower is not offered policies which have been agreed upon in advance. Sixty-six percent of all papers prepared by the planning board for the NSC have had "splits," or differences of opinion. These splits are formally presented, all sides are given and each man speaks his piece.

The President joins in these debates. He sometimes hands down a decision on the policy at the meetings, sometimes makes it later after restudying the papers and sometimes suggests that the matter be put on the agenda for the next weekly meeting.

Each session is opened by a report from the Central Intelligence Director.

Mr. Eisenhower has attended 90 percent of NSC meetings during his Presidency. President Truman's participation was 50-odd percent. This comparison is unfair, however, since Mr. Truman was as regular an attendant after the outbreak of the Korean war.

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Nation is this week observing National Library Week.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my high regards for the thousands of dedicated men and women throughout the country who are working tirelessly to bring the miracle of the printed word to the American people.

The public library and the librarian has played an outstanding role in the history of our great Nation. The public library has brought within the reach of everyone the great books of the world. It has opened new doors to knowledge for millions of people.

All of us are inclined to take our library system and the men and women who operate them for granted. It is fitting that during this 1 week of the year we all pause to express our deep appreciation for our library system and the many benefits it has brought to the Nation.

During this week, I hope everyone will have an opportunity to visit their library and express to the library staff their appreciation for the fine job they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks at this point a letter from the Hutchinson, Kans., Library regarding the observance of National Library Week:

HUTCHINSON PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Hutchinson, Kans., March 28, 1960.
Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
Congressman, Fifth District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: During the week of April 3–9, National Library Week will be observed at your Hutchinson Public Library as a part of a nationwide program sponsored by the National Book Committee, Inc., and the American Library Association.

The aim of National Library Week is a "better-read, better-informed America." It will provide a focal point for many activities designed to promote reading of books, magazines, and newspapers among children, youth, and adults.

In the past years National Library Week succeeded in arousing a sense of personal need as well as a deeper responsibility for the status of reading in the community and in the Nation. The week resulted in new library circulation records, new gains in registration, and many new friends of books, reading, and libraries. More than 5,000 cities, towns, and villages participated, and public officials were a very important part of the success of this observance.

Your Hutchinson Public Library is one of the city's proudest possessions, and especially during National Library Week, or any other occasion, we want to extend a very cordial invitation for you and your family to visit us.

Please remember that we at the library are always at your service, and we want to cooperate fully in the future development of our city, county, and State.

Very sincerely yours,

CARLOS CUITINO.

Tribute to Charles J. Bloch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Indicative of the high esteem in which the people of Geogia hold Hon. Charles J. Bloch of Macon, Ga., is the editorial carried by the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph and News in its issue of Sunday, April 3, entitled "Mr. Bloch and Senate Committee." Georgians respect and admire Mr. Bloch not only for his outstanding and unselfish public service on the State level but also for the honor and recognition which he has brought to our State as an eloquent champion of States rights and constitutional government on the national level. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BLOCH AND SENATE COMMITTEE

Macon Attorney Charles J. Bloch is no stranger to congressional hearing chambers in Washington. His voice has been heard there many times, speaking out eloquently and with legalistic logic, in support of the principle of States rights.

In his most recent appearance as a witness before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. Bloch has once again impressed his listeners with his incisive knowledge of the Constitution and his rational reasoning against the civil rights bill now before the Senate.

Whether Mr. Bloch changed any senatorial minds remains to be seen, but his authoritative testimony cannot help but bring added understanding for the South's viewpoint.

The remarks of Senator SAM ERVIN of North Carolina, a member of the Judiciary Committee, at the conclusion of Mr. Bloch's argument attest the caliber of advocate the doctrine of States rights has in the Macon attorney.

"I have been living with lawyers all my life," Senator ERVIN said, "because my father was a member of the North Carolina bar, and I can say this without attempting to be flattering, but simply as a matter of truth: I have never been privileged to know a finer lawyer than yourself, and I can count on the fingers of one hand the lawyers, all the lawyers I have known that I think approach you."

Coming from a former justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, that's high praise.

Little Emmaus and a Flag Defeat a Left-wing Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening News, March 30, 1960:

LITTLE EMMAUS AND A FLAG DEFEAT A LEFT-WING INVASION

(By Victor Riesel)

Some of the boys rallied around the flag a few Saturdays ago and beat back their left-wing enemies. Just because the battle of the flag was heard only in the Owl's Home Hall in little Emmaus, Pa. (population 7,780), is no reason for it to lose its place in history. Emmaus isn't Valley Forge, but the issue is the same. And let those who think this is flag waving make the most of it.

It all began early on the afternoon of Saturday, February 20, in the Owl's Home Hall to which the pro-Soviet line United Electrical Workers Union (UE) had summoned its people from that section of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and Maryland to a mass rally.

The meeting was called in support of the UE's drive to take the plants of Air Products, Inc., from the union which had the corporation under contract. This latter union is the AFL–CIO International Association of Machinists (IAM).

For 4 peaceful and prosperous years—for management and labor—the IAM has represented the workers in the corporation's plants in Emmaus, Allentown, and Traxlertown.

Now, on the insistence of the UE, which more than once has had some of its important leaders accused by congressional witnesses of being Communists, there was to be an election in these plants. The date was set for February 25. The UE then rented the Owl's Home Hall for a razzle-dazzle windup campaign to convince the workers to vote them in.

About 100 folk attended the monster rally. Of this outpouring, 15 were members of the rival IAM. With the multitude assembled, the left-wing chairman took the platform. He opened the meeting—or at least he thought he did.

But one of the crowd was a machinist who was a comparatively new citizen. His name is Robert (French) Merbah. He had come here from France. There, during the big war, Frenchy had been an underground fighter against the Nazis. They had beaten him and left him for dead. He liked his freedom here. He admired the flag under which he now lived and to which he had sworn allegiance. He got up. He asked the chairman why the meeting had not been opened with a salute to the flag.

The chairman sneered.

He said in this union of his they don't salute the flag. No one can make him salute the flag. He had been saluting the flag under forced draft since he went to public school and it had done no one any good, he asserted. There was to be no saluting of the flag in this district.

The good people of Emmaus couldn't quite understand that. In addition to paying homage to the symbol of their land, they couldn't quite see why their right to an avowal of allegiance could be denied by anyone. Loudly they argued the point for almost an hour.

Finally, the UE chairman retreated. The audience saluted the flag. The meeting was desultory from there on.

The following Monday the Machinists Association issued a leaflet telling the story to their fellow workers in the plants. The throwaway said, "The UE shows its true colors. Air Products, Inc., workers shocked at arrogant outburst. Why not open meeting with pledge of allegiance?"

After that, every piece of IAM literature had a sticker in the corner—a little U.S. flag. When the National Labor Relations Board election count was in, the tally was 326 for the IAM to 93 votes for the UE.

The UE had lost another of its legal efforts to move in on air products and electronic equipment plants. Since these factories already are competently covered by authentic union contracts, the costs to the Government of the IUE campaigns mount up.

But it is all worth it. It's always worth it when the people—as did the good folk of Emmaus—prove they won't let themselves be pushed around.

Standstill at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, around the globe, one of the major challenges that continues to confront all peoples and nations is finding a way to reduce tensions and conflicts of interest and prevent—if at all possible—a third world war.

A major task, of course, is to find a way to reduce armaments. The purpose, of course, would be twofold: First, to reduce the risk of war; and, second, to lift the heavy burden of costly armaments programs from the backs of people all over the earth.

At Geneva, the Western Powers have been striving diligently—and realistically, I believe—to get agreement on proposals for step-by-step reductions in armaments.

Unfortunately, the Communists continue to put forward the old ruses—be-

hind deceptive facades—of getting the Western Powers committed to reduction of armaments. At the same time, they, themselves, would be free—if deceptively so—to possibly develop a secret striking power that could be utilized to attempt to intimidate, or overpower, the West.

As we know, the major obstructionist Communist tactic has been that of refusing to agree to any realistic method of inspection. Without such safeguards, the history of Communist treaty-breaking provides sufficient evidence to conclude that any agreement would be worthless and futile—more than that, dangerous.

The Communists also have raised the issue of U.S. bases around the periphery of the Communist bloc.

We can understand, of course, their interest in reducing our capability for preventing Communist aggression—and providing them greater opportunity to play power politics.

However, their demands for evacuating our bases, I believe, would receive more favorable consideration if the Soviets offered to release the so-called satellite nations from the iron grip of Moscow, pull out troops, and allow these nations the right of self-determination; and, in addition, if they offered to encourage their "partner in conspiracy," Red China, to relinquish its tyrannical hold on Tibet.

From long years of experience, however, we have learned that deceptive tactics are part and parcel of the Communist policy designed to make the road to realistic disarmament as difficult as possible. If possible, they would lure the Western Powers into the trap of disarming, while they, themselves, would be free to further develop military prowess to use for support of Communist policy, for blackmail, and for outright aggression.

We can expect, of course, that the Communists will continue to follow these tactics. We must be careful not to fall prey to them.

Realizing the great issues involved, however, we must patiently—but firmly—continue our efforts to find solid grounds for safeguarded agreements that will not only lead toward ultimate reduction of armaments, but also, the lessening of conflicts in other fields of interest.

Yesterday, the New York Times published an informative editorial on the situation entitled "Standstill at Geneva." Reflecting on this very serious world problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDSTILL AT GENEVA

At Geneva yesterday Soviet Delegate Zorin rejected the Western plan for a balanced and controlled step-by-step approach to general disarmament. He also ruled out any progress at the Conference unless the West first accepts as a basis of negotiation Premier Khrushchev's plan for total disarmament in 4 years—this to be accomplished prior to effective controls and without any international police to keep the peace. Mr. Zorin continued to pay lipservice to controls, but refused to answer Western queries as to what he meant by them; and by accusing the West of trying to avoid disarmament by "endless talk" on control he indicated that once the Soviets obtain a blank check on Western disarmament they would do the "endless talking" on control without making it effective.

The Soviet delegate conceded that even the Khrushchev plan provides for the alternative of partial disarmament measures. But he served notice that he would consent to talk about such measures only if the West first puts itself on record as rejecting total disarmament, envisaged in the Western plan as the final goal.

In keeping with this stand, but also for another propaganda purpose, the Soviet delegate also rejected the American proposal for an immediate and easily controlled ban on nuclear space vehicles unless the United States simultaneously abandons all of its oversea bases—that is, gets out of Europe, Asia, and Africa. He charged that a ban on nuclear space vehicles would deprive the Soviets of weapons in which they were "superior." And he distorted the issue by ignoring the fact that, while the Soviets hold all Eastern Europe as a military base, the American bases abroad are there under collective defense agreements with the host countries, for their own protection as well as ours, and that they are abandoned whenever the host country believes that it can get along without them, as in the case of Morocco.

All this may be merely preparation for the summit meeting. But it has dimmed the hope of any early progress at Geneva.

Importation of Surplus Foreign Military Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a State official in the State of South Dakota which may be of interest to some Members of Congress who are a little bit concerned about the future of the United States and what we are doing by continually putting down tariffs, by continually increasing imports of all kinds, by floating along on cloud 57 and paying no attention to the storm that is blowing up from the rear. That storm, Mr. Speaker, is foreign imports.

The problem of rifle imports and what it is doing to Pittman-Robertson funds is only a drop in the bucket to what imports are doing to the mineral industry, to the farming industry, and to the manufacturing industry in America generally. It is only a drop in the bucket to what imports are doing to undermine employment, but the American people may not wake up until it is too late.

The letter from Harry Woodward, director of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, reads in part as follows:

I am writing to you in behalf of the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Commission and the sportsmen of South Dakota who are concerned about our important wildlife restoration program which is financed through Pittman-Robertson Federal aid funds. It is important that certain facts concerning the future of the Pittman-Robertson program be brought to your attention, namely the importation of surplus foreign military arms.

When the first quarter of fiscal year 1959 figures on P-R collections were released there was a decrease of 26.87 percent over a comparable period during the past year. However, nationwide figures on hunting license sales indicated only a slight decline. In looking for an explanation, one reason advanced is that the importation of surplus foreign military arms is increasing. As an example, in the first 9 months of 1958, 131,000 foreign rifles were imported. Of the 131,000 rifles imported, 111,000 were valued at less than $5. The ad valorem tax for tariff on these guns is negligible. This tax or tariff is, of course, not an excise tax and thus not credited to the P-R program. The cumulative effects of selling low-priced foreign arms which replace American manufactured products reduces or eliminates the total excise taxes collected. The funds set apart for financing the Federal aid in wildlife restoration programs will therefore be expected to decline as the sale of these surplus foreign arms increases.

More Support for Fort Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Rolla Daily News, Rolla, Mo., carried an editorial recently concerning Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. Because of the importance of this military post, I believe this editorial should be brought to the attention of all Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rolla Daily News, Mar. 11, 1960]

MORE SUPPORT FOR FORT WOOD

More and more individuals and newspapers are recognizing the growing importance of Fort Leonard Wood in our defense system, and are encouraging the "permanentizing" program underway there.

There are those of us who fought to make Fort Leonard Wood a permanent facility, and now that the multimillion-dollar project is underway, it is good to observe the wide acceptance of that fact.

Hundreds of our families serving the defense program are now housed in comfortable, modern quarters (the Capehart houses) and more are yet to be. Some new barracks have been built and more are to be constructed. The long-sought 300-bed hospital is now an item before Congress.

High military authorities continue to speak highly of Fort Leonard Wood and back up their opinions with action to make the nearby facility the principal engineering establishment in the Nation. The pleadings and predictions of this newspaper seem nearer toward coming true.

An interesting editorial observation was made this week by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. It read:

"Every month, nearly 6,000 new Army recruits wind up at Fort Leonard Wood to

get their first taste of military life. This huge post is excellent for training purposes, but a rugged experience for the raw recruit.

"Many of the buildings are temporary, wooden relics of World War II. That includes the hospital and the barracks. As Maj. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman, Army Director of Installations, told the House Armed Services Committee, the barracks are unpainted inside, stained with soot from coal stoves and frigid in cold weather.

"'During the winter months, when the temperature falls as low as zero, it is extremely difficult to maintain a reasonable temperature in the barracks,' the general told the committee.

"The Army would like to spend some $9,087,000 to build a new hospital, two new barracks for enlisted men and a new chapel.

"These investments would represent money well spent if only to give a better impression of the Army to incoming recruits.

"The Defense Department can save considerable sums if it cuts down the rapid turnover in enlisted men and persuades more of them to make a career of the Army. The way to do it is provide them with decent living conditions.

"Fort Leonard Wood is one of the best military training centers in the United States. We hope that the House will permit the Army to equip the post in the way its importance deserves."

Saline Water Program Is Progressing Rapidly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have watched the progress of the Office of Saline Water with great interest and I am pleased with its efforts. There are, however, those who have expressed disappointment at the progress of the saline water conversion program. This disappointment is based on a misconception of the facts, because the program is progressing rather rapidly.

Public Law 85–883 became effective September 2, 1958. In essence it called for the establishing of five different processes at 3-month intervals beginning March 2, 1960.

The processes have been selected and were announced on or ahead of the schedule established by the Congress. The law further requires that the construction of the demonstration plants were subject to the following conditions:

Three were to be for the conversion of sea water. Two plants so designed must have a capacity of not less than 1 million gallons a day. In addition not less than two plants were required for treatment of brackish water and one of these must have a capacity of not less than 250,000 gallons a day.

Mr. Speaker, bids will be opened for the first plant in May of this year. This plant will be constructed at Freeport, Tex. Bids for the second and third plants in all probability will be opened in July if appropriations are available. The specifications and designs are being studied for the fourth plant at Roswell, N. Mex.

The Site Selection Board will meet April 28 and 29 to determine the location of the fifth plant, which will be a freezing process on the east coast.

Dr. A. L. Miller, Director of the Office of Saline Water, has informed me that a pilot plant at Harbor Island, N.C., has been used to develop the process on sea water. A conference of prospective bidders is scheduled at the test site April 11, 1960, to witness completion of a test. Engineers will be on hand to answer questions that might be posed by the prospective bidders.

Mr. Speaker, these facts indicate that the program is off the ground and is moving forward. I believe Dr. Miller, his staff, and the Office of Saline Water are doing a commendable job.

The Census Form and Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the serious debate that has occupied this body for the past several weeks has provided little opportunity for many Members to pause and refresh their spirits by contemplation of the humorous trivia that surround all human activities.

Fortunately, the opportunity to do so has presented itself in the form of a delightful column from the Richmond Times-Dispatch by Charles McDowell, Jr., entitled "The Census Form and Family Life."

The writer, a young man of wit and charm and talent, recently has received the National Headliner's Award for the consistent excellence of his column. I heartily commend his articles to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. McDowell's column from the Times-Dispatch of March 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENSUS FORM AND FAMILY LIFE

(By Charles McDowell, Jr.)

The census form arrived at our house last week, and we were glad to see that the Government had enclosed an "example" to guide us in filling out the thing. It is a fascinating example and we commend it to anyone interested in the home life of contemporary Americans.

The hypothetical family in the example is named Vernon. The head of the household is Alexander Vernon, 41, and his wife is Estelle Vernon, 34. They have three children, Marcia, 10, Carol, 6, and Alexander, Jr., a baby who was born in January this year. The household also includes a lodger named George Drayer, a single gentleman of 22 years.

On the back of the example we find that the five Vernons and the lodger live in a seven-room house (counting the kitchen but not the bathrooms) that is worth between $12,500 to $14,900. These people live in Larchdale, Ohio, and it is difficult for one familiar only with the Richmond real estate market to speculate on the layout and condition of this seven-room bargain.

If it is a relatively new house, it could conceivably have three bedrooms, living room, dining room and kitchen, and the Vernons are counting the utility room to make seven. If it is relatively old, the house could conceivably have four bedrooms, living room, dining room and kitchen. In any event, the Vernons are fitted rather tightly into their sleeping accommodations.

We can assume that Mr. and Mrs. Vernon have one bedroom and the two girls another, although Marcia is certainly already campaigning to get out of the room with Carol. The lodger has a room, which accounts for three. The baby, Alexander, Jr., might be in the fourth bedroom, if any, or he might still be sleeping in the room with his parents.

So there might be one bedroom left empty for the present. Well, the Vernons need it, for the example discloses under section C that they have a visitor in the house.

The visitor is James T. Wood, of Newberry, Conn. He is 67 years old, and he may well be sleeping on the sofa. Of course, he could be sharing a room with Alexander Jr. or the lodger, or both of them, but none of these situations would be ideal.

Mr. Wood is a widower. Our guess is, and it seems reasonable, that he is Mrs. Vernon's father. No doubt he has come from Connecticut to see his new grandson. Fine. Our point merely is that this is a crowded and probably rather turbulent household, what with the new baby, the visiting grandfather, and the lodger.

But add to all that still another person and a tremendous element of mystery. In section B of the example, question No. 2, is, "Is there anyone left out of section A because you were not sure whether he should be listed—for example, a new baby still in the hospital, or a lodger who also has another home?" Mr. Vernon, who filed out the form, has checked "yes." And on a line provided for the purpose, he has written the name of this person: Susan L. Mills.

Now who in the world is that? Susan L. Mills is not a new baby still in the hospital, obviously, and we already have a lodger. The addition of a female lodger to the household would confuse things thoroughly, to say the least.

But who is she then? Susan Mills' age and relationship to this household are not given. Presumably these details will be straightened out when the census enumerator calls for the form.

The question of Susan Mills' identity and position in all this has disturbed us for several days, and it may be nagging at the minds of literally tens of thousands of people who have studied the example.

Here is a form that has gone into every home in America, showing us how to count our family, evaluate our home, and report on our plumbing, but hidden away in the form is the mystery of Susan Mills to distract us from the business at hand.

Is she a baby nurse or maid, perhaps, who goes home at night? If so, Mr. Vernon shouldn't have listed her, and surely the Census Bureau wouldn't put an error in the example.

Is she a little girl spending the night with Marcia and Carol? It seems unlikely that Mrs. Vernon would have let her daughters invite a friend at this crowded and hectic time.

Does she bear any relationship to the lodger? Let us not even speculate.

Did she arrive with Mr. Wood? We prefer to think not, somehow.

Assuming that the explanation of Susan Mills' presence is simple, why was Mr. Vernon

not sure whether to list this mystery woman?

We trust that the enumerator will check on Susan Mills when the time comes to pick up the form, and that the Census Bureau will be quick to put America's mind at rest.

Questionnaire Results Revealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, during the months of January and February of this year, I sent a questionnaire into each of approximately 83,000 homes in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, so that I might be as fully informed as possible as to the views of my constituents on a number of vital issues which currently face the Congress. Thirteen thousand two hundred and four questionnaires were returned to me in time to be included in the tabulation, made by an independent statistical firm after my study of the individual views of the many persons who are taking an active interest in affairs of their Federal Government.

Because I feel that the views of my constituents are most revealing, I am placing the tabulated results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to study the answers I received to the eight questions asked.

First, I would like to announce that nearly 9 out of 10 adults who live in the 12 counties of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington agree with President Eisenhower's pay-as-you-go emphasis in balancing the Federal budget. These same residents are nearly as decisive that the Federal Government should stay out of subsidizing teachers' salaries, and have indicated, nearly 2 to 1, that medical expenses should not be included in the Social Security Act.

Other results of my questionnaire show that the vast majority feel that Communist China should not be seated in the United Nations, and that the Federal Government should assume more leadership in the juvenile delinquency problem. The majority of those who returned the questionnaire would rather not see an overall minimum wage of $1.25 an hour.

In a two-part question regarding choice of legislation to help solve the farm surplus problem, the questionnaire reveals that 79.6 percent favor a gradual reduction in Government controls and gradual removal of price supports. In this regard, I feel that it should be pointed out that my district is not a heavily populated urban area, but, rather, an agricultural district of 12 counties heavily dependent upon an agricultural economy.

The complete tabulation is as follows:

Questionnaire results

[In percent]

Questions	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you agree with the President's pay-as-you-go emphasis on having a balanced budget?	87.2	6.3	6.5
2. Do you feel the Federal Government should provide grants to States to meet school construction needs?	36.8	56.2	7.0
3. Do you favor continued reliance on local and State support for teachers' salaries, rather than Federal grants for this purpose?	77.8	16.6	5.6
4. Do you favor a Federal minimum wage law making it mandatory to pay workers in all classifications (business, farm, industry, etc.) $1.25 an hour?	42.3	50.1	7.6
5. Do you think that Communist China should be seated in the U.N.?	15.3	72.6	12.1
6. To help solve the farm surplus problem, would you—			
A. Favor strict production controls with price supports fixed at flexible levels from 0 to 90 percent of parity?	13.2	49.5	37.3
B. Favor a gradual reduction in Government controls on farm commodities with a resultant gradual removal of price supports on crops, including wheat?	79.6	7.7	12.7
7. Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include medical expenses, the increased cost to be paid by additional contributions by employees and employers?	33.4	60.1	6.5
8. Do you feel the Federal Government should assume more leadership in the juvenile delinquency problem by urging stronger local and State laws dealing with youthful offenders?	64.1	27.8	8.1

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that, in addition to providing me with the information just given, three out of five persons who returned the questionnaires took the time to enlarge upon their answers or to give me their thinking on other issues and problems.

I am glad to make the tabulation of results available to all Members of Congress for their personal study.

No Instant Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Hannibal (Mo.) Courier-Post, carried an excellent editorial recently. To make it available to all my colleagues in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hannibal (Mo.) Courier-Post, Mar. 15, 1960]

NO INSTANT IDEAS

The appearance of various so-called instant food products has given rise to a lot of jokes about instant money and the like. The jokes are amusing. Some persons have been so caught up in the spirit of the thing that they believe there might be instant ideas. This is considerably less amusing.

The notion that there could be instant ideas, instant opinions on virtually any subject, is intriguing. It would save so much brainwork if one could simply turn to the proper source, stir in a bit of more or less concentrated attention, and come up with an idea guaranteed to withstand any assault. But this, dolorous as it may seem, is not possible.

Ideas, with the exception of occasional flashes that the average mind is not likely to experience, are the product of reflective thought. Sound opinions are based on a weighing of all the factors concerned. This reflection, this weighing of the evidence, takes time. The more complex the problem, the greater the time and mental effort required for the analytical process.

Information can be digested to a certain extent, though this has its dangers. But no one has ever found a way to substantially reduce the amount of time involved in thinking a problem through. "Instant" may be the word for coffee and whipped potatoes. "Instant" is not the word for ideas.

Courage and Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of Agriculture was in his home city recently, the Salt Lake City Tribune wrote an excellent editorial praising the courage, conviction, and integrity of the man. This I share fully.

It is interesting to note that this is a case of a prophet being with honor in his own country, contrary to the sentiment of the old proverb.

I offer this editorial of March 9 for submission in the RECORD as an excellent appraisal of a great American and his program:

COURAGE AND CONVICTION

Whatever else his critics say of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, they must acknowledge his superlative courage and conviction. Repeated attacks on this veteran Cabinet member in the Eisenhower administration have left his integrity unblemished.

Mr. Benson is convinced that if farmers could get the Government off their backs,

they would adjust crop production to conform with the law of supply and demand. As a result, he believes, agriculture would be freer and healthier.

He has preached this doctrine for 7 years even while under attack in his own party. He holds to it in the face of reports that, in his quest for the Presidency, Vice President NIXON plans his own farm program.

The Secretary said in a Salt Lake interview he would oppose any person regardless of party affiliation, who advocates an unsound agricultural program for political objectives.

The Cabinet member said that four-fifths of the country's agriculture is free of control, in good balance, and getting along well.

It is unavoidable that the wheat program, said to be costing the taxpayers $1,000 a minute, should monopolize public attention. Technological advances have sent crop yields skyrocketing despite acreage limitations. Another situation supports Mr. Benson's stand against high, rigid support prices; despite the overwhelming surplus, 150,000 new farmers started growing wheat the last 3 years.

Mr. Benson spoke in favor of the administration's plan to relate wheat supports to market prices. Alternatives are tight controls or grower referendums, similar to those of the corn program. He believes public opinion is gaining in favor of a change in the wheat program.

The administration plan may or may not be the solution. We aren't sure there is a complete solution.

Mr. NIXON is said to be seeking the advice of experts with the aim of a new approach to the whole farm dilemma. It may be recalled that, when he took office in 1953, Mr. Benson enlisted the aid of more than 500 persons, in addition to an 18-man bipartisan advisory commission, to help the Agriculture Department formulate a program. Congress has passed only part of that program.

Mr. Benson makes sense when he insists that a support program devised to meet conditions no longer existing is costly and foolish.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on flood control published by the Indianapolis Times on March 16, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to say that this editorial illustrates the feelings of the people of my State with reference to the necessity of flood control in Indiana. The Times may be forgiven for the tone of the editorial since the citizens of my State have waited a long time for the implementation of their basically excellent flood control plans.

We all fervently hope that there will not be a repeat of the disastrous floods of last year. A perusal of the editorial clearly indicates that this fear is the motivation for it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESS TALK AND MORE FLOOD CONTROL

Indianapolis and other central Indiana areas stand to pay an enormous price in human suffering for the political inaction, or ineptitude—or both—which has kept vitally needed flood control projects in the drawing board stage.

The human misery, as well as property loss, is mathematically predictable if nature should repeat her capricious contrivances which last year dumped heavy rains upon the frozen ground of the upper Wabash Valley, producing the most damaging flood of a decade.

An examination of the record discloses, lamentably, that there has been much talk about flood control in Indiana but little, if any, practical extension of this talk.

With this city awaiting apprehensively for thawing snows and the rains that usually come with April, Darrell C. Walton, president of the Indianapolis flood control board, has warned:

If floods strike Indianapolis this year, its victims will find nothing new of a physical nature to protect them.

This is ominous news, coming from the head of an official commission charged with safeguarding a public that can look no other way than to its appointive or elective leaders for its guarantees against disaster.

There is little comfort in the assurances by J. I. Perrey, chief engineer of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, that construction may begin—in the summer of 1961—on a proposed chain of three reservoirs on the Mississinewa River near Peru, the Salamonie River near Wabash, and the Wabash River at Huntington.

There is little comfort in Perrey's assurances that the Monroe Reservoir project on Salt Creek, south of Bloomington, is even closer to reality than the Mississinewa, Salamonie, and Wabash projects.

There is little comfort in the assurances of Walton that a study is now almost complete of the White River-Fall Creek project which would include new levees on both streams, a new channel for a section of Fall Creek, and a new bridge over the creek at Indiana Avenue.

There is little comfort in Walton's hope that construction of the city's Big Eagle Creek flood control project can begin this year and that studies and drawings of this project are about 80 percent complete.

Drawing board plans and talk of appropriations will be of little avail to flood victims, once the flood waters begin to creep through their shoe soles and into their homes.

There has been enough talk of flood control.

The time has come for vigorous, forceful action to protect the residents of this area from a repetition of the disastrous floods of the past with their staggering toll in human misery and property damage.

Waterway to Washington: The C. & O. Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the March 1960 issue of the National Geographic magazine contains a stimulating and informative pictorial and narrative description of the C. & O. Canal entitled "Waterway to Washington." Because of the timeliness and authority of this copyright article by Jay Johnston of its editorial staff, I requested and gratefully received special permission for the National Geographic Society's board of directors to have the article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is presented herewith in its entirety to assist the Members of the House to understand the import of H.R. 2331, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, which will come before the House for consideration.

WATERWAY TO WASHINGTON: THE C. & O. CANAL

(By Jay Johnston)

One warm evening last summer I climbed aboard a barge in Washington, D.C., and let a team of mules pull me into a bygone era. With each plodding tug, as the glassy canal water rippled below, the neon-lighted world of the Capital slipped farther behind.

I was riding aboard the *Canal Clipper*, a homely, flat-bottomed craft that carries sightseers up a short stretch of a famous waterway, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. George Washington himself fathered the first canal here along the Potomac. In its heyday, nearly a century ago, the C. & O. floated millions of tons of coal, grain, lumber, and flour from Cumberland, Md., in the Alleghanies to the tidewater port of Georgetown on the fringe of the Capital.

Today, for most of its 185 meandering miles, the once-proud queen of commerce is dry, weed choked, and tree grown. Abandoned since 1924, the old locks that echoed to the shouts of bargemen are sagging and deserted. The lilacs grown wild and the decaying lockhouses recall the less hurried life of an earlier-day America.

But now new life looms for the derelict canal. As these words are written, legislation pending in the 86th Congress would preserve the waterway as a full-fledged national historical park. The National Park Service would restore many of the lockhouses, rewater additional portions of the canal, and build campgrounds and picnic areas along its length.

"It is a refuge, a place of retreat, a long stretch of quiet and peace at the Capital's back door—a wilderness area where man can be alone with his thoughts, a sanctuary where he can commune with God and with nature, a place not yet marred by the roar of wheels and the sound of horns."

Thus did a distinguished American, Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court, describe the C. & O. Canal a few years ago. And the pleasures he had found in many a walk along these quiet banks—solitude and serenity and sylvan beauty—are still there in abundance.

WILDLIFE THRIVES ON CANAL BANKS

Strolling the towpath amid fern-clothed cliffs, in the depths of a dark wood, or beside a sun-drenched pasture, one captures the feel of a vanished age.

When the birds in the gaunt pines and towering tulip trees cease their chatter, a haunting silence reigns. Then the wind song rustles the treetops. Winged seeds spiral toward earth and tick like sleet on the dried-leaf floor. A gray squirrel scolds from a sycamore. A turtle plunges off his log solarium into a rainwater pool.

And you think: This is how it was on a soft spring day a century ago.

Barges and boatmen are gone now, but imagination works wonders. Around a distant bend come plodding mules. A barge glides into view. On its bow the skipper cups hands to lips for a singsong cry, the locktender's cue to open the gates.

"Hey-y-y-y-y-y lock."

The mental image turns back time to a year when this waterway teemed with the traffic of some 700 boats.

Their dimensions were standard: 92 feet long, 14½ feet wide, and a draft of 5½ feet

when loaded. Cargo capacity ranged from 100 to 120 tons.

They were alike as boxcars, yet each was a captain's pride. The squat, sluggish boats bore loving names: *Belle, Katie Darling, Jenny Lind, Nanny McGraw, Scow Lion, Cock Robin, Morning Star.*

EXTRA MULES RODE ON BOATS

The captain and his family, or his hired hands, lived aft in the cabin. In a stable forward rode the relief mules, heads craning through tiny windows.

On sunny days the family wash fluttered from lines strung abovedeck. Children, tethered lest they fall overboard, played about the cabin. Dogs and cats dozed on the warm planking as the mules plodded along at a speedy 2 miles an hour between the west and Washington.

What was life like on the canal during its halcyon days?

I asked this question of many people who dwell on the banks or in the nearby villages. For most, memories are secondhand, tales told and retold by their elders. But the oldtimers, men who lived and worked on the stream, vividly recall the vanished era. And their number, if not legion, is surprisingly large.

One was O. P. Matthews, who managed a hotel where I stopped near Cumberland. He grew up on a farm in western Maryland. From his bedroom window he could see the canal, twisting in hairpin turns through the bright-boughed hills and pine-tufted crags.

"I'd lie abed at night," he told me "and watch the barges inch their way up and down. The light from their bow lamps shone on the water and flashed in the trees. I could hear the music of fiddles, and people singing and laughing in the cabins."

Raleigh S. Bender of Sharpsburg, Md., may well have been one of the canallers whom Mr. Matthews watched from his window half a century ago.

"Call me Cap," he directed. "Everybody does; and besides, I like it."

Reminiscing in the cool quiet of his spacious home on Main Street, Cap Bender conjured up a tableau of lazy waters and slow-moving boats, set against a background of bustling coal docks, blacksmiths and boatbuilders, teamsters and wharfworkers.

"Thirty-six years I worked on the boats. They were the hardest, and happiest, days of my life.

"All day long you'd be trying to make time, beat someone else's record for the trip downstream or up. Come dark, you'd put the feed trough out on the banks and let the mules graze and doze. You'd sit around for a spell, smoking and talking, then hit the hay to be up with the dawn for an early start. Sometimes you'd drive the mules through the night."

He lifted a wooden model from the top of a chest and dusted it carefully.

"This is a model of the last boat I skippered. And these were my mules—Jack, Kate, and Rock. No one ever saw a better three mules on the strip."

He joined boat and mules with a simulated towline of thin cord. His eyes shone with remembrance.

"This is the way they'd work. Just like this when we made the record 62-hour run from Georgetown to Cumberland. And when I towed the last load of coal down to Washington in 1923.

"For years the railroad had been running circles around us; business got so poor there were only 60 boats left.

"Then the 1924 flood wrecked the canal, and no one bothered to repair it. It just wasn't a paying proposition any longer."

He sat back and the rush of words slowed.

"So that was the end. For me and all the other canalmen. I came home for good and settled down here with my wife and seven youngsters. I've been mighty content and comfortable here, but I'll never forget those old canal days."

Sunday outings along the canal provide much pleasure to Cap Bender, still robust and active at 87.

Frequently he gets together with canal cronies, and the talk is hearty and spiced with affectionate insults.

"We were a rough-and-ready lot," he recalls, "and there were a lot of practical jokers.

"One of my mates used to tickle my face with a straw every morning to wake me. One day when I wasn't feeling so good, he did it once too often.

"I grabbed him by the seat of his pants and pitched him off the boat, right into the middle of the canal.

"'I can't swim. I can't swim,' he yelled. And turned out he couldn't. Had an awful time making it to the bank, and I nearly fell over the side laughing."

WASHINGTON BUILT EARLY WATERWAY

This was the canal of yesteryear, a busy, boisterous highway linking the tidewater and the Alleghenies.

But for one man, George Washington, it might never have been.

Washington's plan for a water avenue from east to west merits the first chapter in any history of the Cheasapeake and Ohio Canal.

Below the city of Washington the broad Potomac River flows sedately over clay, sand, and gravel as it passes Mount Vernon and gently laps the corn and tobacco fields of tidewater Virginia and Maryland. This part of the river is navigable for seagoing ships that steam up from Chesapeake Bay.

But above the Capital the Potomac runs swiftly over hard crystalline rocks, the eroded remnants of ancient mountains. Its shores change from rolling hills to steep palisades.

At Great Falls, 10 miles above the city, the river is a wild creature, crashing through rugged gorges, roaring over masses of rock. No boat can navigate these furious waters.

Washington's idea was to bypass such dangerous stretches with canals and upon up a new water route to the west. In 1785 the Potowmack Co. was formed, with Washington as president.

A year later 200 men were at work on a system of improvements, building canals around major obstacles and dredging in the Potomac to make the river navigable. The squire of Mount Vernon made numerous trips up from his home to supervise the project.

Writing to Thomas Jefferson in 1788, he reported: "The labourers employed by the Potomack Co. have made very great progress in removing the obstructions at the Shenandoah, Seneca, and Great Falls. * * * This will become the great avenue into the western country; a country which is now settg. [settling] in an extraordinarily rapid manner, under uncommonly favorable circumstances, and which promises to afford a capacious asylum for the poor and persecuted of the earth."

In 1798 the ex-President, back home in Mount Vernon, reaffirmed his belief in the Potomac's potential. Concerning "the many and great advantages which will accrue from completing the navigation of the Potomack," he wrote to a friend, "I have every day additional reason for supporting my former opinion, and new proof of its advantages."

FIRST CANAL FILLED WITH DANGER

But boatmen who ventured downstream on the "improved" river route in the early 1800's found it a harrowing experience. The swift current, treacherous rapids, whirlpools, and shoals challenged even the most skilled navigator. The crude locks around Great Falls were usable only when the river was high enough to fill them.

If a craft survived the journey, and many did not, it was a rare owner who attempted the even more difficult upstream run. Usually he broke up his raftlike boat, sold it for lumber, and walked home.

The hiker today, tramping the Virginia shore, can see the ruins of locks built by the Potomack Co. After more than a century and a half and many floods, the huge-hand-cut blocks of stone still stand in trim alinement, reflecting the precision with which the walls were built.

PRESIDENT ADAMS SHEDS HIS COAT

The Potomack Co. failed, but the idea of a route between the Atlantic and the Ohio River remained alive.[1] The year 1828 witnessed its emphatic revival when the newly organized Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. began to build a canal from Washington all the way to Pittsburgh and the Ohio.

Appropriately, the directors chose the Fourth of July as the day to start work. They invited President John Quincy Adams to turn the first spadeful of earth near Little Falls.

During his address, President Adams took up a spade and attempted to drive it into the sod. I struck a root. Undaunted, he tried again, with no success. He threw down the spade, peeled off his coat, and, on the third try, pierced the ground. The assemblage roared approval.

Was the root an ill omen? Perhaps, for on the same day—40 miles away, at Baltimore—another group was laying the foundation stone for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

This enterprise was destined to plague the canal throughout its operation. But the waterway's enthusiastic promoters casually dismissed the rail line as a competitive threat. It would, they reasoned, carry only passengers and light freight in horse-drawn cars.

Within a few months the Potomac Valley hummed with activity as hundreds of laborers, using axes and stump pullers, scrapers and gunpowder, wagons and wheelbarrows, dug the big ditch. Stonemasons started construction of locks and lockhouses.

Yet progress was slow. Legal clashes with property owners brought delays; so did struggles with the railroad over right of way.

FLYING FISTS SETTLE WORKMEN'S FEUDS

But from first lock to last, the major problem was the labor force. The tremendous demand for workmen on the many public works underway in the East precipitated a labor shortage. And the workmen corralled by the C. & O., while competent, were temperamental.

So intense was the animosity between Irish and German immigrants, who performed the bulk of the work, that it was necessary to employ them in separate crews.

Rival factions of Irish battled among themselves. Brawls between Corkmen and Longfordmen turned shanty towns into armed camps.

Each payday witnessed violent fights. Whiskey sold freely, and was undoubtedly a factor, but the meager wages of $10 a month, long hours, poor housing, and worse food were the major causes of dissension.

Every summer there was a noticeable slackening of work and a marked exodus of workmen. This was the annual sickly season in the valley. From July until late September men fell victim to aches and fevers, attributed by them to droughts that lowered the river level, leaving stagnant pools along the banks. In September, 1832, a cholera epidemic swept through the camps.

Yet the canal moved westward. Georgetown saw the tidewater terminal take shape. Past Little Falls and Great Falls, Seneca, and Whites Ferry crept the ditch and its locks.

With only the first segment in use, a 23-mile portion between Georgetown and Sen-

Footnotes at end of speech.

eca, the cost of transporting flour dropped from $1 to 30 cents a barrel. In the first 10 days of operation some 30,000 barrels were shipped downstream.

Rural communities like Point of Rocks, Weverton, and Harpers Ferry blossomed under the influence of railroad and canal. The villages of Snyders Landing and Williamsport took on fresh life, for as the canal advanced, it brought trade and prosperity.

By 1839 the canal had pushed 135 miles, to a point above Hancock.

There today, just east of the town, the battered hulk of a canal barge lies stranded in the waterless ditch. When spring floods lap its rotting timbers, youngsters swarm over the old relic and sail it downstream once more.

TUNNEL GROWS AT SNAIL'S PACE

Farther on above Hancock, across the river from Paw Paw, W. Va., canal engineers cut a mountain tunnel to save 7 miles. Using hand tools and black powder, crews painfully hacked through shale at the rate of 10 to 12 feet a week.[2]

The tunnel, 3,118 feet long, 24 feet wide, and 17 feet high from water surface to crown, ranks as an engineering masterpiece of its day.

I shall always remember the first time I walked through the cool, dark tube. I snapped off my flashlight in the center of the bore. Except for pinpoints of light at each end, it was like a moonless midnight. Water from springs in the mountain overhead dripped through the six layers of brick that line walls and ceiling.

This dark tunnel witnessed many a fight between brawling boatmen. Lacking room for barges to pass inside, boats backed up at the entrances like cars waiting to board a ferry. Fists often decided the right of way.

An oldtimer told me of two boatmen, coming from opposite ends, who met in the middle of the tunnel. When neither would give way, they tied up traffic for 2 days until the superintendent could come up from Georgetown to settle the issue.

DITCH COST $60,000 A MILE

In 1850 the waterway touched Cumberland, and the eastern section—the only part ever completed—was formally opened to trade.

Amid salvos of artillery and the blare of brass bands, five barges laden with coal for eastern markets slipped into the locks at Cumberland and headed toward Washington.

Stretching ahead, along the northern bank of the Potomac, ran a waterway 6 to 8 feet deep, ranging in width from 30 to 80 feet, with a towpath 12 feet wide along the river side.

Included in its works were 74 stone locks 100 feet long, 15 feet wide, and 15 feet deep, with a lift averaging 8 feet; the half-mile-long Paw Paw tunnel; a dozen aqueducts over northern tributaries of the Potomac; scores of culverts to carry smaller streams under the ditch; and seven rubble and masonry dams in the bed of the river to back up its waters and turn them into the canal.

The project had cost $11 million, or about $60,000 a mile, a sum staggeringly higher than the backers had estimated.

The proposed connection of the Atlantic seaboard and the Ohio Valley was never achieved. The ambitious central and western sections, requiring several hundred additional locks and a 4-mile tunnel, failed to advance beyond the planning stage.

George "Hooper" Wolfe, a Williamsport merchant, knows the canal's history almost as well as he knows his customers.

A charter member of the Williamsport C. & O. Canal Club, he has worked ardently toward the restoration of the waterway and its development into a full-fledged national park.

"You know, I love that old gulch," he told me.

"It's a funny thing, but the older I grow, the closer it gets to my heart. As a boy I drove the mule teams 4 years, off and on, but the canal never meant much to me then. Maybe that's just human nature.

"But now I'd give anything to see it as it was in its heyday. And I'd like my children and my grandchildren to be able to see it as I knew it."

Over mugs of steaming coffee in his general store, Mr. Wolfe showed me a treasured album of photographs of 19th century canal life. While I scanned it, he recounted the canal's triumphs and disasters.

"The Civil War caused hit-and-run damage. Lee's invasions and raids by Early, Mosby, and Stuart broke down the banks and knocked out some of the locks.

"At Antietam Creek, within cannon range of the canal, Union and Confederate armies fought the bloodiest single day of battle in Civil War history."

The Battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862, climaxed the first of two attempts by General Lee to carry the war into northern territory. His 41,000 troops clashed with a Federal force of 87,000 led by Gen. George B. McClellan. The Union suffered 12,410 casualties; the Confederacy, 10,700.

Neither side could claim a clear-cut victory, but the battle was highly significant. Lee's failure cost the Confederacy the recognition of Great Britain and gave Lincoln an opportunity to issue the Emancipation Proclamation. Had McClellan won a decisive victory, on the other hand, the war might have ended in a few months, instead of dragging on for another 2 and a half years.

"Did you know," Wolfe continued, "that three times the Federals commandeered barges and held them in Georgetown? If a Confederate fleet had steamed up the river toward Washington, the Union planned to load the boats with rock and sink them in the channel of the Potomac below the city. Fortunately, it never happened."

When the war finally ended, the canal's coal trade boomed. In 1875 more than a million tons rode downstream. A single lock saw more than 100 boats pass through in a day.

At long last, the company began to earn some income. But the canal never really made any money for its owners. It was always too far in debt.

I asked Mr. Wolfe if it was true that steamboats once sailed the canal.

"Yes," he said, "they tried steampower for a dozen or so years on some of the barges, and they also tested tractors for a while. But neither steam nor tractor proved as cheap or as dependable as the mule.

"The canal company even built its own telephone network in 1879. At that time it was claimed to be the longest single phone circuit in the world.

"In the eighties, earnings started dipping," he continued. "Many of the Allegheny coal operators had begun shipping by railroad.

"In May and June of 1889 the famous downpour that flooded Johnstown, Pa., also overwhelmed the upper Potomac."

He passed me a yellowed clipping. A reporter for the Cumberland Daily Times observed on June 5, 1889: "It is the opinion of nearly everyone living along the river that the canal has been irreparably injured."

Hooper smiled. "That just proves you shouldn't believe everything you read in the papers. Actually, the canal's bondholders refused to quit. They dredged up another $400,000, repaired the damage, and kept it operating for 30-odd more years.

"But then came the flood of 1924, and canal operations suspended for the last time."

GOVERNMENT BUYS $2 MILLION BARGAIN

By one of those ironic twists, the canal in 1907 passed into the hands of its arch rival, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Hard hit by the depression of the early thirties, the railroad applied to the Federal Government for aid. Harold L. Ickes, then Public Works Administrator, offered to buy the canal, and in 1937 secured the 185-mile-long ditch for $2 million. He acquired a right-of-way from 30 to 900 feet wide containing 5,254 acres.

Many critics spoke their contempt for the purchase. "A century-old white elephant," some deemed it. But others, perhaps more farsighted, suggested that "it may turn out to be the biggest bargain since Alaska."

Since acquiring the canal, the National Park Service has restored the 23-mile segment between Washington and Seneca as part of the National Capital parks system. Gliding out of Georgetown, the mule-drawn *Canal Clipper* carries sightseers along a 5-mile stretch during summer months.

Great Falls Tavern, historic hostelry and lockkeeper's home has been refurbished and converted into a museum where thousands of visitors each year view exhibits tracing the history of both the canal and the Potomac Valley.

In Georgetown, eastern terminus of the canal, apartments and homes today crowd the bank beside the lift locks. A flour mill still uses the flow for power.

Maj. Ernest W. Brown, a retired chief of police, remembers the port town as an exciting place at the turn of the century. Barges laden with coal from the Alleghenies and farm produce from fertile Appalachian valleys sometimes lined up for nearly a mile waiting to unload at the terminal. Draymen streamed between the docks and the big wholesale houses on old Bridge Street (now M Street).

BOATMEN KEPT BUSY, AVOIDED TROUBLE

"My first beat in 1896," Major Brown told me, "was the waterfront, and my first arrest, on a bitter winter night, was a man assaulting a canaler.

"Those canal people were a good lot," the major added. "They were honest and worked hard. They stayed to themselves and generally kept out of trouble. I came to know many of the families who lived on the boats, and I liked them.

"Sometimes they would get caught in the freeze-up and have to winter over in Georgetown. They could hardly wait—father, mother and especially the kids in school—for the spring thaw so they could get back on that canal."

In 1954 a dedicated trek focused nationwide attention on the C & O Canal.

A motor parkway had been proposed along the towpath and in some places along the bed of the canal itself. In protest against possible destruction of the waterway's scenic and historic values Justice William O. Douglas led 36 conservationists and newsmen on an 8-day march down the canal.

The much-publicized hike helped defeat the highway proposal. Soon afterward the Park Service recommended that the canal property be preserved as a national historical park.

Each spring members of the 1954 hike hold a 2-day reunion on the banks of the canal and retrace a portion of their long march.

STAGECOACH TRADE PAUSED AT HANCOCK

Last spring I walked alone on the canal's westermost reaches.

I began my trek at Hancock, a quiet mountainside town on the old Cumberland Road. Lying within a 2-mile-wide strip known as Maryland's Neck, Hancock is the market center of an apple-growing and sand-mining region. Its history is tightly interwoven

Footnotes at end of speech.

with that of the canal. Here stood warehouses and shops that serviced the waterway.

Long before canal days Hancock was a busy stopover point for the stagecoach trade. A host of taverns with intriguing names—Sign of the Cross Keys, Sign of the Seven Stars, Sign of the Green Tree—catered to travelers en route from Baltimore to Cumberland, Wheeling, and Indianapolis.

A few minutes west of Hancock I passed the site of Fort Tonoloway, where early settlers had built a blockhouse for refuge against Indian attack.

Here the dry bed of the C. & O. follows the tortuous bends of its neighbor, the Potomac, as it winds through the mountains.

Spring is a season of rare beauty in this bosky region. Each tree in blossom or tender leaf has its own pastel shade, contrasting with the dark greens of pine and cedar.

With the hardwoods sprouting pale green on the ridgetops and redbud splashing color across slopes white with dogwood, it was easy to succumb to the quiet, whispering lure of again by the symphony of birds singing their delight at the sight of the sun after a 2-day rain, or by the wail of a train.

PAW PAW TUNNEL PIERCES A MOUNTAIN

Ducks flapped and wheeled away over the river. I had flushed them with the snap of a dead twig. A cottontail hopped across the trail and vanished amid clumps of bird's-foot violets, their bowing heads as big as half dollars.

As I strolled on, picking my way through the towpath's molasses mud, the thought occurred that I was now following in the footsteps of the "level walkers." These were canal company employees who walked allotted sections, searching for breaks in the banks or the towpath. Defects were repaired immediately, lest barges be delayed or thrown off schedule.

I approached the downstream mouth of the Paw Paw tunnel through a spectacular manmade gorge. The canal courses between great wedges of rock 100 feet high. I saw spikes embedded in the walls to prevent enormous slabs of shale from flaking off and crashing down on the mule teams below.

Westward toward Cumberland, houses grew more numerous. Then, as I passed the mouth of Town Creek, I encountered a 5-mile stretch where the civic-minded people of Oldtown have cleared the canal and the State has stocked it with pan fish.

"You must come back in August for our fish rodeo," Judge George Henderson told me.

"Hundreds of kids drop in their lines," he said, "and when the fish aren't biting the kids are—on hotdogs and fried chicken and all the other picnic makings. It's Oldtown's big day of the year."

Today only a few vestiges of the canal are evident in Cumberland, the rail and manufacturing center at the confluence of the Potomac River and Wills Creek.

A gap in the Allegheny Mountains rising close by provided a gateway for early pioneers who streamed through here their way west. Old Fort Cumberland served as headquarters for British Gen. Edward Braddock during the French and Indian War.

Cumberland houses shops and yards of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and day and night its streets echo the whistling of locomotives and the clank of freight-car wheels. Millions of tons of coal have been mined in the neighboring mountains.

Floods have often ravaged this industrial city. Army Engineers, seeking to safeguard it, have deepened the river and turned the canal into a levee for about half a mile.

The facelifting project, vital though it was, saddened many an observer. But the canal has known and survived countless misfortunes, and always its admirers have refused to let it slip into oblivion. Converting the canal into a national historical park would win hundreds of thousands of new friends for the old strip.

Tomorrow's generations will never see the barge traffic that once graced the lovely canal, but they may follow the old C. & O. from beginning to end and relive its days of glory.

---

[1] See "Potomac, River of Destiny," by Albert W. Atwood, National Geographic, July 1945.

[2] See "Down the Potomac by Canoe," by Ralph Gray, National Geographic, August 1948.

America Forges Ahead in the Race for Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as it has done so often in the past, the calm, clear voice of Columnist Roscoe Drummond this morning dispels many of the misconceptions and misunderstandings about the status of America's efforts in outer space. In his daily syndicated column appearing today Mr. Drummond points out the myriad accomplishments of our space program and emphasizes why the progress we have achieved is so much more significant than that of the Russians.

At a time when armchair critics tend to obfuscate the facts, it is reassuring to have this expert evaluation that the box score on outer space is not one sided. I hope Mr. Drummond's cogent comments will be studied and heeded by all concerned with this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTER SPACE BOX SCORE—NO LONGER IS ONE SIDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Now that U.S. Pioneer V is continuing to send back its reports more than 3 million miles toward the sun and U.S. Tiros I is orbiting the earth observing the weather and transmitting its photographs, this is a good time to ask: How do we now stand with the Soviets in the race to outer space?

The factual answer, I think, is this:

In significant scientific results the U.S. space program is clearly outdistancing the Russians.

In spectacular firsts—first Sputnik, first Lunik, first to photograph the unseen side of the moon, first to hit the moon, first to send an animal into space and retrieve it safely—the Soviet record is preeminent.

U.S. space projects are beginning to move more rapidly. More launchings are coming soon and in the development of rocket thrust, where the Soviets have been far in the lead, the new Saturn launching vehicle, capable of 1½-million-pound thrust, can be ready in 1963, ahead of schedule, if Congress approves the funds.

Alongside the Soviet spectacular firsts, the United States is achieving some outstanding scientific firsts.

Tiros I, weighing 270 pounds and containing two long-range cameras and equipment capable of receiving instructions and transmitting data to ground stations, is the world's first weather-eye in space. It circles the earth about every 90 minutes at an attitude averaging 450 miles. This is a marvelous, though elementary beginning. The next weather satellite will contain greatly improved instruments. The time will come when the weather forecaster will no longer be the butt of jokes because of his mistakes. When man can predict the weather scientifically, he may well be able to control it.

Pioneer V is another scientific first. It now appears probable that we shall be able to talk to it and get information back even when it is 50 million miles away.

We are getting data on the temperature inside and outside of the satellite as it continues on its orbit toward the sun. It is also sending valuable information on the magnetic fields in outer space.

Altogether the United States has now launched 15 earth satellites of which six are still in orbit. The Soviets have successfully launched three, all of them much heavier than ours, of which one is still in orbit.

The United States has successfully launched four deep space probes. Two of them—Pioneer IV and V—substantially achieved their orbits. The Soviets have successfully launched three. Each achieved its principal objective, one orbiting the moon and another hitting the moon.

As to failures, ours have been publicized. The Soviets have kept theirs secret.

There are three reasons why our space program has lagged in "spectacular" firsts—and that adjective, spectacular, is used in admiration, not in criticism.

We were late in starting and we started timidly.

We tied our space program to the military missile program and when we found that militarily we did not need as powerful a launching thrust for the Atlas as first believed because we developed much lighter-weight nuclear warheads, then there was no military reason for developing the kind of rocket best suited to explorations of outer space. We didn't develop it. The Soviets did.

For too long the administration tended to look at outer space through the wrong end of the telescope and hence failed to see, until the Soviets were well in the lead, that Moscow would garner incalculable prestige if we allowed them to leap to the front in space exploration. We failed to see early enough that by being first in outer space the Soviets were advancing the cause of communism by demonstrating Soviet superiority on a very visible and dramatic front.

The scientific knowledge we are now gathering from outer space is becoming impressive. More dramatic achievements are in the making. We expect to put a man into nearby outer space this year and we are making solid headway in developing a rocket with a thrust of 6 to 12 million pounds, capable of putting a man on the moon.

No longer is the box score on space one sided.

Sins of Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Wash-

ington (D.C.) Post on Friday, April 1, 1960, entitled "Sins of Commission":

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1960]

SINS OF COMMISSION

The more the public learns about the ubiquitious activities of Thomas (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran in connection with a natural gas case before the Federal Power Commission, the more apparent become the evils of ex parte contacts with regulatory agencies. It makes small difference whether Mr. Corcoran's contacts with the FPC in behalf of a gas company were a model of rectitude and enlightened espousal of the public interest. The very appearance of a cozy and intimate relationship between a high-paid gas company lawyer and the FPC unavoidably raises suspicions that the agency has become the pliant captive of the industry it is supposed to regulate.

In the case at hand, the FPC changed its position on a regulatory policy after Mr. Corcoran had personal conversations with three of the Commissioners. This change may yield a subsidiary of the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. an extra $780,000 in annual income, or an estimated total of $15.7 million for the duration of its 20-year contract. This is scarcely pocket money. Mr. Corcoran, although he is not listed as Tennessee's attorney of record, has received $305,907 from the firm for legal services and expenses between 1953 and 1958. Because of his enterprise as a onetime New Deal "brain truster," Mr. Corcoran has a deserved reputation for knowing the ins and outs of government.

Whatever the merits of the FPC's decision in this case, can anyone blame the public for its suspicions? Here, surely, is an especially dramatic example of the evils of informal contacts between industry spokesmen and the Commissions supposed to regulate with a scrupulous concern for the public interest. Although legislated codes of ethics of the kind Representative OREN HARRIS is proposing may help, the ultimate remedy must be a new concept of the Commissioner's role. Frederick W. Ford, the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has espoused a commendable philosophy without the need of a new law. "I've no problem acting like a judge," Mr. Ford said in a recent interview, "I bet I haven't had a visitor a month—people just don't come to see me."

If the FPC had similarly insisted that Tommy the Cork confine his statements on a pending case to a hearing room, the Commission would not be so beset by troubles today.

History, Greatest Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently the Sedalia Democrat, Sedalia, Mo., carried an editorial on the need for continued study of history and current events. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members of the Congress may have the opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sedalia Democrat, Mar. 15, 1960]

HISTORY, GREATEST TEACHER

America never has had a great sense of history. As a young, growing optimistic nation it could see little point in dwelling on all its too brief past. And it has always been sure the present and future would somehow "adjust" to American purposes, both personal and national.

For so long we were not only fabulously endowed with natural riches but luckily isolated from many major world currents. We were able to live successfully in our peculiar and special detachment.

That isolation is gone now. Increasingly we find the life of the world, the events of history, closing about us.

We are facing a realization we should have had long ago—that in not attaching ourselves consciously to the stream of history we automatically suffer considerable personal loss and court the danger of much greater loss.

The man or the country which puts itself constantly in the perspective of history gains immeasurably in self-understanding and self-appreciation. How do you really know what you are without knowing what you have been, and how you got to where you are?

In such knowledge there is deep personal spiritual reward. There is also valuable guidance and counsel for all of us as we thread our way through our vital practical affairs today and tomorrow.

But it is not only the past, as we have seen, that holds these lessons. We must see ourselves steadily in the tremendous frame of current world history.

These events do not totally limit what we can do, but they are limiting, governing factors. Russia and India and Argentina will do certain things whether we like it or not, and what they do will have great impact on us.

If we know and understand what they are doing, we will have some chance of influencing their course—and thus our own.

Not to try, in the patently foolish notion that in today's shrunken world we can somehow achieve our private and national destinies without regard to what others do, would be to practice a kind of monumental futility.

Jailing of Bishop James Walsh by Red China Blasted by American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Monday, March 28, 1960, reporting that Pennsylvania's 12th district of the American Legion went on record as condemning the action of the Chinese Reds in jailing Bishop James Walsh:

JAILING OF BISHOP JAMES WALSH BY RED CHINA BLASTED BY LEGION

Resolution branding the jailing of Bishop James E. Walsh, MM, former superior general, Maryknoll Fathers, and well-known clergyman of this region, by Red Chinese Communist is a mockery on justice, another demonstration of the unwillingness of Communist Chinese to accept honest standards and live with the rest of the world in peace and in justice, was endorsed unanimously by approximately 150 Legion representatives at sessions held yesterday afternoon at Swoyersville American Legion Post 644 headquarters.

John R. Gallagher, of Freeland, the American Legion's 12th district commander, presided over the highly spirited 4-hour session.

Louis J. Greco, 12th district Legion Americanism coordinator, speaking on the resolution explained "any proof" the Communist Chinese could submit would hardly fall within the category of "fairplay" and "honest jurisprudence" as judged by American standards.

Resolution also calls upon Secretary of State Christian Herter to press the Chinese Communists for the immediate release of Bishop Walsh, being detained in Red China on trumped-up charge of espionage, before his health is injured irreparably. Copies will be forwarded to the President, Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT, and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

Program in Conservation of Natural Resources in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conservation of our natural resources—soil, water, forests, and others—is a challenge with which we must all be concerned if we are to preserve our heritage of rich resources for future generations.

For this reason, I am always particularly gratified to know that constructive programs are underway to preserve this resource.

Today, I was privileged to receive a report from Mr. M. F. Schweers, State conservationist of Wisconsin, on the progress of our conservation programs. In his letter, Mr. Schweers outlined the highlights of accomplishment in 1959 as follows:

New State records were made by Wisconsin farm families, assisted by Soil Conservation Service personnel, in the development of new conservation plans and the revision of old ones. These plans are to the land what blueprints and specifications are to a structure. The number of followup or counseling contacts made by service personnel with SCD cooperators also establish a State record in 1959.

The installation of soil and water conservation practices last year was gratifying. Accomplishments were made in spite of the frustrating, inclement fall season.

About 25 watershed associations are organized. They are in varying activity stages from application development, to detailed planning, to actual operations. All projects in Wisconsin are sponsored by soil conservation district governing bodies.

Consertation needs report were completed in 1959 for all counties in Wisconsin. These reports show anticipated changes in land use between now and 1975. The amounts of needed conservation practices have also been estimated. These figures were decided upon by a county committee which included representatives of the SCD governing body.

More than 440 meetings on soil and water conservation were held during 1959.

Excellent interagency relationships and the fine cooperation with SCD governing bodies and farmers of the districts are listed among the reasons for the success of the soil and water conservation program in Wisconsin. The principal credit for our fine showing belongs, of course, to the people who operate the farms. They make the decisions and install the practices.

We realize, of course, that we face the task of further improving these programs.

Since we, in Congress, are required to act upon legislation relating to the Soil Conservation Service, however, I believe it is important that we also be informed on the progress at the operational levels.

Reflecting the splendid way in which the conservation program is going forward in Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Schweers report to Soil Conservation District Supervisors printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., April 1, 1960.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgement of your 1959 SCD annual reports.

Look at soil and water conservation accomplishments any way you wish and Wisconsin can be proud of its record. Your 1959 annual reports show that real progress is being made. Like all worthwhile developments, this did not just happen. It was achieved through the combined efforts of people on farms, people in watersheds, and people in communities who have the knowledge and the desire and the means to carry on this work. Many governing bodies showed their appreciation for these efforts. This was done through recognition banquets, annual meetings of SCD cooperators, the granting of certificates, and in other ways.

I am acknowledging 1959 annual reports with a single summary letter to all supervisors in Wisconsin. SCS Administrator D. A. Williams has asked that acknowledgment of your fine record also be made in his behalf.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE REPORTS

As usual, all of your reports are interesting and informative. Many contain photographs and attractive artwork. For distinctive covers we salute the Clark, Dodge, Jackson, Jefferson, Richland, Shawano, Washington, Waushara and Wood County SCD's.

You will be interested in the fine philosophies expressed by supervisors themselves. Here are excerpts taken from a few of the report prefaces.

"The accomplishments in the soil conservation district have not only been on the land, but also in the education of the people living on the farms." (Brown County SCD.)

"As I see it, conservation * * * appeals to many from different angles. There is the hunter, the fisherman, the man who loves wild flowers, wildlife, and untrimmed beauty, and who desires above anything else to have certain sections of land remain in its natural state as God created it. All these desires are good but I have learned here above everything else, that the conservation of soil comes first and foremost." (Walter E. Bock, Columbia County SCD.)

"The soil conservation district supervisors do a good job of coordinating the technical work of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the educational work of our county agent's office, our schools, and of various allied agencies. Until I became a member of the agricultural committee, I was not aware of the far-reaching powers and responsibilities of the Agricultural committee when they act in their capacity as supervisors. Theirs is a big job and their responsibilities are heavy ones. I think I can say that both the supervisors and the agencies servicing conservation in this county are doing a conscientious, careful, and adequate job. We owe them a vote of thanks." (George H. Harb, Dane County SCD.)

"Encouraging landowners and operators to develop, apply, and maintain a conservation plan for their unit, through district assistance, is held to be a most satisfactory and democratic approach." (Door County SCD.)

"God has lent us the earth for our life. It is a great entail. It belongs as much to those who are to come after us as to us, and we have no right, in anything we do or neglect, to involve them in unnecessary penalties, or to deprive them of the benefit which was in our power to bequeath." (Shawano County SCD.)

It was nice to learn that most district governing bodies again distributed copies of their annual reports to members of their county boards, SCD cooperators, and other interested and contributing individuals, groups, and agencies.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The following table shows 1959 accomplishments made by farm people through their soil conservation districts with assistance provided principally by the Soil Conservation Service. Technical aid on woodland management and tree planting was made available largely through personnel of the Wisconsin conservation department.

Item	Unit	1959	Grand total to Dec. 31, 1959
New cooperators	Number	2,161	40,817
Basic conservation plans	do	2,313	25,602
Plans revised	do	388	
Soil surveys	Acre	628,707	13,086,088
Followup contacts	Number	8,878	
Contour strip cropping	Acre	41,825	998,789
Waterway construction	Mile	240	3,298
Terraces	do	269	4,179
Diversions	do	104	1,960
Land smoothing	Acre	1,004	8,958
Surface ditches	Mile	212	6,322
Tiling	do	813	5,102
Pasture renovation	Acre	29,291	269,822
Woodland protection	do	27,147	327,517
Tree planting	do	15,490	77,163
Field windbreaks	Mile	60	748
Wildlife area improvement	Acre	2,882	25,244
Hedgerow planting	Rod	26,590	172,879
Erosion control structures	Number	289	1,230
Farm ponds	do	314	1,168
ACP referrals serviced	do	13,401	
Public Law 566 projects:			
Work plans	do	1	6
Retarding dams:			
Contracted	do	11	17
Constructed	do	2	6

The installation of soil and water conservation practices last year was gratifying, so your reports indicate. Layout work was very good considering the wet fall season. Records of other years are often hard to beat.

We are, however, pleased to report that new State records were attained in assisting SCD cooperators in developing basic conservation plans, in revising existing plans, and in making followup contacts. As you might surmise, much of the time normally devoted to fall layout was diverted to planning and followup activities because of inclement weather and wet, soggy soil. This condition did provide service technicians with an opportunity to fulfill planning needs.

The service does not maintain records on land use conversions, improved rotations and increased purchases of needed lime and fertilizer. However, these basic factors are considered while assisting farm families in developing their conservation plans.

WATERSHED PROJECTS

Under Public Law 566, the watershed protection and flood prevention act, two major detention dams were completed. Two others were started. This phase of the work was also retarded by unfavorable weather. Contracts were let for 11 structures. These, plus several others contemplated for contract letting this year, should materially step up construction in 1960.

Like the proverbial rolling snowball, interest in Public Law 566 projects is gaining momentum. At year's end, Wisconsin had five watersheds approved for operations and one additional work plan completed. It is now in Washington for review and approval. Three work plans are in the development stage and field surveys have been completed for two other watersheds. Four additional applications for planning assistance have been approved by the State Soil Conservation Committee. At least another dozen watershed groups are organized and are in the process of completing applications for planning assistance.

Thus far, all Public Law 566 projects are sponsored by SCD governing bodies. They are all endorsed by local watershed associations and supported by many local groups such as county boards, town governments, and conservation clubs. Agencies assisting in the development of work plans, in addition to the SCS, are the State Soil Conservation Committee, Agricultural Extension Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Your reports indicate—and we thoroughly concur in your appraisal—that the ACP has been a real incentive in getting more farmers to establish increased amounts of practices on the land.

County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees have been very cooperative to work with. Last year they transferred more than $260,000 to the SCS under ACP-SCS 5-percent agreements. Of this amount, the Service earned $225,000. These funds were used to employ additional permanent and part-time personnel to handle the increased technical workload resulting from the agricultural conservation program.

Layout accomplishments made under this program are included in the accomplishment table.

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION

Periodically we secure data from our work unit conservationists regarding SCS participation in education and information activities. We did this for 1959. The following summary is for the State as a whole.

Activity	Number	Attendance
Extension Service sponsored events:		
General meetings	469	21,800
Demonstrations	116	8,500
Tours	201	11,900
SCD–SCS farm planning meetings	90	1,300
SCD–SCS followup meetings	35	600
PTA, civic groups, etc., meetings	442	14,700

The swell job being done in teacher training and youth education in the field of soil and water conservation deserves special mention here in Wisconsin. The State soil conservation committee is spearheading the teacher training activity under the able direction of Executive Secretary I. O. Hembre. The county superintendents of schools, who also serve as SCD supervisors, have done an outstanding job with our rural youth. It is our firm belief that Wisconsin has one of the best education programs in soil and water conservation in the Nation.

Reports from work unit conservationists indicate that 1,940 SCD-SCS news articles were released during 1959. The number of newspapers carrying the releases totaled 297, an average of 4.2 per district. This makes a total of a little more than 8,000 printed stories for the past calendar year. This is a very good record indeed. More than 9,000 copies of the SCS booklet, "Soil and Water Conservation in Wisconsin," were distributed last year. The department of vocational agriculture requested 4,300 copies.

CONSERVATION NEEDS

A conservation needs inventory for all counties in Wisconsin was completed in 1959 according to schedule. SCD supervisors were represented on every county committee and played a major role in making final decisions.

The tentative State report, a summary of county reports, indicates anticipated changes in land use between 1959 and 1975. There will be a reduction of 3 percent in cropland and 13 percent in permanent pasture. Woodland and all other land show slight increases of less than 1 percent each. New highways, airports, subdivisions, and other developments, will take up most of the land removed from cropland and permanent pasture.

Your county data should help you in planning future programs for your district.

COOPERATION

References have already been made to the excellent cooperation you are receiving from State and Federal agencies. Included in this group are the State soil conservation committee, agricultural extension service, agricultural stabilization and conservation service, Wisconsin Conservation Department, and soil conservation service. A number of reports also mention the Farmers Home Administration.

Most districts are receiving appropriations from their respective county boards ranging from $100 to several hundred dollars.

You commend county highway commissioners, civic organizations, county bankers' associations, and others for direct assistance and sponsorship of events in behalf of soil and water conservation. Naturally, you did not overlook mentioning the fine support received from newspapers and radio and TV stations.

These fine relationships have been a definite influence in making Wisconsin one of the outstanding States, soil and water conservationwise.

MEETINGS

Each year more SCD governing bodies are holding regular monthly or bi-monthly meetings. Only a few hold meetings less often than quarterly. We in the SCS believe that in an active district there are ample reasons for supervisors to get together on a monthly basis.

The five 1-day workshops sponsored by the State soil conservation committee were the best of their kind, so your reports indicate. They dealt with laws under which SCD supervisors operate in their several capacities. Having attended the Shawano session, I agree with you that Attorney Cletus Howard did a masterful job in presenting the subject and answering the numerous questions directed to him.

Each area held two successful association meetings during the past year.

A few supervisors attended the NASCD annual conference held in Houston, Tex., in 1959. Those who were present were impressed with the magnitude of the convention and the sincerity, knowledge, and enthusiasm of the participating supervisors.

STATE ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

The board of directors of your State association held three meetings in 1959. I have had the pleasure of participating in most of their sessions and I am always impressed with the manner in which they conduct their business session and with the overall accomplishments of the programs and activities they undertake.

It is not necessary to tell you about the value of and interest in the State association sponsored speaking contest. Projected figures show that in 1959 there were 22 entries in the adult division, 260 in the senior class, and 905 in the junior group. This is a greater number than participated in 1958.

The dealer-district program is getting a good start, particularly in area 1.

The Buffalo Co. SCD governing body won first place in the 1958–59 Goodyear awards program with the Lincoln Co. district taking second place.

Soil Stewardship Week promotion in Wisconsin has been especially good. Each year this project takes on incerased momentum.

The State association also contributed to Farm Progress Days held in the Marinette Co. SCD last year. This was an extremely well organized affair. Unfortunately, rains during the 3-day period curtailed field operations as well as attendance.

LOOKING AHEAD

The past year was a very good one in terms of SCD accomplishments in Wisconsin.

In spite of an abnormally wet fall that interfered with field layout, gains were made in other phases of our joint program, particularly in the planning and followup activities.

Because of reduced earnings under ACP during 1959 as a result of bad weather, we will have to curtail the employment of part time help in each district by about one-third of what was allotted last year. This will call for better planning on your part and more efficient operations on the part of our personnel.

Our challenge now is to attain the ambitious goals you have established for the current calendar year. You say that districts have a good backlog of work ahead as more key individuals—the people who operate our farms—are ready, willing, and able to move forward more rapidly in adopting the conservation way of farming. We are sure that with the fine leadership provided by you and your associate supervisors, and the efforts put forth by personnel of cooperating agencies, 1960 should be another overall record year.

THANK YOU

The many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service are deeply appreciated. We colse this letter with a heartfelt "thank you."

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservcationist.

Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, I had the pleasure of attending a dinner sponsored by the Great Plains Wheat Marketing Development Association in cooperation with Western Wheat Associates, and at which dinner many Members of Congress were present. I thought all Members of this legislative body should have the opportunity to read the remarks delivered by Mr. Otto Amen, president of Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc., Portland, Oreg., on this occasion.

The remarks follow:

(By Otto Amen)

Out in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, a geographic and economic region often referred to as the Pacific Northwest, we've learned to accent the word "Pacific." I would like to visit with you for a few minutes this evening on the importance of that word, and that ocean, to our area.

Wheat is a traditional crop in the Pacific Northwest. It came in covered wagons with the early settlers and has been of major economic importance ever since.

Traditionally, exports have been our major market. The first wheat grown in the region was shipped to the goldfields of California. Later, as flour mills developed, sailing vessels from all parts of Asia and the East came to our ports to load this valuable commodity.

For the past several years we have produced in the neighborhood of 125 million bushels annually. About 25 million of this is Hard wheat, grown principally in southern Idaho; the remaining 100 million bushels is Soft White wheat, which produces an excellent flour for noodles, crackers, cakes, cookies, and other pastry items.

Between 3 and 4 million acres of land in this region are best suited to wheat growing. Much of this land can grow no other crop satisfactorily.

At one time we enjoyed a reasonably good domestic market for our flour; this is all but gone due to percentage freight rate increases that have made it impossible to ship wheat or flour east. Our only remaining domestic market of any consequence is in California, which w eare able to hold only with diligent attention to freight rate matters.

Thus, sealed off from the eastern part of the Nation by a freight wall, and located in an area that has many natural advantages as a gateway to Asia and the Orient, we must look to exports for about 80 percent of our production, and the waterways of the Pacific Ocean for our means.

It was not by accident, then, that Pacific Northwest wheatgrowers began investigating the market potentials of the Orient nearly 12 years ago. When Public Law 480 was passed in mid-1954, our growers were ready to go into action.

The organization I represent—Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc.—is a regional organization that devotes its full attention to the development of foreign markets. Western Wheat is composed of the State wheat commissions and grower associations of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, with our home office in Portland.

At this very moment our executive vice president is probably somewhere between Japan and west Pakistan on a 6-week inspection tour of our foreign offices at Tokyo, New Delhi, and Karachi. He is accompanied by the executive secretary of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, which has been a joint cooperator in the India and Pakistan programs, and recently joined with us as cooperators in Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. In addition, the two organizations are now full-time partners in Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma, and Thailand. Thus, the U.S. wheatgrowers are seeking "togetherness" in their market-development activities covering the major wheat- and flour-importing countries of south Asia and the Far East. We have learned that our oversea offices and personnel cannot promote Washington wheat or Kansas wheat—we are considered as representatives of all U.S. wheat.

As most of you are aware, our oversea programs are carried out in participation with local foreign organizations or associa-

tions and in cooperation with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Our projects are financed by foreign currency accrued to the U.S. Government through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

Up until the formation of Western Wheat about a year ago, Pacific Northwest wheatgrower associations had spent about $125,000 of their own money on foreign market development. Now that we have pooled our resources we have been able to expand the program and Western Wheat is now annually budgeting about $150,000.

I'd like to outline some of the oversea market development activities that we've carried on. Since time is limited, I'll concern my remarks to only Japan and India.

JAPAN

General: Japan was the first country in which efforts were concentrated since this country offered the greatest immediate potential, and is our area's major dollar market.

One of the significant factors about Japan is that the Central Government has a policy, and a program, to improve the health of the Japanese people through nutrition education. Its objective is to get the Japanese people to eat wheat foods in at least one meal per day. You don't get people to abandon their age-old traditional rice and fish diets by a national proclamation. Some impetus is needed, and this is where we believe market development programs have greatly stimulated wheat consumption.

We've had a number of projects in Japan, each one designed to meet a particular group of consumers. Some projects have been short range, others long range. In the early days we conducted an advertising type promotional program designed to make people aware of wheat foods. Another project saw some 1,700 home economists trained in the nutritional values of wheat.

School lunch expansion

The first major project launched was a program to expand the feeding of schoolchildren. School lunches were not new to the Japanese, but the program needed expansion and further development. Our project was designed to do four things: (1) Train home economists and bakers who were preparing the meals; (2) encourage school officials and parents to add a school lunch program to their school; (3) emphasize the relationship between health subjects taught in the classroom to the meal that was served to the children; and (4) increase the emphasis on a balanced diet.

The year before the expansion program began there had been an increase of 541 schools, representing 308,000 children, added to the school lunch movement. At the end of the first year of our expansion program the number of new schools jumped to 1,460 representing nearly a million children. Increases in the number of schools and children fed have continued until today 60 percent of Japan's schools serve a nutritious lunch—which includes a one-third-pound wheat roll—to more than 10 million schoolchildren.

Schools with existing lunch programs can be influenced also, and a noticeable change can be seen in the total caloric content of the meal served today compared with that served 3 years ago. In its first 2 years of operation, the expansion program contributed to a 35 percent increase in the amount of wheat flour consumed in the feeding of schoolchildren.

The results of improved national nutrition—of which the school lunch is a part—are vivid in the children of the New Japan. The average sixth-grade boy today is 3 inches taller and 8.3 pounds heavier than his counterpart was in 1946.

This program is helping to establish inroads on national eating habits. Many parents have told our representatives that they have been pressured into serving bread and other wheat foods at home because their children insist on them.

Bakers' training school

Through our activities in Japan, we have constantly looked for means that would reach the countless rural villages and small towns. Wheat accounts for 35 percent of the diet in Tokyo compared with 8½ percent in the rural areas. An approach to this matter has been the training of bakers who come from these small villages and towns.

Market development funds have been used to provide advanced technical baking training to rural bakers—bakers who would not otherwise be able to advance in the techniques of their field. This training work is done at the Japan Bakers' Training School, a well-staffed and equipped institution in Tokyo.

The first Bakers' Training School saw 160 rural bakers from all of Japan's 46 prefectures participate in a 3-month intensive training program. Upon completion of their training course, these bakers returned to their villages and conducted classes for other local bakers. It is estimated that a total of 12,000 bakers were reached through this program. The cost of training was about $125 for each of the 160 bakers.

Incidentally, our Canadian friends and competitors have seen the value of this school—last year they donated $35,000 cash for the purchase of new baking equipment.

At present we are conducting another training session for 150 rural bakers. Due to the shortage of market development funds it has been necessary to shorten the training period from 3 months to 30 days.

Kitchen demonstration buses

Perhaps the most novel—and the most popular—market development project has been and is the kitchen demonstration buses. Here again a means was devised to reach into the rural villages. These kitchens-on-wheels staffed by trained home economists travel to villages and conduct demonstrations of balanced meal preparation, stressing wheat foods.

This project started with eight buses in September 1956, and in 1958 four more buses were added.

In the past 3½ years, these 12 buses have traveled a total of 270,000 miles; conducted 15,000 demonstrations to a total audience of 1.4 million Japanese housewives. Or, on a monthly basis, each bus has averaged 640 miles per month to conduct two demonstrations per day to an average attendance of 92 housewives per demonstration.

These people have been reached at a very low cost—the amount of foreign currency spent has amounted to $306,000—or 22 cents per person reached—in a country that today is our leading dollar customer of wheat. The success of these buses and demand for return performances has caused 20 prefectural governments to purchase and operate their own buses. The kitchen bus project has made a lasting and continuing impression in Japan.

Conclusion

When we first began working in Japan we wheat growers were told repeatedly by our fellow Americans that "you just can't get those people to eat wheat—they're rice eaters and always will be." However, pessimism seldom accomplishes anything * * * we didn't take their advice but just forged ahead.

In prewar days, the Japanese consumed about 300 pounds of rice and 30 pounds of wheat per person annually. Today, the per capita consumption of rice has dropped to 264 pounds while wheat has increased 300 percent to 90 pounds per person * * * even with bumper rice crops the past 4 years.

INDIA

General: And now a few remarks about our work in South Asia. There are more people in India today who are not familiar with, nor have been exposed to, wheat foods than populate the entire United States. Possibilities for increasing wheat foods consumption in India are tremendous. Due, however, to a primitive agricultural, economic, and industrial structure, our work will be long and slow. It will require much patience and understanding. I believe our program in India should be assessed with two sets of values: (1) By eliminating mass nutritional deficiency and occasional starvation diets; and (2) by helping to remedy this situation making a physically and morally strong India to ward off a Communist philosophy of life.

Trade teams

To initiate interest and cooperation for our program overseas, one of the most effective means has been to bring Government and industry representatives to the United States to acquaint them first hand with what the American grain industry has to offer. Four Indian Government and private industry representatives visited the United States in June 1958.

A few months later, to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, needs, and possibilities in India, a return survey and evaluation was made by a team of U.S. Government and industry representatives. I was privileged to be a member of that team. From this has come strong support and understanding of what we hope to do.

To carry the person-to-person exchange one step further, it is now anticipated that, with the cooperation of the private grain trade in this country, two Indians will shortly arrive in the United States where they will become, for 6 months, employees of a country grain growers organization to learn firsthand methods of receipting, storage, and warehousing. Trained personnel in this field are practically nonexistent in India, and are badly needed to manage the rapidly-increasing storage facilities now being constructed.

Bakers' training school

In India it is necessary that elementary aprpoaches be utilized for market development. One of the most basic and perhaps one of the most effective is our Bakers' Training School, whereby 300 commercial bakers are being trained over a 2-year period to produce more tasty, more eye-appealing, and more sanitarily prepared, Western and Indian style wheat foods. In addition, private and Government organizations, such as the Indian Airlines, Indian National Railways, Burma-Shell Oil Co., and others have recognized the benefits of such a school, the only one between Japan and Europe, and are training their canteen staffs at this institute.

Bus demonstrations

In a country where less than 10 percent of the people can read or write, where transportation and communications are occasionally difficult, where many languages and dialects prevail, the only effective way to reach the population is by demonstration. The Foreign Agricultural Service has recently approved the construction and operation of six mobile vans to travel to the village of India giving demonstrations of the necessity for a balanced diet, and again stressing wheat foods where possible * * * this program is aimed at better utilization of foods already available and not at something unobtainable by the poorest villager.

Trade fairs

In cooperation with the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, trade fairs and exhibits at four of India's largest cities have introduced wheat foods, including breads, macaroni, and standard household

pastry preparations, to over 3 million urbanites. And this does not include the large international attendance visiting the wheat exhibit at the recent New Delhi World Agricultural Fair opened by President Eisenhower.

Sampling program

To assess our competition, to insure that our wheat meets all quality specifications, and to counteract often misleading statements about the poor quality or high moisture content of U.S. wheat shipped abroad, samples of wheat imported by India and Pakistan, by countries in Europe and South America, are taken at the port of entry. This includes all wheats from whatever source, whether it be United States, Canadian, Russian, or Australian. These samples are sent to a USDA laboratory in Illinois for a complete chemical, milling and baking analysis. The first results of this program are expected shortly.

All of these projects and others have been initiated since the opening of our India office less than 2 years ago.

Conclusion

I could speak at great length on what the American wheat producers are doing all over the world to develop future markets, we hope eventually dollar markets, for our products. To a very large measure the effectiveness, and future, of our program rests with you here this evening.

As growers, Public Law 480 is very important to us. In the past 5 years approximately 45 percent of our Pacific Northwest wheat crop has been exported under title I of this program. But, Public Law 480 is more than a current market for us—it provides us with valuable tools that will enable us to continue to stimulate the development of these future markets. However, continued close cooperation is mandatory between government and industry. By working together, by helping others, we help ourselves.

Subsidies in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the little appreciated facts in American history is the role the Federal Government has assumed in providing substantial, tangible assistance to the various productive branches of the American economy assistance that over the years has amounted to many billions of dollars. No part of our economy has been free of such aid. It has taken a multitude of forms. It consists in part of free services provided by the Government, such as basic statistical data, maps, charts, and other navigational aids, weather forecasts, research in agriculture, mining, industry. It includes tariffs, loans at less than the market rate of interest, various kinds of insurance, grants to many forms of business—such as railroads, airlines, shipbuilding, and ship operating companies—surplus disposal programs, stockpile purchase programs, tax concessions, irrigation projects, rural electrification, and price support programs.

How many of these programs should be included within the term subsidy depends, of course, on how narrowly or how broadly the term subsidy is to be defined. The arguments as to what is and what is not to be interpreted as a subsidy need not be of great concern at this point. The economic effects are much the same, regardless of whether a program involves direct payments to particular business, a remission of charges, sales by the Government at less than market prices, loans at less than prevailing interest rates, or price supporting or raising devices such as the tariff or farm price supports. In each case a specific economic individual or class of individuals benefits directly while the cost is borne by the taxpayer or the consumer.

It is futile to approve or condemn subsidies, however defined, as a whole. Each subsidy must be judged on its own merits, in terms of its cost to the Nation, and the benefits derived. There can be no doubt that some subsidies have contributed greatly to the development of our Nation. Without the enormous land grants given to the railroads of our country, the economic expansion of the West, and indeed of the entire Nation, which characterized the latter half of the 19th century would have been impossible. The American merchant marine, essential to the defense of our country, could not survive without a certain subsidy. Subsidies have been used to prevent business failures when such failures would have had disastrous repercussions throughout the economy. They have been used to prevent price declines that would have paralyzed large segments of our economy.

There have, of course, also been subsidies which have been widely criticized as being contrary to the public interest, where the benefits received were not sufficient to justify the cost. In several cases, subsidies to shipping companies and to airlines have been disclosed to have been associated with graft and corruption. Many tariffs are widely considered to have little economic justification. Similarly, for example, depletion allowances to the petroleum and mining industries and low postal rates for second-class mail have been widely criticized as being unwarranted.

In practice we cannot go through our daily round of activities without almost continually being in contact with subsidies. The very house we live in has in all likelihood its mortgage insured by a Government agency; thereby the interest charges are lower than would otherwise be the case. The food on the breakfast table has been safeguarded by the Federal meat inspection program and the Food and Drug Administration. Our children's education is, in part, subsidized, by the taxes paid by childless wage earners of our community. The school lunch program makes it possible for 12 million of our children to get a hot lunch for far less than would otherwise be possible and the special milk program in 78,000 schools benefits millions more. Every time we buy gas, we share in the benefit the petroleum industry gets from the depletion allowance—a depletion allowance which permits the industry to cut its annual operating expense by about $2 billion a year. Every time we read a magazine, we receive some of the benefit of having the post office bring it to us for far less than the cost of carrying it. Magazine publishers are saved millions of dollars as a result of low second-class mail rates. Steel in our cars or refrigerators may well have been produced in a plant very largely paid for at Government expense during the war and then sold to the private operator for a fraction of the original cost.

In short, we live in a world where we are continually affected by subsidies which reach into every phase of the economy.

Since there is no standard definition for subsidy, and since the benefits from subsidies can frequently not be measured with any accuracy, it is not possible to give a total figure for all Government subsidy programs during a given year. It is possible, however, to show what the budget of the United States calls the current expenses for aids and special services to the various segments of our society. These current expenses are defined in the 1961 budget as "expenditures which provide aids or special services to specific economic groups primarily in the current year, including administrative and other operating expenses attributable to investment-type programs and the costs of maintaining the related physical assets. Benefits accruing to various groups through tax provisions or the Government aids which do not call for expenditures are not included." Table 1 shows these expenditures as follows:

TABLE I.—*Current expenses for aids and special services, fiscal year 1959*

[In millions of dollars]

Agriculture:	
Direct Federal programs:	
Department of Agriculture:	
Commodity Credit Corporation:	
Sales of surplus commodities for foreign currency	1,022
Price support, supply, and related programs	872
Transfer to supplemental stockpile	315
Soil bank programs	68
International Wheat Agreement	48
National Wool Act	20
Other	33
Commodity Stabilization Service:	
Acreage reserve	609
Sugar Act	67
Other	−3
Agricultural Research Service	46
Agricultural Marketing Service	42
Farmers Home Administration	32
Rural Electrification Administration	10
Other	8
Other agencies	3
Total direct Federal program	3,192
Grants-in-aid: Department of Agriculture:	
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	127
Commodity Credit Corporation	154
Forest Service	11
Total grants-in-aid	292
Total agriculture	3,484

TABLE I.—*Current expenses for aids and special services, fiscal year 1959*—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

Business:	
Civil:	
Post Office Department	736
Federal Aviation Agency	228
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers	53
Treasury Department: Coast Guard: Navigation aids	177
Department of Commerce:	
Maritime activities: Ship operating subsidies and administration	133
Patent Office	21
Other	29
Department of Defense—Civil	64
Other agencies	10
Total civil	1,451
Major national security: Expansion of defense production:	
Administrative expenses and losses on transactions	42
Total business	1,493
Labor:	
Direct Federal programs:	
Temporary unemployment compensation	447
Other	17
Total direct Federal programs	464
Grants-in-aid: Administration of unemployment compensation and employment service	297
Total labor	761
Homeowners and tenants:	
Direct Federal programs:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	−149
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	−41
Total direct Federal programs	−190
Grants-in-aid: Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Public housing	111
Urban renewal fund	76
Total grants-in-aid	186
Total homeowners and tenants	−4
Veterans:	
Veterans' Administration:	
Compensation and pensions	3,275
Hospital and medical care	852
Readjustment benefits	585
Other	206
Other agencies	54
Total veterans	4,972
International:	
Civil:	
Mutual security—economic	1,390
Other	47
Total international, civil	1,437
Major national security: Department of Defense—military	2,316
Total international	3,753
Other aids and special services:	
Direct Federal programs—total	122
Grants-in-aid:	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Public assistance	1,966
Other	1

TABLE I.—*Current expenses for aids and special services, fiscal year 1959*—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

Other aids and special services—Con.	
Grants-in-aid—Continued	
Department of Agriculture:	
School lunch program	142
Other agencies	5
Total grants-in-aid	2,114
Total other aids and special services	2,237
Total current expenses for aids and special services	16,697

Source: Budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pp. 921–923.

In this classification, it can be seen that the current aids to agriculture, even using the classification of the Bureau of the Budget, accounts for only 20.9 percent of all current aids and special services. Business accounts for 8.9 percent, labor for 4.6 percent, veterans for 29.8 percent, international—primarily grants under the mutual security program—for 22.5 percent, and all other for 13.4 percent. It should be noted that even here, by no means all of the current aids for agriculture are designed exclusively for the benefit of farmers. The largest single item, sale of surplus commodities for foreign currencies, has enabled the United States to acquire substantial amounts of strategic and critical raw materials which are deemed to be essential for national defense. The soil bank programs serve not merely to maintain farm income while curtailing production but also to preserve the fertility of the soil for all future generations. Rural Electrification Administration administrative expenses help a program which has been a great boon to producers of electrical machinery and equipment as well as to farmers themselves. Market research undertaken by the Department of Agriculture benefits the processors, shippers, and distributors of agricultural products fully as much as it benefits farmers. The Federal meat inspection program is designed to assure the public a clean, wholesome supply of meat. It is actually a program of inspection and supervision of the meatpacking industry. The primary purpose of the Department of Agriculture's brucellosis is public health protection. The International Wheat Agreement helps not only farmers, but also helps members of the grain trade expand their export business and profits. The work of the Forest Service benefits all those who use the national forests for recreation, grazing, and other land utilization, as well as all concerned with better forest management and research in the protection and better utilization of the Nation's timber resources.

It should be noted further that the Federal Government provides much assistance to the various segments of the economy that is not included under current aids and special services. In the case of agriculture, this would include CCC price support and grain storage and loans of the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, conservation payments, water development projects, the school-lunch program, and various international and other programs not designed primarily for the support of agriculture. For business, not included in current aids and special services are Small Business Administration loans, highway, airport, and other public works projects, ship construction subsidies, and grants to States for building private hospitals and other health facilities. For the homeowner and tenants loans and mortgage purchases provide assistance that is not classified among current aids.

It may be illuminating to consider the extent of subsidies to the two related industries of the United States, the shipbuilding and shipping industry. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the United States pays both construction-differential and operating-differential subsidies in an effort to maintain an efficient merchant marine on the high seas, a merchant marine that can operate as an important defense auxiliary in times of war or threat of war. The chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, Clarence G. Mores, reported in September 1957 that from 1937 to June 1956 the total amount paid out as subsidy for new construction totaled $437.9 million. Since then, and including estimates through June 1960, an additional $325.1 million has been spent on construction differentials, half of it in the fiscal year 1960. Thus $763 million has been spent since 1937 on construction differentials alone. These include major subsidies on the present giants of the American fleet, the SS *United States*, the SS *Constitution*, and the SS *Independence*. The cost of the *United States* is reported as $76.8 million, including $25.4 million for national defense features. The United States Lines purchased this from the Government for $28.9 million. The American Export Line paid $14 million for the *Independence*, built at a cost of $26.5 million, and $14.4 million for the *Constitution*, built at a cost of $27.2 million.

Related to the construction differential subsidy is the sales program undertaken by the Maritime Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. Under this program 843 ships, built for the Maritime Commission during World War II, were sold to United States citizens for United States flag operations at a price of from one-fourth to one-fifth of their replacement cost. By December 31, 1956, ship sales under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 totaled $1,776.3 million. Net sales after vessel trade-in allowances have been deducted were $1,697.4 million. This represented about a 40.1 percent return on the war cost of these ships. The operating differential subsidy has amounted to $1,197 million for the calendar years 1947 through 1959.

Actually each subsidized voyage, including a pro rata construction subsidy is estimated to cost $2.8 million over the typical 20-year contract.

Altogether, as estimated in a study compiled by Representative FRED MARSHALL, and published in the hearings, "Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1959," of the House Committee on Appropriations (p. 158) subsidies to maritime organizations for the period 1938 through fiscal 1957 amounted to $3.5 billions.

The trend of these subsidies is, if anything, upward. It is reported that Congress may be asked to appropriate about $118 million in 1960 for a sister ship to the U. S. Lines' *United States*, the *America*, which the company will purchase for about $47 million; and about $86 million for a Pacific American President superliner, the *President Wilson*, which will be purchased by the line for about $35 million. A substantial portion of the cost of these vessels to the taxpayer is due to the incorporation of certain national defense features, which do not enter into subsidy calculations. Maritime interests now are urging relaxation of the provision in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which states that in no case may a construction-differential subsidy exceed 50 percent of the cost of the vessel—excluding national defense features. These interests point out that the cost differential between construction in a foreign yard and in the U.S. yard is increasing and that even with a subsidy of 50 percent of the cost of a ship (excluding national defense features) shipping companies find it more economical to buy ships built in foreign shipyards.

Certain other major subsidies or subsidylike benefits may also be mentioned. In the 10-year period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1958, the postal deficit totalled $5,367 million, $926 million of which was incurred in the most recent of these years, the fiscal year 1958. The largest single factor contributing to this multibillion deficit is the losses incurred in carrying second-class mail—publishers' mailings of magazines and newspapers. These losses on second-class mail totalled $2,324 million over the same 10-year period.

Airlines continue to receive subsidies in connection with carrying mail. The subsidy to certificated air carriers has been estimated by the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board at $554 million for fiscal years 1951 through 1960. In recent years almost all of this has gone to smaller local service carriers, for helicopter service and for foreign operations. However, it may be noted that in the last week of March 1960, a major trunkline operator, Capital Airlines, Inc., petitioned to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a subsidy that would amount to $12,949,000 for the year ending March 15, 1961, citing "particularly heavy losses," its inability to arrange financing, and a critical cash position.

In addition to direct subsidies, air carriers also benefit from such governmental assistance as airport and airway facilities, other navigation aids, aeronautical research and development conducted under governmental sponsorship, and the sale of surplus aircraft both to new and existing companies engaged in civil transport.

Accelerated amortization on certain facilities built for defense purposes has permitted companies owning such facilities to cut their tax obligations substantially. In 1955 the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue estimated that from 1950 through 1960 tax collections would be reduced by some $5,196 million as a result of certificates of necessity permitting accelerated amortization. However, after 1960, when facilities whose value has already been written off under the accelerated amortization provisions are still operative, the tax collections would be greater than they would have been without accelerated amortization. On the basis of current tax rates, it is estimated that for the period 1961–76 tax collections will be increased by $2,426 million and thereafter by another $2,326 million. Of course, for the period up to 1960, when tax collections were lower, companies benefitting from the accelerated tax amortization provisions were receiving the equivalent of an interest-free loan.

Some students feel that all or part of the depletion allowances permitted as tax deductions should be interpreted as subsidies. The depletion allowances to mining, petroleum, sulfur, and gas interests permit producers to deduct from income for tax purposes a substantial percentage of income earned and are intended to encourage development of these resources. Depletion reported on corporation income tax returns averaged $2.1 billion annually for the 10 years, 1947–56.

To some extent the disposal of Government surplus property involves a subsidy. After World War II about $15.1 billion worth—reported cost—of surplus property was sold by the War Assets Administration with a sales realization of $4.1 billion. The difference between the reported cost and sales realization is not all subsidy, since the reported cost does not take into account such factors as depreciation, deterioration, obsolescence, and so forth. However, some purchasers were undoubtedly able to obtain surplus goods at lower prices than prevailed on the open market for comparable items.

It is sometimes claimed that subsidies tend to reduce the incentives for efficiency and growing productivity. Whatever may be the merits of this argument in other industries, it clearly is not valid in agriculture. Farm productivity has been growing at an astounding rate, much faster than productivity in most other occupations, and substantially more than in industry as a whole. Output per man-hour on the American farm has increased 37 percent from 1950 to 1958. This has made it possible for a single farmer in 1958 to provide food and fiber for 23.5 persons in 1958, compared to 15.9 persons in 1950, 10.6 persons in 1940, and 6.9 persons in 1900. This increase has been due in large measure to extensive mechanization on millions of American farms. The average farm today represents an investment in machinery of about $20,700 per worker, compared to about $15,300 per worker in industry. Further, it has been estimated that farmers have $3 invested in production for every $1 that is invested in the marketing of their products.

With the growing productivity of the individual farmer, total farm population and farm employment have declined. This is continuing to happen. In April 1959 farm population was 21,172,000 or 10 million less than in 1937. Similarly farm employment in 1959 was 7,384,000, down 5 million from the 1936 level.

This decline in farm population and employment has been somewhat offset by increases in employment in the processing, packaging, and distribution of food and fiber. Thus the decline, if any, of the total number of persons engaged in the production and distribution of products from the American farm to the consumers of the Nation, has been much less than the decline in the number of farmers or in farm employment alone.

The mechanization of the American farm has made the farmer an increasingly significant customer for American industry. It is estimated that the investment by farmers in machinery is twice that of the entire steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry. To keep the 12,500,000 farm cars, trucks, and tractors running, the farmers buy some $1,500 million of oil products each year, making them the petroleum industry's largest single customer.

Increased farmer efficiency has unfortunately not been converted into corresponding gains in real income. Farmers still lag behind the rest of the Nation in income received. In 1958, per capita farm income was $1,066 while per capita nonfarm income was $2,066, nearly twice as much. Two hundred and ninety-eight dollars of the farmer's $1,066 was for work done off the farm. During 1958 the hourly income for farm labor and management was 97 cents while workers in manufacturing industries received $2.13. Even excluding the smaller noncommercial farms, in 1956 farm families operating the Nation's 2,213,000 "commercial" farms received an average income of $5,415 while all nonfarm families received incomes averaging $6,900.

A common misconception is that farmers are receiving unfair economic benefits as a result of the price support programs and other so-called subsidies to farmers. However, almost every indicator of farm income and farm prices shows that far from receiving undue economic advantage from subsidies, farmers have consistently lagged behind other groups in the economy. Total realized net farmers' income from agricultural sources—excluding net change in inventory—was $11 billion in 1959, down from 13.1 million in 1958 and the lowest for any year since 1943, except for 1957. The index of prices received by farmers compared to prices paid—including interest, taxes and wage rates—was down to 80 in 1959, the lowest since 1939. Prices paid by farmers have climbed every year since

1955 and bring the index of all items paid to 298—1910–14 equal 100. Prices received by farmers for all farm products in 1959, on the other hand, were down to an index figure of 240—1910–14 equal 100—the lowest for any year since 1947 with the exception of the 3 years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Food price increases to consumers have brought about many complaints from housewives. Unfortunately, they have usually tended to blame the farmer for this increase. He has actually been receiving an ever small share of the consumer's dollar. In 1947–49, the farmer received, on the average, 50 cents of the consumer's food dollar. By 1958 this had shrunk to 40 cents.

Put another way, between 1947 and 1958 the annual cost of the family's food marketbasket increased by $154. However, the farm value of the food actually dropped by $40. Labor costs increased $100. Transportation costs rose $31. Other business expenses advanced $60. Charges to pay Federal corporate income taxes were up $8. And the profits of marketing corporations decreased $5.

As a matter of fact, whereas wholesale prices have gone up on the average 19.4 percent since 1947–49, the prices of farm products have gone down 11 percent and the prices of processed foods only up 7 percent.

Actually for the housewife, food and clothing prices have risen far less than other items comprising the cost of living since 1947–49. In 1959 the Consumer Price Index as a whole was 24.5 percent above the 1947–49 level. Food had increased by only 18.3 percent and clothing by 7.8 percent. On the other hand, medical care had increased by 50.6 percent, rents by 39.6 percent, and transportation by 46.1 percent.

With the increases in average incomes of nonfarm families, the relative cost of food has actually gone down. The following table shows how much could be bought of certain basic foods in 1929 and again in 1958 with 1 hour's pay of a worker in manufacturing:

	1929	1958
Loaves of bread (in pounds)	6.4	11.0
Steak (in pounds)	1.2	2.0
Milk (in quarts)	3.9	8.4
Butter (in pounds)	1.0	2.7
Bacon (in pounds)	1.3	2.7
Eggs (in dozens)	1.1	3.5
Potatoes (in pounds)	17.7	33.8
Oranges (in dozens)	1.3	2.8

Taking a comparison with a more recent period, between February 1950 and February 1959, the average retail price of a pound of rib roast beef increased from 68.2 cents to 82.4 cents. During the same period weekly earnings of factory workers increased from $56.37 to $88. Thus, beef prices increased 20.8 percent while weekly earnings increased 56 percent, and the amount of working time required to buy a pound of beef dropped from 29 to 22 minutes.

A similar situation exists in milk prices. In 1952, when producer prices were supported at 90 percent of parity, consumers were paying an average of 22.8 cents per quart for milk. In the second quarter of 1959, producer price supports had dropped to 77 percent of parity and consumer prices had advanced to 24.2 cents per quart. Nevertheless, in 1947 it took 9.1 minutes of the average factory worker's time to buy a quart of milk; in 1959 it took only 6.7 minutes of his work time.

This report has been designed to demonstrate the prevalence of subsidies throughout our economy. Too many people tend to associate the term subsidy exclusively or almost exclusively with farmers and maintain that they are, therefore, being unfairly supported by the rest of the people. As has been shown above, not only are farm subsidy programs only a fraction of all governmental subsidy programs, but the farm programs themselves help many persons besides farmers. It is an illusion that subsidy programs have given farmers an enviable economic position in the economy. Despite enormous advances in farm productivity, farmers still lag behind other segments of the population. It is not within the scope of this report to praise, or condemn any specific subsidy program. Its purpose is limited to indicating how subsidies enter into the lives of all Americans and how they relate to practically every business enterprise and to provide related data on farm and nonfarm income, prices, and production which may help to place the facts relating to farm and nonfarm subsidies in a better perspective.

Investigation of the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, some time ago I received a very interesting letter on the question of the investigation of drug prices, from Dr. Oscar Alden, of Red Oak, Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED OAK, IOWA, *December 9, 1959.*

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Government is now going to investigate the drug companies. In a quotation from the Wall Street Journal, Senator KEFAUVER said their investigations of other industries had not created much interest but thought this one would create a lot of interest. My immediate reaction was: "Is Senator KEFAUVER conducting these investigations for the good of the people and the industry, or for the good of KEFAUVER." His statement makes me inclined to think the latter is all too true. I have been in practice in Red Oak, Iowa, since July 1936, and during that period we have had the most fantastic growth in knowledge of the care, treatment, and prevention of diseases, accidents, and infirmities of people since the beginning of recorded time. It is interesting to note that this growth occurred among free people of the world. Each succeeding country, to lose that freedom, fell behind in advancing this knowledge. Germany went from the top to near the very bottom. American scientists in medicine have won 36 percent of the Nobel prizes in medicine, in fact 2.7 times more than any other country. Almost all of this advancement has been due to the combined development of technique and new drugs. One impossible without the other.

Commonplace surgery today would be unheard of and impossible without the development of antibiotics, anesthetic materials, (drugs and gases), and knowledge of the basic body needs for vitamins, minerals, caloric requirements and the development by the drug industries of materials and means of replacing these for long periods of time, even to unconscious or anesthesized people.

The development of the miracle drugs, (steroid compounds), for arthritis has been phenomenal both in discovery and improvement, as well as lower cost, which has been consistent since its first discovery. What is the proper reward for the people who developed and improved both the product and the means of producing all these drugs? George Washington died probably due to a strep throat infection; a condition treated routinely in our offices today with very little loss of time and practically no deaths. Calvin Coolidge's son died from an infected blister on his heel from playing tennis; a condition that we treat with complete recovery in a relatively few hours today. What is the cost of these drugs today? Both men could have been saved for the price of a case of beer, a fifth of whisky, or a few cartons of cigarettes.

If Senator KEFAUVER and his subcommittee find that the drug industry as a whole are not shysters or thieves, or vultures preying on old defenseless people, will this committee give them a "Good-Housekeeping Seal of Approval," or will it be up to the President of one of these companies to send letters to all physicians of the country stating that after spending numerous manhours, and thousands of dollars, they were acquitted, leaving the bogeyman picture he created in the minds of our elderly people and those on fixed income.

This will undoubtedly take the time of many qualified men and untold sums of money thus added to the costs of drugs, with no improvement in a single lifesaving or pain-relieving drug.

If the pharmaceutical companies as a whole are found to be crooks and thieves by this investigation, then I would like to be permitted one request, i.e., that I be allowed to stand up and be counted with such thieves and crooks who have made the health and care of the American people the best in the world.

Our public health department is very good. They made the standards for testing polio vaccines, but did they offer to defend Cutter Laboratories in the many lawsuits they had because of live virus in their vaccine, not found by public health standards—I'll take company name and product pride over all Government control.

Small companies sell for less money. It has been said "Nothing has been made but what someone could make it with inferior materials and sell it for less money." One very prominent (not to their desire) small drug company specialized in selling the same drugs for less money to dispensing physicians, and they brought out and sold elixir of sulfanilamide. The rest of that story is history in our time. No thank you. I would not give any cheap drugs from a small company to either my family or my patients. They might be just as good, and again—funerals are so expensive.

Yours very truly,

OSCAR ALDEN, M.D.

Slovak Native Music Master 300 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, an editor from Passaic, N.J., which appeared in the March 1960 issue of Dobry Pastier, the official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America:

SLOVAK NATIVE IRISH MUSIC MASTER 300 YEARS AGO

(By John C. Sciranka)

Music lovers no doubt will be interested that on February 13 was the 300th birthday of Johann Sigismund Kusser, who is known as composer of many operas and especially as master of state music in Ireland.

Kusser was born in Bratislava, capital of Slovakia, in 1660. Records show that he was baptized on February 13, 1660. He is also registered under the name of Cousser, which French spelling he adopted during his stay in Paris. His stay in London is established by Daily Courant of February 9, 1705. All the instrumental and vocal music was composed by Kusser, then already referred to as master for Signoria Guiliana de Celotte, famous Italian opera singer, who gave performance at Etheredge's, "The Man of Mode," in London at Lincoln's Inn Fields Theater. Signoria Celotte also gave a benefit concert at York Building on April 2, 1705. She accompanied Kusser to Ireland, and her name turns up again as singer in one of his serenades at Dublin Castle, February 6, 1712, on a bill of expense made out by the composer and preserved in the Public Record Office, Dublin, and published in the Musical Antiquary, July 1911.

It is not known when Kusser left London for Dublin. Presumably he was still in London in 1706, since, according to Hawkins, he set a poem on the death of Arabella Hunt, who died on December 26, 1705.

While in Dublin he is variously called master of the state music, chapel master at Trinity College and master of the choristers at Christ Church Cathedral.

On November 12, 1716, he was appointed "chief composer and music master at Dublin Castle," which is registered on a document in the Public Record Office in Dublin. This title, however, according to historians appears to be the same as "master of the state music."

In this capacity he provided birthday serenatas for Queen Anne, King George I, and King George II with fair regularity, starting with "The Universal Applause of Mount Parnassus" on February 6, 1771.

Historians confirm that librettos of 11 similar allegorical pieces are found at Trinity College, Dublin, also at Bodleian Library, Oxford, as well as British Museum. Kusser was a close friend and pupil of Lully in Paris and came under his influence. His father was in Stuttgart, Germany, where he settled from Bratislava as a cantor of music. Kusser was at Ansbach in 1682–83, later as kapellmeister for Duke Anton Ulrich of Brunswick Wolfenbuttel. There he wrote and produced between 1690–93 seven German operas and one Italian divertimento. Later in Hamburg he took over the direction of the Opera House with Jakob Kremberg in 1694. Although he stayed there only 2 years, historians claim he left his distinctive mark as composer, conductor and manager and is paid high tribute by Mattheson.

Kusser seemed to love Dublin the best for he settled and died there in November 1727. Shortly before his death he supplied the birthday serenata for King George II, on October 30 of that year. His widow afterward still received a pension sent to her to Brunswick from February 1728 on. As a master of state music in Ireland he was succeded by Matthew Dubourg.

Critics claim that while Kusser's importance as an opera composer is overshadowed by that of Reinhard Kaiser, perhaps his pupil and his immediate successor at Brunswick and Hamburg, he considerably influenced the development of German orchestral music by introducing Lully's style and the forms of the French suite. Kusser's nephew, D. G. Treu, the son of his sister, preserved many of his precious works.

With the approach of St. Patrick's holyday, we should remember Kusser and his contribution to music. He is buried in Dublin, the place he loved best beside his native Bratislava in Slovakia.

The American Slovaks will pay due honor to Kusser on Saturday, April 23 at 8 p.m., Carnegie Recital Hall, in New York City, at the 35th annual concert of Prigoda School of Music. We are happy and proud that Kusser, a native of Bratislava, was a master of state music in Ireland almost 300 years ago.

Pesticides: The Real Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, first I want to extend my compliments to the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the aggressive and rightful position he has taken in protecting the food-consuming public of this Nation against contamination of our foodstuffs through careless practices of using certain types of pesticides and include the comments of Dr. Robert L. Rudd of the University of California at Davis:

PESTICIDES: THE REAL PERIL

(By Robert L. Rudd)

Contamination of a portion of this year's cranberry crop dramatizes hazards which accompany the growing use of chemical pesticides. Yet the danger revealed by the incident is not, in the long run, the basic one involved in the use of pesticides, and to that extent our alarm is misdirected.

Traditionally, man has resisted the onslaughts of competing animals and plants with the crudest of measures. He has been compelled to pay a certain tariff to these competitors—a portion of his crops, his livestock, his timber, or his person. Occasionally the tax is too great and he fails. But he has never been content to pay the tithe and has followed every path that promises to reduce or to eliminate his competitors. Less than two decades ago, new chemical discoveries revealed a pathway which promised total release from this competition. DDT was and remains the best known of the pesticides along this pathway of promise, but there are dozens of others. Many are quite unlike DDT; some are more toxic; many are widely used.

Although our experience with these chemicals has been brief, it has also been intense, and greatly varied. We are therefore now justified in asking the question: Have chemical controls led to the Eden which earlier experience promised? In spite of short-term gains in crop yields, and localized alleviation of disease, my answer is "No." There use has in fact created as many problems as have been solved. Witness a few: Increasing contamination of our lands, waters, and foodstuffs; increasing billions to support unneeded production; increasing destruction of natural-control agents; increasing misery from overproduction in many areas of the world.

A great deal of publicity has already been given to "kills" of fish and wildlife resulting from widespread use of chemical pesticides; to the omnipresence of chemical residues in our foods, to the possibility of injury to human beings (the cranberry crisis) and livestock. The public debate on these matters has led to a greater awareness of the hazard, a general heightening of responsibility in users, industry, and Government, a greater research effort, and to some corrective legislation.

Most of this emphasis has centered on chemicals alone. A common belief is that solution of hazard problems will also solve pest-control problems. This is by no means true. Following present land-use practices, we must use chemicals—and the frequency with which we use them must increase as our land use continues to intensify. Eliminate pesticides and our plagues and pestilences would be far more severe than they were before the advent of pest control.

Why is chemical pest control now a necessity? Why does one chemical treatment normally lead to another—to repetitive application? An ecologist would answer, "Simplification of the ecosystem." The ecosystem is the total living complex, relatively stable because of the great diversity of actions and kinds of organisms. When something gets out of balance in such a system, corrections occur quickly and the imbalance is corrected. Hawks and owls, for example, congregate in unusual numbers where large numbers of mice occur. Checks to abnormal increase of any species are inherent in most ecosystems. In simplified ecosystems, natural controls are fewer and respond less rapidly. Potential pests become actual pests under this condition, and herein lies the real danger of our present control practices.

All managed crop and timber production deals with simplified ecosystems. The first person to harvest and store natural cereal grain for later sowing started the simplification of agriculture. Until the mechanization and later chemicalization of agriculture, there was little substantial departure from the methods of the first agriculturalists. Acreages were small, landscapes diverse. Ecosystem simplification was relatively slight and was in any event local. Hedgerows, trees, weed patches, seasonal cropping and multipurpose farming combined to form a diversified base for a diversified fauna. Mechanized and chemicalized crop production has resulted in large expanses of single crop species—the destruction of diversity in the landscape.

Simplification of the fauna follows simplification of the landscape. A pest species provided with abundant food and few competing animals to check its increase, may under these conditions become far more numerous than was ever remotely possible before present-day, large-scale simplification. When the pest is introduced from another country, rarely does it bring with it any of the animals which control it in its native land; as a result, great increase in numbers with devastating consequences can be expected. Most of our major insect pests are "introduced" species.

We further simplify the fauna by two means. We remove single species—coyotes, for example—when the methods are avail-

able to do so. When such methods are not available, we do so by nondiscriminating means such as blanket chemicals. The use of parathion in citrus groves, for example, kills most insects nonselectively. Control of a pest species may be temporarily achieved by chemicals, but the resurgence of pest species is almost assuredly more rapid than is that of the predators and parasites normally checking the pest species. Initial chemical control, therefore, creates the later need for more chemicals. Once begun, there is no stopping if the crop is not to be lost.

If repetitive treatment with the same chemical is continued, control of one pest may be achieved in time to herald the arrival of a new one. Shifts in animal balances can well result in the increase of previously harmful species to pest numbers. The emergence of spider mites to pest status followed successive treatments with DDT in orchards throughout the world. As another example, the control of coyotes and to some extent the smaller predatory mammals, may be responsible for the irruptions of rodents in western rangelands. Although this belief is hotly disputed, the fact is that many livestock growers have forbidden the poisoning or trapping of predatory mammals on their properties. Their aim is rodent control; their method—natural check and balance in an ecosystem previously awry.

I have described the conditions under which chemicals may perpetuate pest control by reducing natural checks to population increase, and the particular way in which new pests can be created. It is also apparent, in rodents, that partial reduction of a pest population may actually act as a stimulus to breeding by the pest species. This reaction does not seem to be widely appreciated among pest controllers; yet it is a maxim of livestock growers and managers of game species that reduction in numbers is often necessary to yield maximum vigor and reproduction.

Simplification of the ecosystem is the result of most current production practice in the United States. Clearly, immense biological and economic problems are created by it. Yet, one other characteristic of our age complicates these problems further—transportation. To an unprecedented extent, animals and plants are being moved from one part of the world to another. Relatively few are intentional introductions (certain game birds and the biological-control organisms are exceptions); most introductions are unintentional. The hardier species become established, spread and may well become spectacular pests. The gypsy moth, corn borer, and boll weevil are examples among insects; house rats and mice are excellent examples among mammals. No practical way of defending against unwanted alien introductions has yet been found.

Quarantine measures, now standard practices at ports of entry, consist of prohibitions against certain plants and animals known to be contaminated, and inspections of admissible kinds to intercept contaminated stocks. Valuable as quarantine is, it is only partially effective. Fifteen of our major insect pests appeared in this country after the establishment of Federal quarantine procedures. It is virtually impossible to prevent the entry of major pest species.

The only recourse available when such a pest becomes established is an eradication campaign. A serious belief in the ability to eradicate pest-insect species is very recent: Only the combination of aerial application and new synthetic chemicals make it possible. In only one species—the Mediterranean fruitfly—has such a campaign been successful; the recent eradication of the pest in a few counties in Florida followed just such methods. But the fly had been eradicated previously—30 years ago. The eradication programs against the gypsy moth and the imported fire ant aim at species well established in a number of States. Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides distributed by air are the control means. Both campaigns have been bitterly opposed. Eradication of these species is indeed possible, but an informed public will not tolerate the hazards nor the cost necessary for such efforts.

The simplification of ecosystems resulting from the use of nonselective, toxic chemicals creates problems in addition to the loss of, or threat to, desirable species. To illustrate, two pest insects—the rice stinkbug and the sugar-cane borer—in Louisiana last year erupted to economically serious levels following fire-ants control measures. Competent entomologists credit these outbreaks to the nonselective action of a control chemical—the removal of the natural checks on the populations of pest species. Of course, additional chemical means are available to control the insect irruptions caused by the initial chemical treatment. Simplification of the ecosystem followed by unimaginative methods to keep it simple. The total price is much greater than the cost of the first insect-control treatment.

Perhaps I may be forgiven a heretical notion. Our export of American agricultural know-how may be doing the favored countries an ultimate disservice. The extension of simplified crop systems throughout the world cannot fail to magnify pest-control problems. Have we given enough thought to the total results of simplified chemicalized crop systems over vast areas of the world's surface? Possibly a fanciful objection in a period of burgeoning human populations.

If simplification of the ecosystem has produced serious pest problems, the obvious solution to them is to reverse the pattern. Complicate it. The eminent ecologist, Prof. Charles Elton, of Oxford, in a recent book suggests that we both conserve variety and cultivate ecological diversity. He says in fact that we must do so if we are to produce indefinitely from lands now in use. We must do so if our aesthetically satisfying landscapes are to remain. How can we accomplish this "complication"?

We do know how. But before we attempt to do so, we must protect the present. We must conserve variety and prevent more simplification.

The first necessity is to continue quarantine programs to prevent access of the hardy, adaptable organisms that become pests. Experience with such organisms makes clear that our food and fiber production areas are ripe for further invasions. Although the quarantine program cannot be totally successful, it must be counted as necessary until such time as we can make the biological adjustments necessary to minimize pest problems.

In the same light, it becomes necessary to minimize cultivation practices or chemical applications which might lead to further simplification of the fauna. A sizable margin of insurance will be demanded by growers. Such safety margins can in many instances be reduced by utilizing available information on resistant plants, timing of planting, management of water, and so on.

Both of the foregoing are protective measures to be operative while the most important phase is being put into effect. Professor Elton's suggestion—cultivate diversity—must be implemented. Some existing land-use practices already do so; we have a good base from which to proceed. Conservationists and wildlife enthusiasts have already arranged for and continue to speak for refuges, for the legal protection of existing species, for the education of the general public, and for proper utilization of renewable resources. The practices of the Soil Conservation Service have led to diversified landscapes accompanied inevitably by faunal diversity. The efforts of Soil Bank and similar reserve plans will result in this diversity. So also will any change to less intensive land use, such as that now occurring in many parts of the Midwest and South.

But only in the conscious pitting of one living thing against another—biological control—can we directly control pests without the hazards accompanying repetitive chemical applications. Many species of insects and viruses have been introduced into the United States to aid in biological control. Only a few have been truly successful, but these few have repaid the cost of all biological-control efforts to date a thousandfold. Their importance is grossly unappreciated, particularly by industry and government.

To such established controls as the ladybird bettle, University of California entomologists have recently added living insecticides—bacteria and fungi that can be applied when certain pest insects reach damaging numbers. The effect of using biological control agents is, of course, the sought-for complication. Simplification of the ecosystem resulted in the absence of natural checks; we can now complicate the life of a pest without chemical hazard to plants, animals and man and without following the primrose path of ever-increasing simplification of the ecosystem.

Some entomologists, particularly in Canada, have already shown the way to manage complex insect relationships with efficiency and safety. European entomologists now speak of managing the entire plant-insect community. It is called manipulation of the biocenose. The biocenotic environment is varied, complex, and dynamic. Although numbers of individuals will constantly change, no one species will normally reach pest proportions. The special conditions which allow high populations of a single species in a complex ecosystem are rare events. Management of the biocenose or ecosystem should become our goal, challenging as it is.

The way is clear, the conditions ripe, for a shift away from chemical controls and from the oversimplified environments which create the need for them. In many crop environments it is already too late to make the shift. Before the pest-producing, simplified ecosystem becomes so widespread as to insure a constant chemical prophylactic blanket on the all outdoors, we should look to our biological reserves. For the good of us all, chemical techniques must give way to ecological emphasis. The cultivation of ecosystem diversity will yield crop safety, sustained productivity, reduction of chemical hazards, and a landscape much more appealing to the eye.

The Airlift Problem—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin which appeared in the New York Times on March 25, 1960:

THE AIRLIFT PROBLEM—III: MILITARY TRANSPORT STUDIES QUESTIONS OF TACTICS, EQUIPMENT, AND COMMAND

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Military Air Transport Service, which is flying an average of almost 7 million ton-miles daily during the 2 weeks of Exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine, hopes the maneuver will clarify some of its problems.

The exercise, which includes the transportation of more than 20,000 Army troops to Puerto Rico, ends next Monday. From it the Air Force and Army hope to draw some conclusions about the vexing problems of military airlift.

These problems are numerous; some of the more important ones are discussed here.

ROLE OF COMMERCIAL CARRIERS IN MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT

The Military Air Transport Service, under Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, operates for the military forces an airways and air communications service, air weather service, air rescue service, air photographic and charting service, and a strategic airlift force.

Some 992 aircraft and 115,000 persons are assigned to MATS, including 4,000 Navy personnel. Of this total, almost 35,000 persons and 483 aircraft are assigned to so-called strategic passenger and cargo airlift.

To meet the war-plan needs of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, MATS is required to maintain a global air transportation system in a state of peacetime readiness that can instantly be expanded to wartime tempo.

This system has long been the target of commercial air carriers and of congressional critics, who maintain that the service is wasteful and completes unfairly with commercial air carriers.

Yet MATS has some convincing answers. Repeated Pentagon and congressional studies indicate that MATS must maintain almost its present level of operations if it is to meet the war-plans requirements of the Joint Chiefs and if it is to be capable of rapid acceleration to wartime tempo.

Operation expanded

MATS normally flies an average of about 5 hours a plane a day. During the current maneuver this has been expanded to about 8 hours a plane a day, which is regarded as the minimum necessary for wartime operations.

Prior to the Korean war, MATS flight hours, programed at 3 hours a plane a day, were actually less than 2.7 hours.

When the Korean war began the Joint Chiefs ordered an accelerated tempo of 10 to 11 hours a day. It took MATS 11 months to build up to less than 7 hours a day, even though its personnel were reinforced with reserves. It never reached the Joint Chiefs' requirement.

MATS does not want to be caught short again; it feels that it must maintain its present tempo and volume of operations on its global air routes if it is to maintain war readiness.

THE MODERNIZATION OF MATS

MATS flies four types of passenger and cargo aircraft—the Lockheed C–121 Super Constellation; the Douglas C–118 Liftmaster, the Douglas C–124 Globemaster and the Douglas C–133 Cargomaster.

These are all propeller-driven planes. The workhorse of the fleet is the C–124; there are 291 of these in MATS. It is a slow and aging plane, with maintenance headaches, although it is still doing yeoman service. The newest heavyweight cargo lifter—a turboprop aircraft—is the C–133. There are only 29 of these; eventually MATS will have 49.

There is rather general agreement that MATS needs modernization, but the unanswered question is whether an entirely new "ultimate" aircraft should be developed, or whether types of aircraft now or soon to be available should be purchased.

MATS is eager to purchase jets; it believes that so-called swing-tailed versions of the Boeing 707 or Douglas DC–8 commercial jet airliners could be modified and developed for military use, capable of using runways 4,000 feet in length or less. A combination of a turbofan engine and leading edge flaps and boundary layer control could permit short takeoffs and landings.

However, the Army points out that the fuselage of the 707 or DC–8 is not large enough for outsize cargoes and that adequate cargo planes are the bottleneck of the military transport problem.

Moreover, paratroopers cannot jump from any available jet; their minimum flying speed is too high. The Army prefers an improved version of the Lockheed Hercules C–130, which is used by the troop carrier wings of the Tactical Air Command.

TACTICAL AND STRATEGIC AIRLIFT

The problems of airlift are complicated by the overlapping functions of the Tactical Air Command and the Military Air Transport Service. Both operate troop carrier and military cargo aircraft.

The Tactical Air Command utilizes the C–130 and the Fairchild C–123 assault transport. These so-called short-legged aircraft are designed for so-called tactical or assault missions, with troops and cargo combat loaded for jumping or for rapid unloading on an improvised airstrip in an enemy zone.

MATS aircraft, on the other hand, have a so-called strategic mission. They are generally bigger, longer range planes. Paratroopers do not jump from them and cargo is not rigged for parachute dropping, nor is it combat loaded.

MATS planes are generally adapted to transporting troops and supplies to a staging area or friendly base, where the troops can be unloaded and then reloaded into Tactical Air Command assault aircraft that would fly them to the enemy objective.

But developing technology has blurred the once-clear distinction between tactical and strategic. So-called tactical aircraft are now achieving longer and longer ranges.

If a two-purpose plane that could combine both strategic and tactical functions could be developed, airborne troops could be combat loaded in the United States and flown directly to the scene of action anywhere in the world without using intermediate staging bases.

MATS does not believe this is possible without great sacrifice of speed or other important characteristics. The Tactical Air Command and the Army think that it might be feasible in the future.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND COMMAND RELATIONSHIPS

The Army requested some time ago, and apparently was granted, a single point of contact between the Army and its Strategic Army Corps and the Air Force. Instead of dealing with two Air Force agencies—MATS for strategic lift, and the Tactical Air Command for tactical or assault lift—the Tactical Air Command was to be the point of contact for both.

The purport of a directive issued by Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, initially went further than this. It was understood by both the Tactical Air Command and the Army that after the end of Exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine next Monday the Tactical Air Command would, in the future, exercise control over all peacetime maneuvers involving both the Army and Military Air Transport aircraft. This would be true whether the craft were drawn from MATS or Tactical Air Command.

However, partly as a result of the current exercise, there has been some restudy of this understanding. The question of command and organizational relationship between MATS and the Tactical Air Command and between them both and the Army is therefore one of a number of unresolved problems that the lessons of the current maneuver may help to solve.

The Medical Future for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the American Medical Association, predicts a substantial increase in private health insurance coverage for America and for the elderly. He also opposes compulsory retirement at any arbitrary age. He recognizes that in doing so, we are "wasting the vast experience and knowledge of our older people." This is the seventh in a series of articles prepared for Ray Henry and which appeared in many newspapers earlier this year. I commend it to the attention of the members:

THE MEDICAL FUTURE FOR THE AGED

(By Louis M. Orr, M.D., president, American Medical Association)

What is ahead for our older citizens during the next decade?

In many ways, this is a difficult question to answer. For these are times of rapid changes—in our technology, our economy, our scientific knowledge, our common attitudes.

As Americans, we have learned the status quo cannot survive for long in our fast changing 20th century.

The very phenomenon of aging illustrates this.

Back in McKinley's day, relatively few men and women ever reached the age of 65. But today we have nearly 16 million Americans who are that old or older—and their numbers are increasing.

They are the result of a healthier Nation.

And the Nation is healthier because medical and public health progress have reduced the incidence and death rates of most communicable diseases; because infant and maternal mortality rates have been lowered; because the physicians, dietician, bacteriologist, biochemist, and the many other collaborators in the vast teamwork of medical research have all contributed substantially to the reduction of disease.

This fruitful cooperation, if allowed to continue without Government restriction, will continue to work its wonders. Ten years from now, or earlier, we might well break through in the fight against cancer, and also develop new drugs and techniques for combating the cardiovascular diseases.

Such dramatic advances as these cannot be predicted, with any degree of certainty, within a convenient time space. But sooner or later they will come about—and when they do, they will further lengthen lives, thereby swelling the ranks of our older citizens.

One thing is certain: In the decade ahead, people will live longer and healthier lives.

And, on that basis, certain predictions can be made with considerable accuracy:

I predict: there will be a substantial increase in private health insurance coverage. Revolutionary progress has been made since World War II in this area. It will continue.

At the end of 1945, only 32 million people were covered by voluntary health insurance. By the end of 1958, the number had soared to 123 million.

We can expect this to go on, for three reasons:

First, most programs today are so written that they can be continued after the age of 65; second, an increasing number of policies are now being made available to those who are presently 65 or older; and third, voluntary health insurance is becoming an increasingly important fringe benefit in labor's collective bargaining with management.

According to the Health Insurance Association of America, 60 percent of our senior citizens who need and want health insurance will have protection by the end of next year.

Further, that percentage will increase until 75 percent will be covered by 1965, and 90 percent in 1970.

Just as private health insurance met the challenges of 15 years ago, I feel they will meet the challenges of the next decade.

I also predict: that the financing of health care for the aged will be immeasurably aided by an action taken more than a year ago by the AMA's house of delegates.

The Nation's doctors proposed, at that time, to set the fee for their services at a level which will encourage the continued development of insurance and prepayment plans at reduced premiums.

Our State and local medical associations have been moving rapidly to make this policy effective.

I predict: that in the next decade we will make great progress in the provision of home care programs. Teams of physicians, nurses, social workers, and others, will help get the patient home from the hospital earlier, and care for his needs during convalescence and afterward. We are already working to bring that about.

I predict: that the public, once it understands the dangers inherent in any program of compulsory Government health insurance, will reject political medicine in unmistakable fashion. Forand-type legislation, for example, proposes a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and it does so in an inflexible, costly manner.

I predict: that within the next decade, Americans will develop a new and realistic attitude toward the older person. We will realize that chronological age has little meaning and that a human being is forever as young as his capabilities.

I predict: an even healthier and more vigorous old age for added millions of Americans, for tomorrow's elderly people will have lived healthier lives during youth and maturity than those of today. They will have benefited more by the comparatively recent developments in science, medicine, and nutrition, most of which have been since the turn of the century.

Finally, I predict: that compulsory retirement at any arbitrary age will soon become a thing of the past. We Americans are too intelligent, I think, to go on wasting the vast experience and knowledge of our older people.

By 1970, through the voluntary effort of private citizens working together at the community level, I believe we shall have attained our goal of making every American's later years the truly golden years of productivity and enjoyment.

Gallaudet College Honors the Late Mrs. Mary L. Thornberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, Gallaudet College, an outstanding Washington, D.C., institution which is devoted to the education of the deaf and hard of hearing, has paid recognition to the memory of a woman who ceaselessly dedicated her own life to make easier the lives of deaf boys and girls. Gallaudet has named a modern new facility for testing hearing capabilities of students and others the Mary L. Thornberry Hearing and Speech Center. Mrs. Thornberry, the mother of our colleague, HOMER THORNBERRY, was a respected and revered teacher for many years at the Texas School for the Deaf, in Austin. Her dominant desire to help deaf youngsters receive good educations and take a normal place in our society represented more than an academic interest, since she was herself deaf. HOMER THORNBERRY has followed his mother in this mission. He is a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet and gives freely of his time and energy to advance this worthwhile institution. With the facilities provided in the new Mary L. Thornberry Center, where both adults and children are able to have their hearing problems scientifically and carefully analyzed, a significant forward step is being made. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for printing in the RECORD the following article from the Lone Star, a publication of the Texas School for the Deaf, which explains more fully the background of the Mary L. Thornberry Center, and tells of the dedication of the woman who gave it its name:

SPEECH-HEARING CENTER HONORS LATE MRS. MARY L. THORNBERRY

An unassuming little lady from Texas, a teacher in the Texas School for the Deaf for many years, would have been overwhelmed at the mere suggestion that a building unique in its conception, purpose, and design—quite unlike any other in the world—and located on the campus of the world's only college for the deaf, Gallaudet College, in Washington, D.C., should have been named in her honor. But in recent time this building was given the name of Mary L. Thornberry Hearing and Speech Center and subsequently put into service.

The Thornberry Building was planned for specific needs and is especially equipped for auditory testing of the deaf. In order that accurate tests of hearing can be accomplished with students and out patients with varying degrees of hearing impairment, appropriate sound treated rooms are necessary. The exclusion of sound other than those used for measuring hearing must be accomplished as completely as possible.

Two sound-proof suites for use with adults have been incorporated into the center; one set of two rooms is used for clinical work related to testing of hearing and hearing aids; another two-room sound-proof suite is used principally for research in hearing and deafness, while a third 2-room facility is used for testing the hearing of children.

Ventilation of the rooms, which are approximately 12 by 15 feet in size, is accomplished with air conditioning. Specially constructed noise reduction boxes and sound treated ducts have been have been installed in the air conditioning system in order that extraneous sounds from the compression be kept at a minimum. This prevents undesirable noises from being picked up and amplified through wearable hearing aids and high-powered auditory training units.

Special consideration has been given to construction and placement of all rooms in the Thornberry building. Diagnostic and evaluation services, undergraduate training courses, postgraduate courses and research in hearing and deafnes sare carried on in the center.

Mary Lillian Thornberry, bother of U.S. Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY from the 10th Congressional District, Texas, and two abiding desires and ambitions in life, to educate her son and to help the deaf boys and girls under her tutelage at the Texas School for the Deaf. She asked no other recognition or reward.

One of these ambitions was fully realized when she saw her son earn two degrees from the University of Texas. She saw him rise from a page boy in the State capitol to be elected to several city and county offices, later to the Texas Legislature, the office of district attorney, and then to the U.S. Congress, which post he still holds. Perhaps the honor betsowed upon him that meant most to Mrs. Thornberry was his appointment to the board of directors of Gallaudet College. Having been deaf herself, she realized the importance of education and was always an ardent exponent of education for the deaf.

With deaf students from all over the world coming to the only college specially set up for them, and receiving their training in the Mary L. Thornberry Center, her name will be spoken or signed in the far reaches of the world. And from this center young men and women will receive training that will bless the deaf worldwide and continuing from generation to generation.

Tribute to Dan Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, a great honor was recently bestowed upon Dan Lambert of Orrington, Maine, the fifth district commander of the American Legion. In recognition of this tribute I submit to the RECORD an account of the proceedings related thereto as it appeared in the March 10 issue of the National Tribune:

[From the National Tribune, Mar. 10, 1960]

MAINE LEGIONNAIRES TURN OUT EN MASSE IN TRIBUTE TO DAN LAMBERT

Over 200 members of the American Legion and Auxiliary in Maine, Gold Star Mothers and veterans' representatives joined on Washington's Birthday evening to pay tribute to Daniel E. "Dan" Lambert, Orring-

ton, fifth district commander of the American Legion at a special testimonial banquet and reception held at the Brewer Legion Hall. The program was cosponsored by the Daniel E. Geagan Post, American Legion and Auxiliary of Brewer and witnessed one of the largest turnouts of veterans to honor a Legion officer in northeastern Maine in many years.

Charles C. Campbell, Orrington, post commander, and Mrs. Kathryn M. Campbell, unit president, served as cohosts to the program with the banquet being served by the Easter Rebecca Lodge of Brewer under the direction of Mrs. Inez Little, chairman.

MANY MESSAGES OF PRAISE

J. William Rogers, Bangor, served as the toastmaster of the event and read messages of warm congratulations from Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Congressman Clifford G. McIntire, Congressman Frank M. Coffin, Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Gov. John H. Reed of Maine, Sumner G. Whittier, Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administrator; Leonard L. Stevens, Portland, national executive committeeman of the DAV; Dominic Bruno, Togus, VA chief of recreation; John H. Levinsky, Stonington, past State vice commander who was vacation-bound for Florida; William J. Rogers, Auburn, alternate national executive committeeman; Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster of Dexter; James L. Boyle and Nathaniel T. Cobb, Waterville, State adjutant and finance officer, respectively, and Bill H. Fribley, national commander of the DAV.

Distinguished guests included Col. Roger J. Averill, Maine National Guard; M. Sgt. Talcott B. Hull, USAF Public Information Office; Joseph P. Dinsmore, Bangor postmaster; Sumner G. Marshall, Wells, state vice commander; Maurice Parisien, Portland, first district commander; Donald Stone, Portland, first district adjutant; Benjamin Brookman, Bangor, DAV Americanism officer; Mrs. Ruth Jucius, Bar Harbor, State auxiliary membership chairman; Dean S. Reynolds, Jr., Etna, Penobscot County commander; LeRoy Knowlton, Dexter, Piscataquis County commander; William Owen, Blue Hill, Hancock County commander; Mrs. Louise Falkingham, Hampden, State president, American Gold Star Mothers; Arthur P. Ambrose, Dexter, State child welfare chairman; Mrs. Elvenia Magee, Veazie, Penobscot County auxiliary president; O. Sylvester McNally, Bangor, retarded children's group: Mrs. Lottie Parker, Orrington, State community service chairman; Mrs. Donna Fogg, Guilford, junior activities chairman; Anthony J. Rumo, South Portland, national executive committeeman; John M. Robertson, Lewiston, past State commander and chaplain; Roland J. Shanks, Freeport, department sergeant at arms; Lucien Bussiere, Lewiston, post adjutant; John Appleby, Lubec, State vice commander; Mrs. Telma Johns, Carmel, alternate vice president; Theodore A. Johns, Carmel, past district commander; Donald Carr, Belfast, fourth district commander; Mrs. Vera Danforth, Bangor, district civil defense chairman; Ralph M. Merrow, Newport, past State commander.

CITATIONS PRESENTED

A citation was presented by Maine State Civil Defense and Public Safety Director Col. Walter Kennett, who represented Governor Reed. Kennett paid warm tribute to Lambert's efforts in the field of public relations and information in assisting the civil defense program in Maine. Colonel Kennett referred to the Orrington Legion official as a "most dedicated public servant who has given much in the promotion of sound national defense both in the military and civilian fields."

The Reverend John H. Miller, pastor of the Second Congregational Church of South Brewer and chaplain of the Maine National Guard, presented Lambert with a national award of merit from the American National Red Cross. The Reverend Miller termed the guest of honor "a fine Christian gentleman who has consistently done much to promote the full observance of religious and patriotic holidays, and the full heritage of America."

A letter of appreciation was read from the Maine Friends of Retarded Children in appreciation for the support given to the program by District Commander Lambert. He was also cited for his legislative action on behalf of retarded and handicapped children.

After presenting the honored guest's family, which includes Mrs. Elise C. Lambert, R.N., and daughters Cynthia Mildred,, Maureen Patricia, and Margaret Marie with corsages, Cynthia Lambert sang "Galway Bay," and "I Passed by Your Window," as part of the program.

Many gifts from all parts of the fifth district organization were presented and the Daniel E. Geagan post and unit presented Lambert with a leather briefcase.

Fank McDonald, Rockport, State commander of the Veterans of World War I, was presented as well as Arthur Ingersoll, Thomaston, Knox County commander.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS TRIBUTE

Members of the American Gold Star Mothers chapter in the area were in a body during the program and presented District Commander Lambert with a gift in appreciation for his many kindnesses to Gold Star mothers and fathers in the area.

Robert C. MacFarland, Thomaston, State Legion commander, paid the department tribute to the Orrington Legion official for his unselfish work on behalf of the State and National organization and presented him with a personal gift.

AUXILIARY PRESIDENT SPEAKS

Mr. Ruby Tapley, Blaine, State auxiliary president, joined in the program with a few remarks in tribute to the four-time wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II and thanked Lambert for his efforts in support of the Legion program.

The Reverend Maurice Venno, Damariscotta, State Legion chaplain, called attention to the fact that the fifth district organization was one of the top groups in the field of religious emphasis and urged other groups to keep pace with the district leadership. He recited Kipling's "If" in tribute to Lambert.

Mrs. Louise Swan, Dexter, district auxiliary president, was introduced and expressed the thanks to the district auxiliary organization for the many kindnesses shown by the district commander and the warm spirit of cooperation existing between the two district groups.

CALLS FOR STRONG LEADERSHIP

Responding to the tribute, District Commander Lambert called for a strong leadership program on all levels of veterans' affairs and called for an end to the attacks against the Legion by some misinformed groups on the national scene. He told his audience that the testimonial program was not a tribute to Dan Lambert, but rather evidence that solid, good comradeship and brotherhood exists in the ranks of the American Legion for all to see.

Following this, Cynthia Lambert closed the program with the rendition of the song "Bless This House." The Reverend John H. Miller pronounced the invocation and the Reverend Maurice Venno gave the benediction.

Serving as hostesses were Mrs. Marguarite Rice, Mrs. F. Katherine Hay, Mrs. Elsie Wilson, and Miss Bonita Campbell. Eva Frost had charge of the guest book and Elizabeth Rogers was in charge of the gift table.

J. William Rogers served as general chairman of the event, assisted by Robert C. Reed, Elias Ferris, Ralph C. Ham, Henry F. King, William F. Lawlor, Ralph Winslow, Earl Parker, J. Elmer Hay, James G. Hachey, Sr., and Mrs. Kathryn M. Campbell, unit president, and Charles C. Campbell, post c ommander.

The Aged, Poor, and Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, any measure as controversial as the Forand bill, unfortunately, brings forth arguments on both sides which tend to be extreme. It is, therefore, encouraging to find a statement on this subject which is temperate and represents a calm and objective review of the situation. Such a statement is represented in the following thoughtful editorial appearing in a recent edition of the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 4, 1960]

THE AGED, POOR, AND SICK

Congress is under heavy pressure to provide hospital, nursing and medical care for people over 65.

President Eisenhower is resisting this compulsory plan and for this he is being accused of a heartless attitude toward the aged, sick, and poor.

Now nobody will deny the obligation of our society to care for those who cannot care for themselves, especially among the elderly.

But the plan chiefly at issue before Congress goes far beyond this. It takes in everybody covered by the present social security system—rich or poor or neither. By the same token, it excludes an estimated 4 million who are on the outside merely because Congress never included them in the social security system.

The money to pay for this would come from a higher tax on everyone now under social security, even those wage earners who might be poor or burdened themselves with heavy family medical and hospital bills. Moreover there is grave doubt that the proposed tax would be adequate to foot the costs.

These and other proposals for broadening the social security system may be highly desirable. But it hardly is necessary, in providing for those in serious need, also to offer handouts to the vast majority who already have provided for themselves, or are capable of taking care of themselves.

Millions of Americans have a stake in the social security system. Anything that jeopardizes its soundness jeopardizes their investment and their retirement security. Brash spending by the Government already has depreciated savings, insurance, and pensions by more than 50 percent since 1939.

Before Congress acts, it should know that it has a plan fair to all, soundly finnaced and one which won't defeat the purposes for which it is intended. An election year seldom is the best time to get that kind of legislation.

The End of an Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this past week one of Wisconsin's leading citizens passed on.

Mr. Hamilton Roddis, chairman of the board of the Roddis Plywood Corp. of my home city of Marshfield, Wis., died on Sunday, March 27, after an illness of several months. During his 84 years, he made a tremendous contribution not only to the city of Marshfield but to our State.

The March 29, 1960, edition of the Marshfield News-Herald carried a very fine tribute to this outstanding American. The editorial reads a follows:

THE END OF AN ERA

With the passing of Hamilton Roddis, Marshfield has come to end of an era—an era in which the individual was able to build a great industry as a result of his own innate ability and personality and without benefit of corporate surroundings and all their modern trappings.

This community witnessed the passing of other industrial giants, for really such they were, in the person of the Uphams and the Connors. Their time ran out about the same period as the timber resources on which they thrived gave out.

This was not true of Hamilton Roddis. After piloting the Roddis firm through economic seas which wrecked other companies, he adopted modern methods to expand the firm's holdings until, at his death, they reached into Canada and to most of the States of the Union. He surrounded himself with capable assistants who pushed production to coincide with sales of the company's nationally and internationally accepted forest products. Even though outside capital helped to finance and develop the Roddis company, and despite the weight of added years, Hamilton Roddis continued until his death to be the real director and leader of this most important Marshfield industry.

His engrossment in the affairs of his company never prevented him from taking an active interest in his community and his church. A Christian gentleman, his religious and educational philanthropies were noteworthy, even though never acclaimed by him or his family. A family of five daughters and a son bear the imprint of their rearing by parents whom they will ever respect and revere, just as this community has always paid respectful homage to them.

And so Marshfield parts most reluctantly and sorrowfully with this man who gave a half century of his life to the community's largest employer of labor and an industry that has given the city wide and favorable publicity. We have, as a community, wondered what Marshfield would be like without Hamilton Roddis. We have hoped and believed those who succeed him will carry on in the fine tradition he established, even to continue to expand and develop the nucleus which he and his father, ahead of him, nurtured from the days of the Hatteburgs, into the trying depression and war years, and until this moment when the Roddis Plywood Corp. has become internationally known.

H. R.'s heart always was in Marshfield. He expanded his energies here to bring about expansion of his plant both in point of production and sales. It is the earnest hope and prayer of this community that his successors will continue the policy to which he held so steadfastly.

A Postal Pay Raise Is in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert in the Appendix of this RECORD a statement made by Andrew T. Walker, president of Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, in support of its fight for a postal pay raise. Although this statement was submitted to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in connection with its current hearings, I believe it is of sufficient interest and importance to warrant the attention of the Members of Congress:

A POSTAL PAY RAISE IS IN ORDER—"MOONLIGHTING" COMMON AMONG POSTAL EMPLOYEES

(By Andrew T. Walker, president, Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen)

(A presentation before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearing on Federal and postal employees salary increase.)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew T. Walker, president of Branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, the oldest active postal employee union in America. I am nearing the 80-year mark, having completed 50 years of service in the Post Office Department, and continued on as president by a change in the association constitution for the past 10 years.

I am indeed grateful to have this opportunity of presenting this statement to you for the record in behalf of such a vastly important subject as is being considered before this group.

There are at least 40 varied industries granting its employees wage increases in 1959. Leading the group is the airlines and coal mining sections with 15-percent increases. Others include steel, trucking, utilities, wholesale and retail trade, cement, food and beverage, printing and publishing, textile, clerical units in manufacturing industries, combined services, electrical, stone, clay, and glass; shipping, furniture, and others.

Postal employees cannot strike in an effort to secure an equitable salary increase from their employer, the U.S. Government. Without a doubt the tightfisted fiscal approach of the administration toward its 2½ million employees' appeal for a pay hike is endangering the related functions of the Nation's civil agencies by sharply reducing the employees' morale and spirit to do more than a required day's work. That once proud feeling of belonging to the governmental family of workers, particularly in the postal service, is quickly fading away; that feeling of dignity and importance associated with Federal employment has been replaced with an attitude that Congress and the executive branch of Government does not care or concern itself with him other than he is a statistic on an employment chart.

Nearly half of our postal workers are "moonlighters" (second jobholders) and perhaps the figure is quite higher here in the East, particularly in New York City, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and other adjacent cities.

Turnover of young, desirable employees from low-salaried civil service jobs is alarming. Particularly in the light when many municipal and State governments grant their employees some sort of relief in salary or reduced pension contributions, in either case permitting more take-home pay. False economy that denies a living wage is forcing experienced employees out of the postal service and from other Federal agencies as well, to be replaced by new men who must be trained at the expense of the Government.

POSTAL MEN AND WOMEN ARE TRAINED

It is true to say that in but few trades is it more difficult to gain perfection for advancement than in postal work. The clerk must qualify on two or three and sometimes four of the several aspects of mail distribution. These operations include schemes of separation necessitating months of study at home and then qualifying by examinations. The postal schemes involve separations of mail to all cities served by certain railroads and all other railroads connected through transfer points; separation of mail for an entire city to respective delivery stations; separation of mail for all carrier routes out of a given carrier station and other distribution patterns. A clerk's knowledge must also include, depending on his assignment, mail classification, rates of postage, amounts of fees, serving the public with courtesy and patience, assuming financial responsibility for sums of money and registered mail. I am also mindful of the letter carrier who is also doing an excellent and outstanding job. In addition to knowing his route thoroughly, he must start his day at an early hour and in any kind of good or miserable weather and represent to the public the good will ambassador of the postal service. The mail handler, the custodial employee all the way down the line is doing a faithful job.

Civil service examinations are constantly being held throughout the Nation and in most instances on a continual filing basis—no closing date. This points up sharply the lack of applicants. A few years ago Mr. James P. Googe, the Regional Director of the Second Civil Service Region, admitted that: "Postmasters frequently report increased difference in securing enough eligibles to fill subclerks and subcarrier vacancies. In some areas, big wage scales and fringe benefits offered by private industry make it almost impossible to fill positions in the local post offices." I do believe that that situation is true today. Some improvement in fringe benefits has taken place in Federal employment, I will admit, but such improvement does not put meat and potatoes before the employee's wife and children.

PUBLIC SERVICE

The salary crisis in the postal service must be faced and solved with equivocation, gentlemen, and the simple facts are that the postal workers have earned the pay raise. True, it costs the taxpayers, and incidentally that includes the 2½ million Federal employees as well, money to operate the postal service but we should be mindful that it also represents an outlay of expenditures by the Congress for the operations of the White House, the Judiciary System, the Commerce Department, the Army and the Navy and other agencies. Also that very little direct revenue comes into the Treasury coffers from the functions of many of the other agencies. It is a basic understanding that the costs and operations of these public services are taken for granted. Yet, with the income of about $2.5 million a year from the Post Office Department there is current talk of this so-

called postal deficit. It is obvious that such revenue as is produced by the postal service is not duplicated by any other agency.

POSTAL RATES

The issue of increased postage rates is not related with the pressing problem of postal wages—no more than the operational costs of running the Department of Interior or the Navy Yard with the salaries of its employees. Yet, it is an important subject and one to be deliberated upon by the committee at a later date, as I understand will happen. The citizenry of our Republic have always looked upon the postal service as a function created by our Constitution and for the people. Whether or not it pays for itself in terminology of time, cost, and production is a matter for the Congress.

MECHANIZATION

We do not in the least have any objection against modernizing the mail and the allocation of funds for such equipment if it makes for improved service and provides for ample mail provisions but we do not subscribe to any counting system which will place a daily hardship upon the individual mail distributor. Electronic research must go forward in keeping with the times to prepare the way for the avalanche of mail of tomorrow. It is said that within the next score of years the annual volume of mail is expected to double the 66 billion pieces of mail calculated for the fiscal year ending this June 30. The massive mechanization is on the road and the Department is expected to keep it rolling. It began 11 years ago with the cost of $49 million in 1949. This year the research spending is expected to total $11.5 million. An idea of how advanced this modern postal program is and will be is a statement by Mr. Rollin Barnard, Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities. He said, "In Project Gateway almost all the equipment to go into Gateway has got to be invented." Gateway is a plan to build at Oakland, Calif., the most modern postal facility possible.

MAIL FIRMS GLAD TO HAVE POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR SECOND JOB

Many of the mail order firms, and mail rooms of large concerns in the east particularly in the metropolitan area of New York have come to appreciate the mail distribution abilities of our postal clerks. Here is a readymade corps of men and women trained by the post office on city and State mail schemes available at hourly rates anywhere from $1 an hour upward. The firm not alone knows a good bargain when it sees one but is getting an experienced and honest employee at half his worth, and at hours in the evening as well. In some of these firms thousands of contest letters are handled which contain money. Sometimes mailings of valuable certificates are handled by these part-time postal employees and the firms do not worry because they know the postal employee is trustworthy. I hope in time that dual job work by postal employees will be eliminated. It is as you know, gentlemen, occasioned by the aftermath of a substandard wage in Government employment. Records will show that bank and loan companies show an all record high in loans to postal and Federal employees. Also, records will further show that many employees have borrowed on their insurance policies. Federal and State credit unions in various postal employee unions have taxed themselves in extending loans. I can cite my own Federal credit union in Branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen. Up to today we have borrowed out in loans every single dollar and there is a waiting list. It is a healthy sign for the credit union not to have any idle cash but a sad commentary indeed that our postal employees have to borrow so heavily.

I do not believe it relevant here to speak of the billions for foreign relief but it sometimes rings an unfair note when we think of our loyal governmental family getting inadequate salaries and have to exist below the American standard of living, while billions of dollars are sent overseas.

FRIENDS IN CONGRESS

The postal worker has, I believe, a tremendous range of friendship in the Congress for the reason that he is and always has been one of the loyal and hard working of all public servants. Also, that when he appeals to Congress he is reasonable in his requests for equitable treatment. We stand today, united within all postal and Federal groups asking you, the members of this committee, to meet reasonableness with reasonableness. Our request to you to support the deserving Morrison pay bill is in keeping with the times. I thank you.

Seats in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, 2 days after his 99th birthday, the following letter of Mr. Walter F. Willcox, of Ithaca, N.Y., appeared in the Ithaca Journal of March 24, 1960:

SEATS IN THE HOUSE

EDITOR, THE JOURNAL:

This letter will argue that Congress went astray some 20 years ago when it changed from Daniel Webster's method of redistributing seats in the House of Representatives after a census to the present one. The change was made in order to enable the State of Arkansas to retain a seat which otherwise would go to Michigan and also enable the party in power to retain a seat which otherwise it would probably lose.

The present method was devised by Dr. J. A. Hill, who succeeded me at the Bureau of the Census in 1902, and was turned down by the Director of the Census because he thought its mathematics too hard for Congress. Thereupon Hill listed the support of mathematicians at his alma mater; they improved his method and, when Congress learned that it would give a seat to Arkansas and the majority party, which the old one would give to Michigan and probably to the minority party, it adopted the new method by a strictly party vote except for the Michigan representatives.

The present method allots about one seat after each census to a small State to which a large State has a stronger claim. For example, after 1950 it gave to Kansas a seat, to which California was entitled. Either method would have given the two States together 36 seats. The question was whether Kansas should have 5 and California 31, as the Webster method would have divided them, or Kansas 6 and California 30, as the new method did divide them.

The Constitution requires seats to be distributed among the States "according to their respective numbers" or population. If the population of these two States in 1950 is divided into 36th's, Kansas had 5.49 and California 30.51, so the large State had the better claim to the disputed seat and the Webster-Willcox method gives better results than the Hill-Harrington one.

The method which Congress had adopted after the census of 1910, and rejected later, was devised by Senator Daniel Webster. His rule was: "The population of each State shall be divided by a common divisor, and, in addition to the number of members resulting from such division, a member shall be allowed to each State whose fraction exceeds a moiety of the divisor."

The difficulty with this rule lies in the key words, common divisor, which neither Webster nor anyone else for 80 years told Congress how to find. Then I found the common divisor needed for the figures of 1910, prepared, with the help of my students in statistics at Cornell, apportionment tables based on it, and took them to Washington. Congress at once accepted them as better than anything the Bureau of the Census had to offer.

After the census of 1920, Congress was deadlocked and no apportionment bill passed, but if the deadlock had been broken and Congress had used the present method, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Vermont would each have received a seat to which New York, North Carolina, and Virginia had a better claim. After no other census, I believe, would the difference between the results of the two methods have been as great.

WALTER F. WILLCOX.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Who Needs the Interest Rate Ceiling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in June 1959 the Congress received a message from the President of the United States urging the adoption of legislation repealing the archaic 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on marketable bonds issued by the Federal Government. During the time that this legislative recommendation was pending before the Committee on Ways and Means it was made abundantly clear that the interest rate ceiling itself did not keep interest rates down, that without a ceiling the Secretary of the Treasury would still endeavor to borrow at the lowest possible rate, and that retention of the ceiling is inflationary in that the Government is compelled to borrow in the short-term market in competition with the borrowing needs of small business and the American consumer.

In Newsweek magazine for April 11, 1960, the distinguished economist and political analyst, Mr. Henry Hazlitt, has written a perceptive commentary on the failure of Congress to act on this important legislation. He raises the question: What sense is there in retaining the interest rate ceiling? He goes on to point out that the adverse implications of its retention are:

First, administrative, in that the Federal Government is not able to properly manage the public debt; and, second, economic in that the only way in which the artificial ceiling could be made effective is by having the Federal Reserve pursue the inflationary course of pegging the Federal bond market.

TYING ITS OWN HANDS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In the last 2 or 3 months there has been a sharp fall in interest rates. As a result it is being frequently said in Washington and in the press that the U.S. Treasury's efforts to get Congress to remove the statutory limit of 4¼ percent on long-term Government bonds have become altogether futile; that the proposed legislation is in indefinite eclipse, and that the whole dispute has become pointless. But before we so hastily bury the issue it might be wise to ask if it is really dead.

It is true that a few months ago some long-term Treasury issues were selling at prices to yield about 5 percent and that within recent weeks some have been selling to yield less than 4¼ percent. It is true that the Government's 91-day bills, which sold at rates to yield 4.75 percent in early January, have recently been put out at yields of only 2.79 percent.

The need for congressional action looks less urgent than it did a few months ago. But it remains no less important. It would be, in fact, dangerous for Congress to postpone it. In the recent high interest rates Congress got an unmistakable warning. It will have to bear full responsibility for the consequences if it ignores that warning. President Eisenhower raised the issue in a message as early as last June. It became more urgent after he raised it. If interest rates can fall unexpectedly they can also rise unexpectedly. The latest issue of long-term bonds that the Treasury attempted—the 4 percents of 1969, put out in 1957—rose to 110 to yield about 2.94 within a year of their sale. Less than 2 years after that they had declined to about 94, at which their yield was 4.71 percent.

WHY KEEP IT?

Instead of asking what need or point there is in removing the statutory interest-rate ceiling, we should be asking what need or point there is in keeping it. If the ceiling were repealed, no harm whatever would follow. It would not in the least increase the interest rates the Government would have to pay. The Secretary of the Treasury, as now, would not try to borrow at the highest rates possible but at the lowest rates possible, in accordance with his plain duty.

But though the statutory ceiling does no good, it retains great possibilities for harm. Last week the Treasury felt obliged to offer the 4¼-percent ceiling rate for new bonds. When interest rates on Government long-term bonds are above 4¼ percent, it forces the Treasury to borrow at short term (less than 5 years). This leads to congestion in the market for short-term securities, forces up interest rates on such securities, tends to raise the average rate at which the Government can borrow, and prevents the Treasury from achieving a manageable balance in maturities.

PRESCRIBING INFLATION

Two issues are involved here—the administrative and the economic. The administrative issue is whether the terms, maturities, balance, timing, and interest rates of 50 or more different issues of Government securities should be determined by Treasury experts, in daily touch with the money market, or whether these decisions should be prescribed blindly and far in advance by a lay Congress concerned with a hundred other matters. The 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds was written into the law more than 40 years ago. Fortunately for us now, that ceiling was not imposed, as it consistently might have been, on short-term as well as long-term borrowing. Fortunately, also, by historic accident, the statutory ceiling we now have is the 4¼ percent imposed in 1918, and not the 3½ percent earlier fixed by Congress in 1917.

Administratively, it is folly for the Government to tie its own hands. But the economic case against the ceiling is even more serious. The only way interest rates can be arbitrarily held down to the ceiling (even temporarily) is by an increase in the money supply, either directly, or indirectly by forcing the Federal Reserve banks to return to the pegging of interest rates by buying Government bonds and monetizing the national debt. In effect, this is what Senator DOUGLAS and his congressional committee have been proposing. The failure of Congress to remove the ceiling now can only undermine confidence in the dollar both at home and abroad.

Need for Funds To Implement the Poultry Products Inspection Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter sent to me by my constituent, Mr. Peter F. Manos, of the Morton Frozen Foods Division of the Continental Baking Co., at Rye, N.Y., concerning the need for appropriating adequate funds to implement the Poultry Products Inspection Act:

MORTON FROZEN FOODS,
Rye, N.Y., April 4, 1960.

Re Poultry Products Inspection Act.

The Honorable EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOOLEY: I am a resident of your congressional district residing at 24 County Road, Mamaroneck, N.Y. and a products marketing manager for the Morton Frozen Foods division of Continental Baking Co. We process and sell frozen chicken and turkey pot pies and dinners.

I understand the House Appropriations Committee is currently holding hearings on appropriations as presented in the President's budget. These include appropriations to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for administration of the Poultry Products Inspection Act. The President's budget included an amount approximately the same as was appropriated last year for carrying out the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

Unfortunately, the amount that was appropriated last year was not sufficient to provide inspection as provided by that act. Because of lack of funds the Department took administrative action to limit its inspection to the slaughtering process and denied inspection to those operations which are classified as further processing.

Both the Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Inspection Act require products to be inspected before they can be moved in interstate commerce. The meat inspection division provided such inspectors at the processing plants as well as at the slaughtering operations.

This appears to me to be discriminatory and unrealistic. Furthermore, the American consumer is not afforded the protection that is provided by the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

I believe the only reasonable solution is an adequate appropriation to carry out inspection as authorized and directed by the Congress in the Poultry Products Inspection Act. I understand that only about $500,000 or $600,000 in addition to that requested in the budget would be required.

I would consider it a personal favor if you will urge members of the Appropriation Committee to grant an adequate appropriation for this purpose. I believe this will be a real public service.

Very truly yours,

PETER F. MANOS.

The Angel of Marye's Heights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina has produced many famous and illustrious sons, some of whom have received the acclaim of the world during their own time, and achieved their place in the history of this Nation. I could name many, including President Andrew Jackson, who were born in my own congressional district in Lancaster County, S.C., and who always claimed to be born in Lancaster County. But aside from those who have been acclaimed either for military achievement or leadership in the field of government, there are others whose deeds, not hitherto well publicized to the world, inspire the greatest admiration, and whose contributions are forever written in the sacred pages listing the good deeds of mankind.

I speak particularly of a Confederate soldier by the name of Richard Kirkland, born in the upper part of Kershaw County, S.C., and who enlisted as a private in the South Carolina Volunteers, Army of the Confederate States of America, when he was merely a boy. I would not use my own words to account his heroism, but plagiarize with his permission, on an account of his deeds sited by a great Virginian and a dedicated historian, Dr. Richard N. Lanier of Fredericksburg, Va. Dr. Lanier's devotion to the promotion or remembrances of brave men and great events, and his knowledge of history, is inspiring to all of us. He is presently engaged in a most worthy undertaking, organizing and spearheading a drive to promote a monument to be erected to Richard Kirkland on the battlefields of Fredericksburg, for his heroic acts at the battle of Fredericksburg on December 13, 1862.

I include here as part of my remarks a speech given by Dr. Lanier at Camden, S.C., and other places entitled "The Angel of Marye's Heights," and also include a poem about Richard Kirkland:

THE ANGEL OF MARYE'S HEIGHTS

(By Dr. Richard N. Lanier)

The story of one of the most heroic and humane acts ever to be displayed on a field of battle will be portrayed in granite and bronze on December 13, 1962.

This message will be in the form of a memorial to be erected to Richard Kirkland, "Angel of Marye's Heights," for his heroic

acts at the Battle of Fredericksburg, December 13, 1862.

The Civil War Centennial Committee has decided not to attempt to reenact any part of the battle in its program commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Fredericksburg to be held on December 13, 1962. But rather would the committee and the People of Virginia and South Carolina expend their energies in giving to their fellow countrymen and the world the story of Richard Kirkland who fought here and hallowed the ground upon which this bloody battle was fought.

Richard Kirkland's commanding officer on that day was Gen. Joseph B. Kershaw of Camden, S.C.

At the foot of Marye's Heights, west of Fredericksburg, Va., is a road known as the Sunken Road. It derived its name from the fact that it was flanked on both sides by a stone wall. The wall on the west side of the road is a retaining wall, while the wall on the east side is a property wall.

General Lee at once saw the value of this road as a natural fortification of almost impregnable proportions. Lee's plan was to place Gen. T. R. R. Cobb with 2,500 seasoned troops from Georgia to hold this position.

General Cobb placed his riflemen four deep behind the stone wall facing the Federals. When the troops in the front line fired their muskets they would drop back to reload and another soldier with loaded musket would take his place. Later in the afternoon when the charges of the Federals became more intense, more fire power was needed, the depth of Cobb's riflemen was extended to six deep.

The battlefield extended eastward from the stone wall to "Federal Hill," a colonial estate on the outskirts of the city of Fredericksburg,, one quarter mile distance from the Sunken Road. This was the battleline on which the troops of Hooker and Summer formed. At noon the Federal troops moved on the left wing of Lee's army under General Longstreet which was heavily entrenched on Marye's Heights. The Federals knew nothing about the fortifications on the Sunken Road until Cobb's men opened fire on them at pointblank range.

You know the story of the six courageous charges made by the Army of the Potomac, and how the ranks of the Northern army were so decimated that it has been estimated that 40 percent of the troops under Sumner and Hooker who participated in this battle lay dead or wounded on this field. General Longstreet was moved to remark to General Lee, "Such bravery is worth of success." General Lee said "our men I fear cannot stand the pressure of these charges much longer. I fear the Federals might break through."

General Cobb fell mortally wounded early in the afternoon. His troops were exhausted and low on ammunition. General Longstreet ordered the South Carolina troops to reinforce the Georgia troops. It was then General Kershaw moved in and assumed command of the troops on the Sunken Road. The South Carolina and Georgia troops continued the fight through the 13th and 14th. It was at this time, on the afternoon of December 14, that a young lad of 19 years, Sgt. Richard Kirkland, performed his heroic deed, beyond the line of duty.

Richard Kirkland was the son of a farmer in the upper part of Kershaw County, S.C. He enlisted as a private in the South Carolina Volunteers when merely a boy. In 1862 he was made a sergeant. It is here our story begins.

On the enemy side of the stone wall in this sector, Sike's division of U.S. regulars lay. All day on December 14 the skirmishing was incessant. The temperature was 8 degrees below zero. Between the lines and the wall the dead and wounded Federals lay.

The agonizing moans and cries of the wounded and dying calling for "Water" had lasted all night and night. Dick, probably more sensitive than his comrades, stood it until he could do so no longer. He went to his company commander, Capt. John D. Kennedy, Company E of the 2d South Carolina Volunteers. Captain Kennedy advised the young sergeant that he would have to get permission from General Kershaw. General Kershaw was in the north room, on the second floor of the Stevens house surveying the field of battle when young Kirkland approached him. "General," he said, "I can't stand it any longer, I want your permission to go and give those poor men out there some water." General Kershaw regarded him for a moment with a feeling of profound admiration and said, "Kirkland, don't you know you would get a bullet through your head the moment you stepped over that wall"? "Yes, sir," he said, "I know that, but if you will me go, I am willing to try it." After a pause the general said: "Kirkland, I ought not to allow you to run such a risk, but the sentiment which actuates you is so noble, that I will not refuse your request, trusting that God may protect you; you may go." General Kershaw afterwards said, "I felt when I gave young Kirkland permission to go over the wall, that I was signing his death warrant."

The young sergeant's eyes lighted up with pleasure. He said, "Thank you, sir," and ran rapidly down the stairs. The general heard him pause for a moment and then return up the stairs. He thought that Kirkland's heart had failed him. But he was mistaken. The sergeant stopped at the door. "General, can I show a white handkerchief?" The general slowly shook his head, saying emphatically: "No, Kirkland, you can't do that." "All right, sir," he said, "I'll take the chance." Dick without further hesitation, gathered all the canteens he could carry, hastily filled them with water, and without rifle, side arms or a white flag, went over the top of the stone wall. With bated breath and profound anxiety General Kershaw watched as Richard Kirkland sprinted to the nearest wounded soldier. He knelt down, tenderly lifted the drooping head to his own noble breast, placed the canteen to the parched lips of the soldier, pouring the cooling life-giving water down the fevered throat. Dick gently lowered the wounded soldier to the ground, placed his knapsack under his head for a pillow, straightened out the shattered leg, and after covering the soldier with his overcoat, replaced his empty canteen with a full one, then turned to another sufferer.

By this time Dick's mission of mercy was well understood by the Federal troops whose comrades were lying wounded and dying in front of the stone wall. The young Confederate was not filching their dead but bringing succor to the wounded and dying.

All firing stopped on both sides. A mighty cheer rent the air. From all parts of the field arose fresh cries, "water, water; for God sake water." More piteous still the mute appeal of some who could only feebly lift a hand to say, here too, is life and suffering.

When Dick exhausted his supply of water, he went back over the stone wall, refilling his canteens. At this point firing was resumed on both sides. But when the lad in gray uniform appeared again on top of the wall all firing was stopped and the cheering was resumed.

For an hour and a half did this ministering angel pursue his labor of mercy, nor did he cease to go and return until he had relieved all the suffering and the wounded in front of the stone wall.

Greater love hath no man than he risk his life to relieve the suffering of a fellowman.

Thus the Christlike deed that Sgt. Richard Kirkland performed on that afternoon in December 1862 saved many a life and his name became legend on the lips of the soldiers of both the North and the South.

Little remains to be told. The next spring Richard Kirkland was with Lee and Jackson at Chancellorsville. Then Gettysburg. Here again he distinguished himself in battle and was promoted to a lieutenant. At Chickamauga he fell mortally wounded in the hour of victory. Shot through the heart and with blood pouring from the wound in his side and mouth, his last thoughts and words were for the safety of his men. "Save yourselves men, let me be. I am done for. Tell my folks I died right."

He was but a youth when called away and had never formed those ties from which might have resulted in a posterity to enjoy his fame and bless his country. But he has bequeathed to the American youth, yea to the world, an example which dignified our common country.

When the monument is erected to Richard Kirkland on the field of battle in front of the stone wall at the foot of Marye's Heights in Fredericksburg, Va., where more than 8,000 soldiers in blue were killed or wounded, it will be unique in the annals of battlefields. Monuments have been erected to thousands of fighters. Hundreds of soldiers in bronze stand with uplifted swords or raised rifles with fixed bayonets as though going into the fray, but the monument to Richard Kirkland will honor the rarest and noblest quality that a man may possess, that quality called sympathy which will uplift a man so that he is ready to lay down his life that his fellowman may not suffer.

It is this heritage that Richard Kirkland has left to the people of all ages.

The words of the British military historian Henderson, written at the death of "Stonewall" Jackson, are equally appropriate in the eulogy of Richard Kirkland. "The fame of Richard Kirkland is no longer the exclusive property of South Carolina, Virginia, or the South, but has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American."

THE ANGEL OF MARYE'S HEIGHTS

(By Walter A. Clarke of Georgia)

A sunken road and a wall of stone
And Cobb's grim line of gray
Lay still at the base of Marye's Heights
On the morn of a winter's day.

On the plains below, the blue lines glow,
And the bugle rings out clear,
As with bated breath they march to death
And a soldier's honored bier.

And then from out of the battle smoke
There falls on the lead-swept air,
From the whitening lips that are ready to die
The pietous moan and the plaintive cry,
For "water" everywhere.

And into the presence of Kershaw brave
There comes a fair-faced lad,
With quivering lips,
As his cap he tips,
"I can't stand this," he said.

"Stand what?" the general sternly said,
As he looked on the field of slaughter;
"To see those poor boys dying out there,
With no one to help them, no one to care
And crying for "water! water!"

If you'll let me go, I'll give them some";
"Why boy, you're simply mad;
They'll kill you as soon as you scale the wall
In this terrible storm of shell and ball,"
The general kindly said.

"Please let me go," the lad replied;
"May the Lord protect you, then,"
And over the wall in the hissing air,
He carried comfort to grim despair,
And balm to the stricken men.

Like Daniel of old in the lion's den,
He walked through the murderous air,
With never a breath of the leaden storm
To touch or to tear his gray-clad form,
For the hand of God was there.

And I am sure in the Book of Gold,
Where the blessed Angel writes,
The names that are blest of God and men,
He wrote that day with his shining pen,
Then smiled and lovingly wrote again
"The Angel of Marye's Heights."

Panama Continues Tension Over Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Richard Fryklund as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 30, 1960. Mr. Fryklund is military affairs reporter for the Star and has just returned from Panama where he talked to American officials and Panamanian leaders.

The article follows:

THE CHANGING HEMISPHERE—PANAMA CONTINUES TENSION OVER CANAL

(By Richard Fryklund)

Almost all Panamanians will tell you that the slim shape of their country is their greatest natural resource—and that they ought to profit from it, just as Arab countries profit from their oil.

And they also will tell you that the Canal Zone treaty was imposed on them unfairly in 1903 and that it should be revised completely.

These two national convictions run counter to firm beliefs of the U.S. Government. The opposing points of view already have been translated into several rock-throwing incidents on the Canal Zone borders, and more demonstrations are expected the first week in May.

DIFFERENCES ON BOTH SIDES

American and Panamanian officials are split on the best way to handle the dispute. The State Department suggests some modest compromise. The Panama Canal Co., for all practical purposes an independent Federal agency, recommends standing firm on the existing contract with Panama.

Panama's "first families," who run the government, toyed with violence last fall but now counsel legal pressure. But the rabble-rousers, Panamanian, Cuban, Egyptian and Communist say demonstrations have paid off and urge more of the same.

Most people concerned predict trouble ahead. Almost all the military power is on the side of the United States, of course; but demonstrators and saboteurs could interrupt use of the vital canal, and "anti-colonial" demonstrations could undercut American policy elsewhere in the world. The incidents already have hurt, American diplomats say.

At stake are: Low-cost passage from ocean to ocean by the world's shippers; America's standing as a moral leader in the cold war; and a contract.

NONPROFIT SERVICE

This country and the Panamanians look at the canal in different ways. The company runs it, by American law, as a nonprofit service to the world. About 60 percent of the canal traffic is American, but the whole world benefits from low tolls.

Tolls have not been raised in a half-century. And as long as the company can remain in the black and continue slowly to retire its original debt they won't be raised.

But the Panamanians see the canal as an exploitation of their country's geography. Extremists say Panama should share 50–50 in the canal's gross, just as Middle Eastern countries split the take with Western companies pumping oil from beneath the deserts. Panamanian moderates don't talk 50–50, but they do say payments to Panama should be increased.

Exactly what the extremists mean by 50–50 is not clear. Is it 50 percent of the tolls, which run about $45 million a year? Or of gross profits, which in the peculiar canal setup would be impossible to measure? No one knows.

In any case, it would be many times the roughly $2 million a year Panama is now paid for the concession.

Any such increase would boost tolls or would come directly from American taxpayers.

ISSUE IN POLITICS

If the United States says, "No," Panamanians say there will be trouble. All three candidates for president in the May elections are running on a platform of "Get more from Uncle Sam." These candidates all represent the country's business interests. The businessmen have run Panama for generations in traditional strong-arm Latin American style.

But even if they should lose in a quick revolution or gradual evolution to broader democracy, the alternative national leaders are even wilder in their demands that Panama should get more out of the canal.

To compound the problem, the extremists have combined nationalism with profits. They not only want 50–50 but they want Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone to be recognized.

Some veteran American observers in Panama and the Canal Zone say the extremists are only saying what the moderates are thinking. Every Panamanian leader, it is said, has a step-by-step program which calls for a greater and greater share of the canal profits, token recognition of sovereignty, then real exercise of sovereignty, then participation in the running of the canal and finally full ownership of the canal and abolition of the Canal Zone.

CONCESSIONS MADE IN PAST

This country already has made some compromise gestures. Concessions have been economic. For example, Panamanian merchants have been given a greater share of company business. And some State Department people believe more concessions may be desirable—perhaps an increase in the payments to Panama and the flying of the Panamanian flag somewhere in the Canal Zone.

These concessions, in the best guess of many Americans in Panama, could keep reasonable peace through the term of the next President. But canal company employees, who are organized in a strong and effective Washington lobby, say concessions will only tempt the Panamanians into more demonstrations. They say the existing treaty should be enforced in the same way as any other valid contract.

The company, in general, recommends a firm policy.

Even the compromisers see a day coming when reasonable concessions will not be enough. The Panamanian people are becoming more aroused by agitators from the Castro Government of Cuba, by the Egyptian Minister in Panama who has been so active in urging Panamanian control of the canal that he recently was rebuked by the Panamanian Foreign Minister, by the handful of Communists active out in the provinces and by Aquilino Boyd and Ernesto Castillero, two violently anti-American politicians.

GOT OUT OF HAND

One faction of the "oligarchy," as Panamanians call their ruling families, supported Mr. Boyd and Mr. Castillero during their agitations last fall. But the resulting demonstrations apparently convinced the oligarchy that mob action can get out of hand. Mr. Boyd and Mr. Castillero seem to have lost their high-level backing.

Strictly speaking the masses are without a present leader. No one has come along, as in other Latin American countries, to use—and fan—national discontent. When one does come, the Americans here say, demonstrations could become a national policy.

The next troubled period is expected to come in May. The first of May is Labor Day and a day for demonstrations by Communists and sympathizers. On May 3 the students—an important and irresponsible element in Panamanian politics—will commemorate the student demonstrations of 1958. May 8 is election day. And the University of Panama resumes classes during the week.

If serious demonstrations can be avoided during that week and if one presidential candidate wins by a big enough margin to convince everyone it was honest, then Panama might be in for a period of calm, American diplomats say.

But if major demonstrations start or if there is a political revolution in Panama, the United States is in for a lot of trouble.

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the settlement of Mays Landing in Hamilton Township, Atlantic County, N.J., having been founded in the year 1710, is this year celebrating its 250th anniversary. The occasion has been made official by the following:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas in the early days of the colonization of New Jersey there came into the valley of the Great Egg Harbor certain hardy pioneers determined to carve out of the wilderness homes for themselves and for those who were to follow them; and

Whereas in the year 1710 A.D. certain of these settlers arriving at "the forks" and seeing the beauty and the utility of this area remained to found here a settlement called Great Egg Harbor, later to be named Mays Landing; and

Whereas those who built and those who followed after them with great pride and confidence wrought so well that, in January 1837 when the new county of Atlantic was formed this village became the county capital; and

Whereas throughout the intervening years with reverence toward the Almighty and with faith in themselves its citizens have upheld the finest traditions of America; and

Whereas our present generation remembering the past, now desire by word and deed to commemorate the 250 years of existence of our well-beloved community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That I, William Davies, mayor of Hamilton Township, do proclaim this year 1960 as "Celebration Year," and desire all who dwell here and all those whose origin was here and now live apart from us to join with us in this gala occasion as we celebrate the 250 years of our community.

WILLIAM DAVIES, *Mayor*.

I take this occasion to extend my good wishes to this typical American community on its 250th birthday.

Spending for Public Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, March 10, 1960:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—SPENDING FOR PUBLIC NEEDS

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—Here at home the overriding question is how to pay for the public needs of our growing population in an era when our social order is relentlessly challenged. These public needs include not only the rising costs of the race of armaments and the competition among the underdeveloped nations. They include also the rising costs of scientific research, of better public schools, of more adequate hospitals and public health services, public works, roads, water supply and sewage disposal, slum clearance and urban renewal.

There are some who will say that we cannot meet all our public needs without abandoning the freedom of our society. There are others of us who say that we must meet these needs, that we can meet them without sacrificing our liberty, and indeed that by meeting them we shall strengthen our liberty. This is the central issue of our time, and no one who is interested in public life can ignore it.

An excellent newspaper, which I read regularly and greatly respect, the Wall Street Journal, said recently in an editorial that to argue, as I have done, that our public needs have to be met is to invite us to start surrendering our liberties in panic. For to meet the needs will cost a lot of money, and this will put us on the dready road of statism and when the individual must face the faceless state, he has only as much free choice as the state chooses to grant.

This would indeed be monstrous if it were allowed to happen. How are we to make up our minds whether it will happen if we decide to devote to defense and to other public needs enough of our wealth to pay for them? One way to go about deciding is to look at the problem quantitatively and concretely, and not abstractly and in generalities. Let us then look at some figures.

I am taking my figures from the fourth report of the Rockefeller Bros. Fund which was issued in 1958. It covers all government expenditures, Federal, State, and local, which are for the purchase of goods and services. It omits transfer payments which, like the interest on public debts, do not make a direct claim on our production of goods and services. The report contains figures for the year 1957 and estimates for the year 1967. The report is, by common consent I believe, expert, disinterested, and obviously it is not partisan.

In 1957 all Government purchases of goods and services came to 86.4 billions. In 1967, if we meet the public needs for defense and other things which the authors of the report are agreed upon, the cost will be 153 billions (in 1957 dollars). This gives us an idea of the dimensions of the problem. The question then is whether the expenditure for public purposes of 153 billions in 1967 would revolutionize our society.

In 1957, when we spent 86.4 publicly, we were taking 20 percent of our national production, leaving 80 percent in private hands. What would be the situation in 1967 if we carry out the programs to meet public needs which are recommended in the Rockefeller Report? The answer to that question will depend on our rate of growth in the next 10 years.

The Rockefeller estimates show that on the feasible assumption that our gross national product can grow at a rate of 4 percent per year, the share taken for public purposes in 1967, if their recommendations as to what is desirable are followed, would be only 24 percent and the share left in private hands would be 76 percent. This would mean that the rise in private consumption, which on the average has been 2 percent per year, would drop to 1.4 percent. We would not be raising our private standard of life quite so fast as we are now. But we would be raising our public standard and we would be doing it with three-quarters of our product still in private hands. No one can say that on these fairly conservative assumptions we would not still be a free society.

These figures make the assumption that we can grow only at the rate of 4 percent. If, however, we could raise the rate of growth to 5 percent, the position would be changed substantially. We would then be spending for public purposes 22 percent, which is not much more than the present share of our spending, and there would still be left in private hands 78 percent. At the sametime consumption would be rising at 2.8 percent which is above the average.

It is evident then, that the argument of the Wall Street Journal is based on an assumption which is not stated. The assumption is that the U.S. economy, in this stage of automation, cannot increase its productivity fast enough to support our growing public needs. The figures I have cited indicate that if we can now achieve a growth rate equal to that of the years 1947 to 1953, that is to say an annual rate of growth of 4.7 percent, instead of the 2.3 percent rate of the years since then, we shall be able to provide the needed public services while maintaining approximately the same ratio of public to private spending as we have today.

I am sorry to use so many figures. But they are necessary in order to put in its true perspective the size of the great problem of our era. When we look at this problem quantitatively, comparing our growing needs with what can be our economic growth, we may conclude that our tasks are big, which makes them interesting, but that they are quite within our capacity.

Dollar Gaining Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Sylvia Porter as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 30, 1960:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—DOLLAR GAINING STRENGTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

The U.S. dollar is among the most stable currencies in the world.

Its reputation is far better than a year ago, particularly in the principal money centers of Zurich, London, and Frankfurt.

Its present position is a reflection of changes in the economy and reappraisal by other countries of these changes.

FACTS ARE LISTED

The facts back up the changes.

So far this year the dollar hasn't lost a fraction of a cent in buying power. We measure the depreciation in a currency by the rise in the country's consumer price level or its official cost-of-living index. Against this yardstick the U.S. dollar actually has gained a bit in buying power in the last few months.

True, if you compare the March, 1960, dollar with that of 1939, it's worth only about 47½ cents. More than half of the dollar's buying power has been wiped out by the steep inflations of the first post-World War II period, the Korean conflict, 1956–58.

But if you compare the March 1960 dollar with the dollar of a year ago this spring, it's worth only about a penny less. While this is not absolute stability and over a generation a loss of a penny or so a year compounded does add up to real depreciation, this is relative, reasonable stability of a great currency.

And if you compare the March, 1960, dollar with the dollar of last fall, it's actually worth a fraction more.

Few countries can boast records as good as this.

Traditionally neutral Switzerland—the capital of the international bankers—has kept the buying power of its franc virtually unchanged. Also the values of the West German mark and the British pound were held throughout 1959. With wage demands and costs rising in both Germany and Britain now, though, I'll wager the record of the U.S. dollar this year is superior to the mark and pound.

OTHER CURRENCIES SLIDE

As for other currencies, a measure of their depreciation is that last year the cost of living in Canada rose 6 percent; in France, 3 percent; in Holland, about 2¼ percent; in Finland, about 10 percent; in India, about 7 percent.

Why the shift in the dollar's position? Primarily, it reflects control of inflation. Inflations simply do not thrive in a country with a balanced budget, credit restraints, ample plant capacity, plentiful supplies of goods, fierce competition. All these conditions exist in the United States today.

Why the change in the dollar's reputation? Primarily, this reflects the mounting belief of financiers in other lands that we can and

we soon will get our foreign trade back into balance by increasing our efficiency, our exports and other commonsense moves.

Our dollar remains the leading currency of the world today.

Johnson Is Strongest Possible Candidate, Congress Democrats Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Congressional Quarterly, which is regarded as one of the most authoritative references on Congress and politics, recently conducted a special poll of Members of both Houses of Congress as to their judgment of the strongest possible ticket the two major political parties could present to the voters in November.

The results were subsequently released to the press for publication last January 31. According to the results, the Democrats were of the belief that the strongest ticket their party could nominate this year would consist of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON as candidate for President and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY for Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the full text of the story as released by Congressional Quarterly and I urge all my colleagues to read it and to analyze it as to its full meaning:

[From Congressional Quarterly]

CONGRESSMEN RATE JOHNSON, NIXON STRONGEST CANDIDATES

Congressional Democrats think Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, is the strongest presidential candidate their party can field in November, according to a Congressional Quarterly poll released today.

Republican Members of Congress overwhelmingly chose RICHARD M. NIXON as their presidential candidate. But they gave the vice presidential slot to New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller with less unanimity.

More than half the voting Democrats, from all regions of the country, said Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, would be the strongest vice presidential nominee their party could select.

The poll, distributed January 12, asked every Member to give "your judgment on your party's strongest possible ticket." Replies came from 53 percent of the Representatives and Senators. (While delegations to the national conventions are often controlled by State Governors or others active primarily in local politics, many of the Members who answered the Congressional Quarterly poll will have large influence on the way their delegations vote in the conventions.)

JOHNSON, KENNEDY, and NIXON all gained in percentage support in comparison with a similar Congressional Quarterly poll taken last July. Rockefeller, leading a 24-man vice presidential field, lost 15 percentage points as compared with the July poll.

In the interval between the two polls, Rockefeller took himself out of the Republican presidential race, leaving Nixon the sole apparent contender; and both Kennedy and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, openly declared themselves candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination. All three men said they would not accept vice presidential nominations.

DEMOCRATIC RESULTS

JOHNSON had placed third in a January 1959 Congressional Quarterly poll with 14 percent of the vote and then took first place in July with 32 percent. Leading the field behind Johnson in the present polling was Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, who had finished first in January 1959 but dropped to a second-place tie with Adlai E. Stevenson in July. Behind Symington in the current poll came Kennedy, Stevenson, and Humphrey.

Democratic President

[Percent]

	January 1960	July 1959	January 1959
Johnson	37	32	14
Symington	21	18	33
Kennedy	16	17	17
Stevenson	10	18	12
Humphrey	8	6	13
Others	6	7	8
No choice	2	2	3

JOHNSON'S strength rested primarily on his southern support. Almost three-quarters of his votes came from southern Members. JOHNSON also had more western votes than any other candidate, while KENNEDY led in presidential votes from eastern Members. SYMINGTON led in the Midwest and was second in strength in both the South and the East.

Other Democrats who received votes for President were Representative Chester Bowles, Democrat, of Connecticut, five; Michigan Gov. G. Mennen Williams, Democrat, two; Kansas Gov. George Docking, Democrat, Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Representative James Roosevelt, Democrat, of California, one each.

These results were based on replies from 170 Democratic Members of Congress, constituting 49 percent of the total Democratic membership of House and Senate.

REPUBLICAN RESULTS

NIXON received virtually all the votes for the presidential nomination, gaining the support of all the southern and western Members who returned ballots. Rockefeller received five votes, all from eastern Members, and one midwesterner voted for Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson.

Republican President

[Percent]

	January 1960	July 1959	January 1959
Nixon	95	84	78
Rockefeller	4	14	17
Anderson	1	----------	----------

These results were based on replies from 112 Republican Members of Congress, constituting 60 percent of all GOP membership.

VICE-PRESIDENTIAL RESULTS

KENNEDY received the Democratic Vice-Presidential designation on more than half the ballots. He was strong in all regions of the country, particularly in the South where he received 42 of his 91 votes. Most of those who supported Johnson, Symington and Stevenson for the Presidency named Kennedy at or near the top for the second place on the ticket. Leading the 24-man field after Kennedy were California Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Democrat, Symington, Johnson, and Humphrey.

Democratic Vice President

[Percent]

	January 1960	July 1959	January 1959
Kennedy	53	49	41
Brown	7	12	5
Symington	5	6	12
Johnson	5	4	6
Humphrey	3	4	5
Others	16	14	22
No choice	11	11	9

While Rockefeller's strength dropped from 53 percent of those voting for the Republican vice-presidential candidate to 38 percent, House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana, took 12 percent of the votes compared with 4 percent in July 1959. Those with some strength behind Halleck were Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and Senators Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, and Thruston B. Morton, Republican, of Kentucky. Nineteen others each got some support.

Republican Vice President

[Percent]

	January 1960	July 1959	January 1959
Rockefeller	38	53	21
Halleck	12	4	8
Mitchell	6	3	5
Keating	5	----------	3
Morton	4	1	----------
Others	30	25	37
No choice	4	14	26

Airline Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, historically, my interest has been focused on business activities or Government flats which lead to the creation of a monopoly. Except in the case of certain public utilities, where the best interests of the subscriber are served by having a single company provide a service, I am militantly against procedures and practices which offer no competition.

As a consequence I registered my opposition several months ago when an examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board came forth with the shocking suggestion that one airline be given a monopoly between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii.

At a time when New York and other east coast cities are seeking direct air routes to the Orient it seemed inconceivable that the CAB would consider curtailing an existing service that had been operational for 12 years and which was being flown for the first time by long-range jet aircraft.

New York and the east coast are now within 14 hours of Tokyo. New jet aircraft, already operating and on order, can whisk a traveler from Idlewild Airport nonstop to one of a couple of Alaskan cities and, after refueling, again nonstop to Tokyo.

The CAB's overwhelming reversal of the examiner's recommendations is very gratifying. Every Board member participating concluded that public convenience and necessity, plus continuing the CAB's historic concept of competition, are best served by continuing both Pan American and Northwest on the route between Seattle and Portland and Honolulu. And by putting each carrier on a permanent instead of temporary basis, the Board supplied them with additional incentive to invest in new equipment and to make long-range plans for making their respective services even more attractive to the traveling public.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that one of the most important services a Member of Congress can perform for his constituents is to keep them informed of his activities through publication of a regular newsletter "Report to the People."

Because I feel it may be of equal importance to keep my fellow Members of Congress similarly informed of my activities, I am introducing into the RECORD today the latest issue of my own "Report to the People":

A VISIT TO PUERTO RICO AND CUBA

Partly responsible for the delay in issuing this first newsletter of the second session of the 86th Congress was my absence from the country as a delegate to the Caribbean Assembly on the United States and Latin America, which was held in San Juan, P.R., early in March. There were some 60 participants—30 Latin Americans and 30 North Americans—representing a variety of professions and occupations and varying points of view. President Eisenhower addressed the delegates in Puerto Rico en route home from his recent Latin American good-will tour.

I took advantage of my attendance at the Assembly conference to make a personally financed side trip to troublesome Cuba. I want to emphasize this trip was at my own expense and that I took it, brief though it was, so that I could get firsthand, on-the-spot impressions of the situation in Cuba. While I spent but 24 hours in Havana and another 24 hours on an American-owned ranch in eastern Cuba, my fluency in Spanish helped tremendously in my efforts to find out what the controversy between Cuba and our own country is all about.

I came away with several impressions and, with the understanding that a weekend is a brief time to probe into a problem as involved and delicate as United States-Cuban relations, I want to pass them on to you.

For one thing, I failed to notice any spontaneous anti-Americanism during my entire visit. There was no evidence of it certainly on the part of the Cubans I encountered on the streets who couldn't mistake me for anything but an American. Nor was there evidence of anti-Americanism displayed elsewhere.

I also was especially impressed by the fact that no one in Cuba, no matter how his interests were being affected by the Castro government, appeared to want a return of the Batista regime.

Yet I left Cuba convinced that a poor job of administering the country by the Castro government will in itself bring serious economic troubles to Cuba in the near future.

WHAT MUST WE DO CONCERNING CUBA?

It is important, I think, that we respond with vigor to unfavorable and unwarranted attacks upon us by the Castro government. We must do so, I feel, with the idea in mind of protecting our interests in the rest of Latin America. At the same time, we must take every step to prevent any untoward incident that will give Castro an opportunity to attack us further. Specifically, we must halt unauthorized flights by American planes over Cuba, for such flights only weaken our position at home and abroad.

I am very much opposed, incidentally, to proposals for broadcasting directly from the United States to Cuba. Such plans, it seems to me, would be repeating a fatal mistake made during the days of Peron in Argentina when our Ambassador tried to interfere. If we broadcast anti-Cuban programs, then we will be identified as the only anti-Castro force in Cuba and all Cubans will rally behind Castro. This suggestion only underlines the need for a full-blown Voice of America program for all of Latin America which would bring to the Latin Americans a clear idea of what the long-range U.S. objectives are. The VOA would spell out specifically what our programs and hopes are for the free people of Latin America.

President Eisenhower's recent trip aroused all kinds of hopes for the roles we are to play in the future development of Latin American and we must be ready to help meet these expectations. I disagree with Mr. Eisenhower's claim upon his return from his recent good-will tour, however. The President maintained that our prestige was never higher in Latin America. In my opinion, our position in Latin America has never been more perilous.

It is of vital importance, I believe, that we explain our democratic system of government and outline the role that private enterprise can play in the development of Latin American countries. Private American capital invested abroad can do much to help Latin America meet its needs.

THE BATTLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Another reason for the delay in issuing this newsletter was my desire to wait until I could report to you about the battle for civil rights legislation in Congress. At this writing, the House had passed a civil rights bill and the Senate, a record filibuster behind it, was struggling to do likewise. It seemed virtually certain, however, that civil rights legislation would be enacted by this session of Congress despite many obstacles to be overcome.

I supported the House civil rights bill and would have voted for the strongest possible bill which could be proposed. As you may know, I have been a strong advocate of civil rights for a long time. I was the 23d Member of the House to sign a discharge petition which ultimately gathered more than 215 signatures and was instrumental in getting the Rules Committee to bring a civil rights bill to the floor for action. Then, too, I was a signer of a discharge petition designed to bring home rule legislation for the District of Columbia to the House floor. This legislation, of course, is closely linked with civil rights legislation.

Unquestionably, the House-passed bill could be improved upon, but under the circumstances I think it is of greater importance to get an adequate bill out now than to spend endless time arguing about every phrase or provision it should contain.

Richard H. Rovere, writing in New Yorker magazine, summed up rather well, I think, the task still before us in this problem of civil rights. "It may take two or three more bills, in two or three more Congresses," he wrote, "to achieve anything like complete protection of the franchise, but scarcely anyone doubts that in time the protection will be achieved and that it will be seen as the one civil right that can, if it is put to use, achieve most of the others."

I would like to express my pride in the House of Representatives, incidentally, for the sobriety and dignity with which it approached the civil rights problem, finally passing what I thought essentially was a good bill. It made me glad to be a Member of this great body.

THE COMMUTER CRISIS

Since my last newsletter, there have been many developments in the New Haven railroad commuter crisis. These developments included:

A personal on-the-spot survey of the New Haven's commuter operations.

My introduction of legislation to provide $500 million in long-term, low-interest Federal loans to local or regional agencies for the purchase of equipment which would be leased to railroads or other transit systems.

An Interstate Commerce Commission-ordered investigation of the New Haven.

When I inspected the New Haven's operations in late December, I found that poorly kept trains, stations, and working areas were depressing employee morale and detracting from passenger comfort. I found that admittedly improper maintenance was causing breakdowns jeopardizing passenger and train crew safety.

My bill, introduced in February, got much early support, particularly from members of the House Banking and Currency Committee which would be charged with holding hearings on it. Unfortunately, due to the pressure of other legislative matters, the measure received a setback when Committee Chairman SPENCE advised me it would be impossible to promise hearings on the bill. Meanwhile, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey proposed legislation similar to mine but providing for a smaller amount of funds and for the loans to be administered differently. My bill, I feel, represents a sounder approach but I will support Senator WILLIAMS' legislation if it appears it will get a quicker response. The main purpose is to get the job done as soon as possible.

I was heartened when the ICC announced it would investigate the New Haven, for this is an action I had been demanding for many months. I wrote ICC Commissioner Charles A. Webb urging him to make his probe a broad one, covering all aspects of the New Haven's operations over the past 15 years. The fact that the New Haven has demanded a 70-percent increase in fares indicates to me that something is radically wrong with the carrier's management policies. Obviously, the New Haven's abrupt financial crisis stems from developments over a long period of time and isn't something recent.

It is especially important, I think, to keep in mind that the problems created by the poor service on the New Haven must not be looked upon as problems that are irritating and frustrating to the commuters, but in terms of the tremendous economic importance it has on real estate values, on the building industry, on retailers, on the entire economy of Fairfield County and the whole State of Connecticut.

BETTER AIR SERVICE ASSURED

There have been two vastly important developments recently that assure Fairfield County of greatly improved air service. One was approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of better and more frequent airliner service between Washington and Bridgeport. The other was CAB authorization for helicopter service to Danbury via New York Airways, Inc.

The new direct air service via Allegheny Airlines was scheduled to get underway April 12 with one-stop flights to Washington via Baltimore leaving Bridgeport at 9:40 a.m., 2 p.m., and 6:24 p.m. daily. Flights from Washington via Baltimore to Bridgeport will leave at 7:50 a.m., 1 p.m., and 5:30 p.m. This direct service will be fast and timesaving for many residents of Fairfield County and I hope the people of my district will use and encourage this new air link between Bridgeport and Washington and Bridgeport and New England points to the north. Inauguration of this improved service will be important to me personally in commuting between Washington and my district. Last year many of my trips were made by car whereas as of April 12 I am going to be able to fly quickly right from Washington to Bridgeport.

AND SPEAKING OF PROGRESS

I was delighted over action of the Urban Renewal Administration in earmarking more than $9 million in Federal funds for Bridgeport's redevelopment program. Another welcome announcement from Urban Renewal concerned the Southeast Quadrant redevelopment project in Stamford. The agency approved an advance of $130,490 for planning purposes for the project, which eventually will involve an estimated total Federal grant exceeding $6 million. Additionally, $750,000 is included in the 1961 public works appropriation for development of Bridgeport Harbor for navigational purposes, representing an allocation of Federal funds toward a project that will cost some $3.5 million to complete. Pending, too, is the Stamford hurricane protecting project, now under consideration by the Senate Public Works Committee, with hearings expected shortly.

AVAILABLE FOR THE ASKING

By dropping me a postal card at my Washington office, 1319 House Office Building, you can obtain while the supply lasts:

"The Family Fallout Shelter," a booklet outlining how to go about building your own fallout shelter. I have proposed legislation, incidentally, that would allow income-tax deductions for the cost of civil-defense-approved fallout shelters.

"The Capitol," a pictorial story of the Capitol in general and the House of Representatives in particular.

THE WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

In the next decade, one of the really critical problems that will confront our Nation will be that of water pollution.

This is a problem that will stem directly from our exploding population with its accompanying swift industrial expansion.

Numerous communities, especially smaller ones, have already been aided through the Federal antipollution program which provides funds to help finance sewage-treatment plants.

Westport, for example, got such a grant in the amount of $250,000. Bethel just recently received one of more than $60,000.

The importance of helping smaller communities, in particular, to solve their increasing water pollution problems makes it all the more unfortunate that legislation passed by the 86th Congress to increase the amount of funds available was vetoed by the President.

I supported this legislation and will support similar proposals when they are brought up.

He's a Proud Legionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature story by Mr. Lou Rauscher which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of April 3, 1960, the subject of his story being Mr. Walter Kasian, commander of Warrior-Run American Legion Post 176:

WALTER KASIAN REMEMBERS LIFE IN NATIVE LAND—ASKAM RESIDENT SAYS GI'S JOB ISN'T FINISHED

(By Lou Rauscher)

If Walter Kasian had his way, there'd be a 50-star flag in every home in the valley. The deep-seated love and respect which this modern-day patriot holds for our national symbol are of a type which would put most of his fellow citizens to shame.

Walter's story is simple, yet full of meaning. It spans from his early years in Poland, then already feeling the approaching harassment of the Red Star, to his settling in the Warrior Run-Askam area where he now serves as commander of an American Legion post and spearheads one of the most unique programs in the entire Legion ranks.

It was largely through Walter's efforts that members of Warrior Run American Legion Post 176 took it upon themselves to place a 50-star flag in every home in Warrior Run and Askam. At last count, 262 homes in that area have already purchased the flags.

Walter Kasian's background serves to arm him with an appreciation of freedom which many native Americans have never attained.

He was born in Uscieczko, a town in the southeastern part of Poland, noted for its closeness to Russia. He is of Ukrainian stock and relates that his birthplace has long been a trouble spot with both Poland and Russia seeking allegiance of the 7 million Ukrainians making up the population there.

Walter, who operates a grocery store at 45 Center Street, in Askam, and who talks with a charming accent, still has a sister living in Poland. The area, he says, has long been referred to as Galicia.

EACH VETERAN'S DUTY

Why this great devotion to the flag? "Well," says Walter, "I feel it's the duty of every veteran of the Armed Forces to do what he can to keep patriotism at a high level. Too many of us become lax when we are once discharged from service."

Walter served for 4 years with the Air Force, having enlisted right after Pearl Harbor. He came to this country when he was 19 in 1934. His mother had died when he was only 1 year old in a tragic aftermath to a plan for the future which his father had fostered before he was born.

The idea was for Walter's dad to come to this country, which he did, and once settled to send for Mrs. Kasian and the newborn child. All in readiness shortly after Walter reached his first birthday but his mother's death intervened.

Walter saw his dad for the first time when he came to the United States to join him in Mahanoy City. From there he went to Hanover Township to join an uncle in the grocery business. A stint in the Nanticoke bakery preceded his Air Force career and after discharge he settled in Askam and opened a grocery business.

He met Helen Kapral, they were married, and now have a son, Eugene, 13. The couple recently celebrated their 18th wedding anniversary.

URGE TO BELONG

"I joined the Legion immediately after discharge. I guess I had an urge to belong, more so than the guys who were born here. When you come from a foreign country you want to be accepted by your neighbors and joining such an organization certainly helps.

"Once a GI is discharged his job isn't finished. We just can't quit fighting for our freedom, even though actual combat is over. I have long felt puzzled by the lack of appreciation for our flag."

Walter points out that the Warrior Run Legion Post which he heads is the third oldest in the county. "We'd like to build our own home some day and all proceeds from our flag sales are going toward that goal."

The post has about 34 members and needs 2 more to go over the top in new memberships for this year. Meetings are held in Lincoln's Hall on Front Street in Warrior Run, and "if we get many more we'll have to get a shoehorn to fit them in," according to Walter.

This is Walter's first year as commander. He formerly belonged to Lee Park Post 609. Early this year is when he and a fellow legionnaire, Joe Lenkiewicz, made the first calls in the Askam-Warrior Run area in conjunction with their flag-selling project.

MOST HOMES REACHED

From a humble beginning, the drive mushroomed so that now there are 12 men making the rounds with the job nearly completed. Walter points out that those homes which were missed, due mainly because no one was home, will be contacted.

"I sure appreciated the cooperation that the post members have been giving me since I became commander," says Walter who is also full of praise for Lou Greco, district 12 Americanism coordinator. "He's one fellow who's devoted to the Legion cause. The country could use more like him."

Walter recalls the time his post was to install new members. The team which was to do the installing didn't show up, leaving the Warrior Run candidates confused and a bit disheartened. "We called up Mr. Greco even though it was late. He had just returned from Harrisburg where he took part in a Legion ceremony and was already in his pajamas. But he rounded up another local official and came out to install us members and save the night."

CALLS FOR NEW MEMBERS

Walt appeals to all ex-servicemen who don't belong to a veteran's organization to join the ranks. "Too many guys wait to be coaxed or join just for the social advantages. We've got a drive on in the district now and we're looking for new faces."

One of Walt's neighbors relates that the first thing he did after acquiring his present home was to purchase a flag. Walt himself is pretty fond of telling about the Askam widow who bought a flag on the installment plan.

"She's up against it but still felt compelled to get a flag."

Asked whether he had any apprehension about being called a "flag-waver," Walt replied:

"I'm thankful that we have a flag to wave."

Fantastic San Fernando Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the almost unbelievable growth of the great San Fernando Valley, a portion of which I have the honor to represent, is well depicted in detail in the attached article, published in the San Fernando Valley Times of March 26. I am sure it will astonish most Members of the House:

(By Mark de Villers)

Valley population has pushed up to 850,000, according to city, State, and county estimates. These were made as blank census forms were being sent out through 22 post offices in the valley to many of the 260,000 households.

Matching the boost in population this week was the revelation that the northwestern section classified phone books (4 in all) have 2,352 pages, 160 ahead of the 2,192 pages for Los Angeles Central Directory, generally considered the Nation's third largest. The 2,600-acre Warner Studio Ranch beside Calabasas and Woodland Hills was sold for a reported $10 million to a Southern California Edison Co. subsidiary which plans to develop an all-electric city and campus-type research and development center.

Valley building for February reached $26,140,729, a new record for the three incorporated areas for the period.

Mutually acceptable postal boundaries are being worked out to enable the city's new community freeway, street and traffic "sign" program to go into effect swiftly. Plans for May Co.-Sears Shopping Center indicate that the Warner Ranch area there may hold a third department store, and can be in the midst of a West Valley population that can move from 210,000 today to 550,000 in 15 years.

Two plans for developing the vast southern stretch of the valley along the Santa Monica Mountains were presented to the city's planning committee.

NEW FREEWAY FLYER

MTA inaugurates its Central Valley Freeway Flyer bus service April 6, day after the Ventura Freeway will open, promises to cut 14 to 20 minutes off travel time from Panorama City to downtown.

Southern Pacific closes its station April 22 in Burbank, up to now a "conditional stop" only; the stop was built in 1929. Van Nuys is investigating raising meter time prices from pennies and nickels to nickels and dimes on its 1,354 parking meters. Parking discussions continued between Fulton Avenue residents and Valley College officials, while the city laid plans for widening Burbank Boulevard to five lanes and Fulton Avenue to six lanes.

Salvation Army's Men's Social Service Center at Van Nuys will be dedicated Sunday. Deauville Country Club's planned 90-hole club greens at Tarzana are being seeded, will be ready for play in June. San Fernando Valley Science Fair, to take place April 9 and 10 at North Hollywood High School, is getting Army help. Heart Association meets Wednesday at Valley College. A mental health clinic for the West Valley, to be interfaith and nondenominational, is in the planning stage.

Mrs. Dolores Hope, wife of comedian Bob Hope, and a valley resident, is now serving on the board of library commissioners. With receipt of provisional accreditation, Valley College is ready to open a school of nursing this fall. Pierce College listed enrollment of 7,525 students, 1,825 in day classes. Valley State College proposed promoting 17 professors. Seven valley residents are to attend the decennial White House Conference on Children and Youth opening Sunday in Washington, D.C.

PERILS U.S. LEADERSHIP

Dr. Margaret Mead, world-renowned anthropologist, called Americans most married people in history, said we have produced a new style of marrying so young that we are endangering the education of young men needed to help retain the U.S. position of world leadership.

New building height districts for Studio City, Sherman Oaks, and Encino, were approved. A fire station opened in Tarzana. Sunset International Petroleum Corp. is surveying North Hollywood as part of a development program. Construction of a power station (to cost $439,000) in Sunland begins April 15.

NEW BANK NAME

Valley National Bank will be the new name for Glendale National Bank when it opens at Toluca Lake April 1. City National Bank's Canoga Park branch opens Friday. William F. Boyd will manage Bank of America's newest branch, at Victory Boulevard and Tampa Avenue. Work to complete Sherman Oaks Savings & Loan Association's new headquarters by June 1 is being rushed. Shopping Bag Food Stores merges into Von's Grocery Co., name and all, as of March 28.

Industrial Products Division of I.T. & T. got a new president, Frederick H. Juterman. The 360,000-pound-thrust Air Force Atlas missile can be seen before the Rocketdyne main plant next Monday through Wednesday.

AIRPORT LIGHTING

Full lighting of San Fernando Airport is expected by April 1 and construction of 20 new hangars is underway. Bledsoe Properties Co., of Van Nuys, bought 15 acres of industrial land for $300,000. Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge income reached $9,743,918 last year, an 8.5-percent rise. King Pools opened an Encino office. Big Do-Nut Drive-In No. 10 opened in Reseda and shared honors with a Big Tacos Drive-In. Packard-Bell was awarded a Navy contract of $1,250,000.

Industrial Association went into its 11th year, noting that the valley had become a major industrial center. Tip of the week: Government economists look for a 6-percent increase in business in 1960.

Prayer for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the Reverend O. H. Bertram, pastor of the Redeemer Lutheran Church in my district, enclosing a prayer written by a 13-year-old youngster in his confirmation class. The prayer is a sincere and earnest expression of a devout young lady that so impressed me that I feel it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, call your attention to the prayer of Miss Linda Cartin of Philadelphia:

PRAYER FOR THE NATION

Dear Heavenly Father, who wants all men to be saved, help us to bring the message of salvation to all people and nations. We pray that you would deliver the world from all sin, and give health to all the sick. We pray that Thou wouldst give inspiration to those in power of our Government. Help us to pray for our enemies that they may be led to true repentance and to the knowledge of the true God. We pray for all who rule and have authority in the kingdom of the world that there may be world unity and peace. All these things we ask in Jesus' precious name. Amen.

Nuclear Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the fields which has recently opened up for man's efforts to delve into is that of nuclear power. It has rapidly, through initiative and endeavor, developed to meet many of the needs of modern society.

At the 1960 American Nuclear Congress, held in New York City, John W. Simpson, vice president of the Atomic Power Division of Westinghouse Electric Corp., a fine, outstanding administrator in the scientific and research field, made a speech which I am now calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. SIMPSON, VICE PRESIDENT, ATOMIC POWER DIVISION, WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP., AT THE 1960 AMERICAN NUCLEAR CONGRESS, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 4, 1960

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in this morning's discussion of "What Will Future Development of Nuclear Energy Demand of Engineers?" our first topic, "Outer Space Exploration and the Nuclear Engineer" is most appropriate. In the years ahead atomic power will play a major role in outer space exploration, and the nuclear engineer will show the astronaut vistas he hardly dreams of today.

The nuclear engineer will develop nuclear rocket engines and the internal electric power equipment so necessary for space exploration.

For over 4 years now, the Atomic Energy Commission has sponsored the development of a prototype nuclear rocket engine in the Rover project as well as the development of increasingly larger nuclear space auxiliary power units in the Snap program. The results to date have more than demonstrated that atomic power has practical applications. The merits of these applications are essentially proven. Much of the information we need to assess this future role of the nuclear engineer is now available and we can make some pretty good projections.

Project Rover is being carried forward by the Commission's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. It is a joint program of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and the Atomic Energy Commission.

We are familiar with the concept of a nuclear rocket engine with its compact, high temperature reactor over which hydrogen gas passes, is heated and expelled to produce thrust. This reactor eliminates the combus-

tion process of the traditional chemical engines and the specific impulse—the performance factor—is high. We have heard these specific impulse numbers but it seems better to use a ready rule of thumb. Allowing some variation for size, the nuclear rocket engine has more than twice the efficiency of its chemical counterpart for a given rocket frame. In addition there will be considerable margin for improvement in nuclear rockets long after the chemical engines have passed their performance zenith. The zenith of the nuclear engine is so far out, one could hardly make a good prediction as to time. This developmental work will probably contine during the lifetime of the youngest nuclear engineer in this room.

If nuclear engineers were to announce that they could now offer an engine with twice the efficiency of today's best ship or locomotive engines, the announcement would receive much attention. Probably, because space exploration seems somewhat remote, the potential we will speak of today appears less significant. But space exploration is going to take place and the world is going to beat a path to the more efficient engine. The nuclear engine will dominate space propulsion and the nuclear scientist and engineer will make this possible.

Our double efficiency rule of thumb is somewhat deceptive in terms of describing what nuclear rocket propulsion can offer. It is only when we analyze the long missions that the payoff comes into perspective.

For example, to put a 50-ton payload in orbit around Venus and have it return to orbit around Earth, a high energy chemical propulsion system would require five to six stages and a thrust unit capable of lifting 18 million pounds from the Earth. On the other hand, the same mission could be accomplished with only a two stage nuclear powered system capable of lifting only 2.4 million pounds.

In more difficult missions as one involving a soft landing on Mars there is even a larger ratio in favor of nuclear propulsion.

Of course, there are many complex factors in rocketry and in applications like intercontinental ballistic missiles and close-in satellites, the existing chemical rockets can do the job so well that there would be limited purpose in developing an alternate system. It is in the long range and big missions where nuclear rockets will probably first show their advantage. This is a pragmatic approach to phasing the nuclear rocket into the scheme of things and does not account for the international prestige factor which could dictate earlier demonstration regardless of mission.

The important factor is this:

The nuclear engines will supplant chemical systems only if the nuclear engineer can make them safe, reliable, and practical equipment like our ship and utility reactors today. There is no reason why this can't be done but it is going to take development.

In the atomic energy industry we have learned from experience that nature places more than a few roadblocks in the way of our most promising applications. There is no exception here and we will sweat before promise becomes reality. We might review a few of the technical problems.

Materials must be found which have adequate properties under extreme conditions like high reactor temperatures and large temperature variances from one part of the reactor to the other. The materials of construction must not only have adequate high temperature strength, but also be able to resist corrosion and erosion.

Research and development since World War II produced the so-called high temperature alloys culminating in the development of useful nickel-base and cobalt-base alloys. Even these alloys which took so many years and so much effort to develop have little strength above about 1,800° F. and we must look elsewhere for materials.

Interest is naturally directed to the refractory metals tungsten, rhenium, osmium, tantalum, molybdenum, and niobium. The melting points of these metals range from 6,170° F. for tungsten to 4,380° F. for niobium. The pure refractory metals themselves have little strength at temperature above about 50 to 60 percent of their absolute melting points. By suitable alloying one might hope to get adequate strength at 80 percent of the melting point of the base metal—perhaps 5,300° F. for a tungsten base alloy. However, even though the refractory metals have been known for a long time, the development of their alloys is still in its infancy and a great deal remains to be done.

High temperature requirements also suggest the use of refractory compounds such as oxides, carbides, and the like. Development of these ceramic materials for the particular demands of space powerplants has only begun.

The application of refractory metals at very high temperatures also poses some serious metallurgical problems. Achieving high temperature strength while avoiding low temperature brittleness while providing adequate fabricability and weldability is a large order. It is made even more difficult by considerations of resistance to corrosion and irradiation damage. The solution of such problems will require the concentrated application of the most advanced metallurgical and solid state science as well as the utilization of a wide spectrum of specialized equipment and facilities ranging from large scale fabricating equipment under inert atmosphere to nuclear testing reactors and hot laboratories.

The road from the first conception of a relatively exotic material to the ultimate and successful application is strewn with difficulties. One is reminded of the experience with zirconium.

In 1949 it was first suspected that zirconium should be a good material for reactor core construction, for about this time it was realized that the hafnium content of zirconium was responsible for adverse nuclear properties. Hafnium free zirconium had a low thermal neutron cross section and good corrosion resistance to high temperature water. A large effort was required to learn how to remove hafnium and to produce the zirconium in useable form. Corrosion resistance proved to be highly variable, depending upon the presence or absence of a variety of impurities. The solution of that problem required several years of concentrated effort until a suitable zirconium base alloy (zircaloy 2) was developed in 1952. Since then, a series of difficulties, for the most part unexpected, have required considerable effort to improve upon corrosion resistance and strength. At present, we are looking for zircaloy 4.

Materials development for nuclear space engines will require a similar long and concentrated effort.

Another typical problem in the development of nuclear rocket engines involves the heat transfer and fluid flow properties of hydrogen at high speeds and temperatures. Even understanding the mechanisms of heat transfer to a rapidly moving stream of hydrogen is a real challenge. With nuclear reactors the available temperatures introduce the problem of dissociation of the gas into monatomic hydrogen which affects the impulse which can be obtained from the rocket nozzle. The basic data on dissociation and recombination of hydrogen as it passes through the reactor and the nozzle must be accurately determined and analyzed. Work has been done in this field (in the analysis of high temperature gas phenomena. There are others. This is only one small field.) But many avenues of exploration are open.

And there are the usual problems associated with hardware. The valves, pumps, and mechanisms for the nuclear rocket propulsion system will be intricate.

We need only look at the problems encountered with chemical missiles to realize the high reliability which must be assured in a rocket system. Pumps and valves should be simplified and if possible eliminated. Fortunately, the system opens avenues to simplification and hopefully much elimination.

The safety aspects of nuclear rocket firings will demand high reliability and quality control.

We will hear more on this matter of safety as the months pass—I would think there is less likelihood of a nuclear rocket blowing up than a chemical rocket. Even in the unlikely event of the reactor meltdown the contamination would be many orders of magnitude less than weapons contamination. Nevertheless reliability and safety will be a priority problem. There is also the safety problem of failure in flight and return to earth, but this again accents reliability.

Today's chemical rockets offer essentially a one way trip to the planets. Some day, after the first demonstration of a nuclear propulsion system, we will have to look to stopping and starting engines for cruise considerations and return trips. This will require improvements in the technology of fuel packaging and storing, raising the temperature of the reactor systems, and controlling the propulsion system so that it can be turned on or off—providing spurts of energy. These problems will be formidable.

To wind things up on the rocket, we can say that to make nuclear space propulsion fulfill today's promise, much needs to be done—and like everything else the job never really ends.

If a satellite or space vehicle is to be anything more than novelty, it must have an internal power supply. This power can come from several practical sources, but high levels of power for long periods of time can best come from the atom.

Batteries, fuel cells and solar energy systems are the competition, but for electric power requirements in excess of one kilowatt to be provided continuously for more than 6 months we must look to atomic power.

The space electrical propulsion engine which promises continuous but low thrust over long periods of time will be a big consumer of space electrical power. The ion, plasma, thermal arc or MHD engines of which you hear so much need atomic electric powerplants to supply their power and plants in the range of hundreds of kilowatts are needed. Advanced reactor systems in this power range will have to be developed.

Space vehicles also need power for communications, reconnaissance capability, exploration (perhaps using television) and a myriad of other uses.

If we talk about manned space flight of any duration, we must look to human requirements—air regeneration for respiration, water regeneration, food regeneration and to the environmental needs of heating, cooling and simulation of life on earth. These will require significant quantities of electrical power.

We can see at a glance that the space electrical power we are talking about for the years ahead is closer to megawatts than to watts. This is a job for atomic power.

The AEC has been developing space nuclear auxiliary power systems in the Snap Program. They have focused on the development of lightweight, long lived systems. The Snap effort followed two avenues—the development of small compact reactor systems and the development of systems using energy from the decay of radioisotopes.

Radioisotopes will produce up to several hundred watts of electric power but they have obvious power limitations. Surely they will have their place in the scheme of things but not in the big efforts.

Last November the Atomic Energy Commission revealed the details of the Snap II

reactor, a compact 200-pound plant with a turboelectric generator developed by Atomics International Co. I am sure many of you saw the reactor at the American Rocket Society meeting. Within this same AEC program there are other reactors under development which promise significantly more power. Systems with more power than those under development today are quite feasible.

I believe that by 1965 one megawatt of electricity can be generated in outer space from a nuclear powered auxiliary system. By 1967, 10 megawatts are possible and by 1970—60 megawatts.

These predictions are based on the belief that with today's technology we could generate a kilowatt of electric energy with 8 pounds of payload—8 pounds per kilowatt. I believe that by 1970 it is reasonable to expect 4 pounds per kilowatt. Thus, 120 tons of payload would give you a 60-megawatt output.

Of course, we would need boosters powerful enough to put such weights into orbit, but such boosters are programed and with the development of nuclear rockets, far more will be possible.

At first blush you might ask what possible use power in these ranges could have in outer space. Probably nothing close to these quantities will be needed but it is stimulating to speculate on what you could accomplish if it were available. Think of all of the electrical propulsion you could supply and what this would mean for interplanetary travel.

Consider that in the more hostile environments on earth—our deserts and seas—the limiting factor of human survival is power. If you supply enough power and conversion equipment, you can support human life in any type of environment. This will be true in outer space—the most hostile environment for man which we can anticipate. As more and more power can be supplied manned flights, lunar landings and interplanetary explorations could become quite supportable.

I think demands are forthcoming and we will be lucky to stay close to them let alone ahead of them. Fortunately, we have now learned not to undersell the future—we did too poor a job in other years of forecasting its demands.

One of the most difficult problems facing the nuclear engineer is the development of auxiliary space electrical equipment which assures a very high degree of reliability. This equipment must operate relatively unattended for years with only a negligible probability of failure.

Experience has shown that reliability is an inverse function of complexity, therefore, these systems must be simple. It may not be possible, as in terrestrial systems, to make manual adjustments. Even in manned space vehicles the attendant will probably be able to perform only operations as complicated as working a mechanism like a throttle.

Years of experience has taught us the intrinsic stability of nuclear reactors in the power ranges. It will be the nuclear engineer's job to take advantage of this inherent stability of reactors to design self-regulating, self-controlling systems.

As we once again speak of reliability we must look to materials.

Materials problems will be as formidable as those I described in rocket development, but they are similar and the one program should assist the other.

The environmental problems in space present some unique problems, but the environment is not always hostile. For example, the vacuum in space allows use of high temperature materials which would oxidize in the atmosphere. Examples of these materials are molybdenum, graphite, and tungsten.

The lack of gravity seriously affects ones ability to pump liquids since it is not easy to obtain a sufficient inlet pressure on a pump to prevent cavitation. Therefore, the transfer of liquids from one vessel to another introduces some more complexities.

Another environmental problem is radiative waste heat in a vacuum. How do you get heat out of a thermos bottle?

In order to radiate appreciable amounts of energy, high temperatures must exist at the heat sink. The amount of heat that can be radiated is proportional to the fourth power of the absolute temperature. For temperatures less than approximately 1,000° F. very little heat is radiated per unit area, but as the heat sink temperature rises, the quantity that can be transferred increases rapidly. For example, at 1,000° F. 2¼ kilowatts per square foot can be radiated and at 2,000° F. 18.4 kilowatts per square foot can be radiated. It is evident, therefore, that to have a small heat sink any nuclear powerplant in space must operate at extremely high temperatures. While much work has been done on high temperature apparatus like aircraft jet engines, we have not been accustomed to operating equipment for periods in excess of 100 to 500 hours. In the case of a space powerplant the equipment must operate for 1, 2, or more years at even higher temperatures.

On the other hand the nuclear industry is no infant and we have passed our first decade of actually developing and building plants. Much of what we have learned is directly applicable. We can make direct use of things like our calculational methods, digital computer codes, testing methods, materials research and a multitude of other things.

Some new areas of professional specialization will emerge in our industry and a broad spectrum of engineering talent will be required. The technologies of nuclear engineering, heat transfer, fluid flow, aerodynamics, stress analysis, materials engineering, control, and communications are involved.

If we accept that there will be a major research and development effort for nuclear space applications, the nuclear engineer should be pleased. He can welcome a new challenge and the opportunity to participate in one of the most exciting technical adventures of our time.

He should also welcome the fallout of basic information which will help us immeasurably in our other nuclear power work. The atomic energy industry was born from a major defense effort. A big part of our power technology grew out of other defense work. A major effort to apply nuclear power for outer space, while not labeled as defense, has similar connotation. It should have an equally healthy effect on our industry.

Speaking to you this morning posed a rather difficult problem. Some of the things I prepared are rather elementary for men of your training and experience, yet it seemed important to cover the field in broad perspective.

There is a challenge ahead—there is a new frontier. The nuclear engineer is entering a new era which will probably demand more of him than anything in the past. I may lack precision in describing the problems, but I speak with sincere personal belief when I say that we in the nuclear sciences are going to make outer space exploration a reality. Judging from your past accomplishments I am confident success is assured.

And with success will come great satisfaction, but it would be a mistake to think of the satisfaction of technical accomplishment alone. There is the incomparable satisfaction of providing the means for a better understanding of our universe. When all people have this understanding, they may learn to live together peacefully. We could ask little more.

Nixon Keeps Calm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the pleasure of attending the jumbo jamboree which was presented in connection with the Eight Annual Republican Women's Conference. It was a big old-fashioned Republican rally, complete with box supper, band top entertainment and plenty of Republican enthusiasm.

As a switch, President Eisenhower reviewed DICK NIXON'S record as Vice President and emphasized the record speaks for itself. The President went on to point out that Vice President NIXON was "uniquely knowledgeable" when compared to the many aspirants who have launched themselves into "oratorical orbit" in their quest for the White House.

It is, therefore, not difficult to see why there has been a slight fluctuation in the polls as a result of a blaze of national publicity directed to the Democratic presidential hopefuls who have been beating each other over the heads for headlines. It is also not difficult to see, in evaluating the President's remarks, why Vice President NIXON remains calm and keeps his mind on his business.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in last night's Washington Star by William S. White brings out the reasons why DICK NIXON is not the kind to panic:

NIXON KEEPS CALM AMIDST DOUBTS—VICE PRESIDENT IS SEEN FUNCTIONING AS GOOD CAMPAIGNING CARD PLAYER

(By William S. White)

Vice President RICHARD NIXON is settling back with wry calm to last out what he knows is likely to be a series of dips in the graph of his presidential ambitions.

He is like a good poker player who finds the cards suddenly running against him. He figures his luck is bound to turn and so he is by no means desperate. And he knows that you can't ever win a pot unless you keep staying in. But he also knows that when your luck is momentarily out you play your hands with great care. This is definitely not the kind of night on which you try to fill inside straights.

The Vice President does not for a moment delude himself. He is fully aware that he has had some poor to bad breaks lately and that there probably will be more before the turn comes.

Ironically, he is to some extent the victim of his own earlier good fortune. The fact that he is—officially at least—unopposed for the GOP presidential nomination is a mixed blessing. It would be dangerous to act as though it already was in the bag. So he must walk softly.

He is having to keep all openly political activity to the absolute minimum. This means that the national spotlight, for now and for some weeks ahead, is nowhere near his vicinity. It has been playing hotly on the man the NIXON people now believe will be his Democratic antagonist for the Presidency, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It may well stay beamed in that direction for a while to come.

For example, the latest Gallup poll presents KENNEDY as leading NIXON in the Nation by 53 percent to 47 percent—a reflection, the Vice President thinks, of KENNEDY'S rarely rivaled blaze of national publicity.

Again, NIXON'S status as the more-or-less designated successor to President Eisenhower puts other restraints on the Vice President. Mr. Eisenhower is going to be out of the country a good while in his summit diplomacy. This means NIXON must stay here to mind the store. And while he will be doing important things in this period, they will not be of the big-headline variety.

Finally, President Eisenhower has much diluted his earlier seeming all-out endorsement of NIXON. The President's subsequent comment that he would not have given such an endorsement in the first place if the Vice President had not been the only Republican candidate in sight has not been helpful—to NIXON.

Obviously and unarguably it has given some encouragement to those Republicans who still hope to bring off a presidential draft for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York. (This one estimate is strictly this correspondent's; it should not be attributed to NIXON.)

Actually, the Nixon people's worry is not so much that the current polls will be hurtful in the election itself. Before this the Vice President has gone down in the polls only to climb high again. What really bothers them is that every time the smallest Nixon weakness is indicated before the GOP convention the Rockefeller partisans will seize on it to renew the chant "NIXON can't win."

The Vice President, in a word, is not so much afraid of the Democrats in the election. He is more concerned about what may be done by other Republicans to exploit against him anything unfavorable that may happen from now to convention time.

There is nothing remotely approaching panic here. NIXON is a cool and steady handed gambler politically. He is, rightly or wrongly, perfectly confident that he will come through in the end. But in the meantime he has problems, not with his own morale but with that of his workers. They clamor to him: "You must get out and get busy." He replies in effect: "It's just the way the ball bounces—now. Take it easy. I'll be 'out there'—and plenty 'busy'—when the time comes."

A Good Salesman Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, business is becoming more international. The company and the country recognizing this will prosper just as the company or country which does not will be left poorer in material wealth as well as in terms of world influence.

Greater American exports are vitally important in our competition with the Communist world. They could also offer a great new job market for Americans who, in many cases, are finding automation displacing jobs which men have performed for generations. Greater exports with their related jobs for citizens of the trading nation in production, management, the professions, and services can make the transition to a new job pattern much less painful. In the long term future greater exports can help insure that our standard of living and gross national product rise to new heights.

Markets for such trade, however, will not be brought to us on a silver platter while we sprawl in the shade of the old backyard. We will have to go after them with all the salesmanship, marketing and production genius our Nation has made legendary.

I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, because of an article which appeared recently in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The article indicates that, at least in the potential markets of an Africa emerging in new nationalism and freedom and with strong desires for material as well as political advancement, American business and government may be resting on their oars.

Here, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include that article and commend its reading to my colleagues:

EXPORTER-INVESTIGATOR REPORTS U.S. BUSINESS MISSING BET IN AFRICA—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO RECIEVE FINDINGS OF FOUR-MAN MISSION SOON; EMBASSIES' PERSONNEL TO BE CRITICIZED

Pittsburgh Exporter Alfred Teshen is just back from West Africa, where he found the natives restless not only for independence but also for American business.

That disturbed him because he hadn't known before his 2-month trip that we aren't doing much business there now.

"American business has failed miserably," he said.

And if he were asked why anybody would want to do business in places such as Liberia, Ghana, Guinea, and Sierra Leone, he would answer in the terms of a mountain climber—because it's there.

"The possibilities are tremendous and I'm not a man who says possibilities are tremendous when they are only good."

SEES NEED FOR CHANGES

Mr. Teshen is a burley man, who speaks in an accent that is thickly German, even after 34 years in this country, but his words curiously are those of a go-get-'em Rotary Club member—which he is.

"We need a lot of changes in our embassies. We need a whole new set of commercial attachés. They ought to be sparkplugs, seasoned businessmen, who know what they're talking about—instead of, as in many cases now, the take it easy, feet on the desk, when-is-the-next-party type of people."

That indictment, he said will be phrased in just those words in a report to the U.S. Commerce Department, which sent him to West Africa with three other businessmen on a mission of finding out why we aren't getting much trade there.

Aside from a few firms such as Firestone Rubber, Republic Steel, and Kaiser, he said, American business has shown no interest in the area, or the interests it has shown has been lackadaisical or crooked.

"We talked to Africans who bought textiles from well-known American firms and were asked for evidence of their reputability. Then, when they ordered 2,000 yards, they got 1,600 yards—or they bought from samples and what they got was cheaper materials."

Saddest of all, he said, was their finding that there are no American exporters in any of the four countries. There were many from Europe and in Guinea, newly independent from France "we were surrounded by Russians."

"Guinea is going to be a springboard for the Communist gospel," he said. "The day before we got there 150 Russian trucks were delivered. We were driven around in two Russian cars."

FRANCS PRINTED IN RUSSIA

Mr. Teshen said he asked one Guinea Government leader whether he would guarantee their currency. The leader flatly said he would, and then was on the radio the next day announcing the French franc would no longer be valid there.

The insult was rubbed in, as far as Mr. Teshen was concerned, by the fact that the following day a Guinea franc was newly issued—and had been printed in the Soviet Union in 1958 and 1959, which indicates the Russians were alert.

Racial discrimination takes some odd twists, Mr. Teshen observed. In Liberia the white European businessmen and the African national businessmen maintain separate chambers of commerce.

STUDY IN CONTRAST

"Then, the well-to-do Africans don't seem to give a damn for their own poor. We went to a reception given by the President of Ghana. The champagne was flowing, the men wore black ties and the women had gowns, the latest from Paris, some of them must have cost $1,000.

"And yet, across the street, you could see the greatest filth, poverty, starvation and most backward living conditions."

Possibly what bothered the Pittsburgh exporter (who has offices in the Bessemer Building) most of all was finding American-made goods being sold in West Africa—by European firms.

Civil Defense Is a National Problem as Well as a State Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have long contended that defense is a national problem and not a State problem. The Constitution places the responsibility and the burden of defense upon the National Government. That responsibility cannot be evaded by delegation to the States in whole or in part.

That is not to say that the States should not cooperate to the fullest in a proper civil defense program. The cost of civil defense is as much a charge upon the national budget as is the maintenance of our Armed Forces.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint resolution of the New York State Senate and Assembly, No. 139, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to initiate a program for radioactive fallout protection for all citizens of the United States, which was adopted by the New York State Senate on March 28, 1960, and concurred in by the assembly on March 29, 1960.

While we may not be in agreement with all that is urged in the resolution,

we cannot find fault with their justification of my position that civil defense is a national problem to be dealt with on the national level for the benefit of all of our citizens. While the States have a definite responsibility, the initiative must be taken on the Federal level.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 139

Joint resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to initiate a program for radioactive fallout protection for all citizens of the United States

Whereas the people of the State of New York feel deep concern for the international situation and its effect upon the safety and future of each citizen; and

Whereas they know the freedom of the people of this State and Nation to be fatefully bound to the fate of free peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas they realize that the future of freedom everywhere depends on the willingness of the American people to defend the right of peoples to determine their own fate; and

Whereas all free peoples today confront, in the form of the steadily growing force and resources of Soviet communism, a threat without parallel in their history; and

Whereas the simultaneous evolution of science and weaponry makes this threat a menace of such proportions as has been confronted by no other generation; and

Whereas the success of diplomatic negotiations with the Soviet Union, involving both the safeguarding of the freedom of Berlin and progress toward disarmament, depends critically upon our national strength and our national resolve; and

Whereas all levels of concern—moral, political, and military—dictate the need for Government to assure adequate defenses for our population, not only to sustain possible hostile attack, but also to deter and to discourage the attempt of such attack; and

Whereas both the lives and the liberties of all Americans are thus at stake in the military and political decisions of this time; and

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that "our total defense is incomplete and meaningless without reliable and responsible home defense" and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated that a fallout shelter program is "essential" both to our military defense and to our policy of seeking peace through deterrence of nuclear attack; and

Whereas the Secretary of State has made it emphatically clear that there is a direct relationship between a fallout shelter program and the effective conduct of foreign policy; and

Whereas the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has indicated that fallout protection for our people is essential to withstand nuclear blackmail; and

Whereas the health, the safety, and the survival of the individual citizen is a matter of paramount State and National concern; and

Whereas the fallout protection essential to the survival of tens of millions of Americans, in the event of a nuclear attack upon our country, is readily obtainable; and

Whereas it is a matter of utmost gravity and urgency that protective steps be taken by and for the people of every State in our Union and to make these steps effective that further supporting action be taken by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress and the President of the United States be and hereby are respectfully memorialized to—

1. Declare it to be the policy of the United States that every American citizen have effective fallout protection as promptly as possible.

2. Provide affirmative additional support to State, local, and individual initiative in obtaining essential fallout protection by, among other things, (a) authorizing a Federal income tax deduction for the cost of fallout shelters (up to a maximum of $100 per planned shelter occupant); (b) making the provision of fallout protection mandatory in all construction built with Federal funds or financed with Federal loans or guarantees; and (c) providing fallout protection for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and for the Armed Forces of the United States to assure the continuity of their functioning in the event of nuclear war.

3. Direct the promulgation of a comprehensive nationwide program of nuclear protection, warning, and training.

4. Accelerate the establishment with Federal funds of the nationwide, fully automatic system of monitoring for radioactive fallout, using modern computer techniques, supplemented with an improved attack-proof system of radio communication with shelter occupants.

5. Direct that an immediate and intensive program of research be undertaken looking to action which will make possible national recovery following a nuclear attack, including vigorous new steps for decontamination, for the prepositioning, preservation, and distribution of food supplies, for the purification of water, for the prepositioning, rationing, and distribution of fuel, clothing, medicines, building materials, and other supplies, and for most effective employment of the surviving population for the national recovery; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to assert their best efforts to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

Phenomenal Growth in Air Traffic Between Pacific Northwest and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest congratulates the Civil Aeronautics Board for its unanimous decision of last Friday in which it made the Northwest-Hawaii certificates of Northwest Airlines and Pan American World Airways permanent.

This order by the CAB is particularly significant inasmuch as the States of Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii were indignantly unanimous in their insistence that they were right and the CAB examiner was wrong when he proposed to cut the air service in half.

The Board did not react to pressure; it reacted to logic. When the whole economic picture was spelled out before the Board by Government officials, business and civic organizations from Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest, the CAB lost little time registering its sharp disagreement with the recommendations of its examiner.

There are few sections of this country growing more rapidly than the Pacific Northwest. Addition of Hawaii to our Union of States necessarily means greater travel and commerce between Honolulu and the mainland. You can imagine the stunned reaction of the people in my area, Mr. Speaker, when we learned the CAB examiner proposed that a pattern of competition which had been operating for 12 years suddenly be abandoned and a monopoly substituted in its place.

The growth of Washington and Oregon demands more air service than heretofore. It does not necessarily mean a third carrier on this route, because new jet equipment, flying greater frequencies, will be adequate to meet accelerated travel demands.

Competition itself made this route successful, Mr. Speaker. Starting in 1949 as a first full year of operations, Northwest and Pan American together carried a total of 6,825 passengers. During 1959, a decade later, these 2 fine airlines carried 57,000 passengers. Those of us with confidence in the Pacific Northwest feel that this is only a beginning, and that another 10-year period will witness a phenomenal growth in air traffic between our area and Hawaii.

The CAB did itself proud in maintaining the status quo.

The Juvenile Court Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to again call attention to the juvenile court situation here in the District of Columbia, as I believe I have done each year in Congress. Ten years ago I was astounded to learn that but one juvenile judge was trying to cope with the situation when there was obviously enough work for a half-dozen judges. The predicament of the juvenile court then bordered on the ridiculous, but it has worsened each year in alarming proportions as evidenced by recent headlines, which I will include herein.

Does the majority leadership feel that we can continue to ignore the crying need for attention to the source of the deplorable crime rate here in the Federal city?

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1960]

JUVENILE COURT CASES SET NEW BACKLOG MARK

A record backlog of cases, mostly involving adults was built up in Juvenile Court dur-

ing the first half of the current fiscal year, court officials disclosed yesterday.

The court was 1,390 cases behind schedule on December 31. This compares with 948 the previous quarter ending September 30, according to quarterly reports released at a meeting of the Juvenile Court Advisory Committee.

Most of the backlog, or 989 cases, involved adults while 401 were juvenile actions, the report reveals. This compares with 662 adults and 226 juvenile cases the first quarter.

Juvenile Court Judge Orm W. Ketcham said that there was no single reason for the steadily increasing backlog but said it was cumulative. The judge said again that the court needs more judges.

BLOCKED IN CONGRESS

The Senate during the last session of Congress passed a bill giving the court two more judges. The House version, however, not yet been reported out of Representative DAVIS' House District Subcommittee.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 17, 1960]

RECORD CRIME RISE IS REPORTED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SERIOUS OFFENSES INCREASE 21.7 PERCENT IN 1959, FBI SAYS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Serious crime in Washington during 1959 soared to a 21.7 percent increase over the previous year, the FBI's Uniform Crime Records showed today.

It was the biggest increase in any year since Washington adopted its present crime reporting system a dozen years ago.

The increase, reflected in all major crime categories except murder, came at a time when city crime throughout the Nation showed only a 1-percent increase.

While Washington was recording its biggest annual increase, the other four cities in the same 750,000 to 1 million population group—Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Houston—showed an overall decrease of 4 percent.

The Clouds of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the launching of Tiros I, which is the most remarkable scientific feat in photographing the cloud covering of the earth to date, is evidence that our space program is progressing rapidly, and is an indication that the United States is second to none in the exploration and use of outer space. Tiros I is the first weather satellite which by further development and perfecting will be a means of predicting immediate weather conditions which would be of extensive value to the people of the United States and the rest of the world.

Since we have proved that it is possible to photograph the earth from 450 miles away, and with the further perfecting of the camera lens on such a satellite, we can obtain photographs of military installations of foreign nations which could not otherwise be detected.

I submit herewith with my remarks an editorial from the Los Angeles Times which includes some of the pertinent and specific benefits that this type of satellite can be to us:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 2, 1960]

THE CLOUDS OF THE WORLD

Some people have had great difficulty in adjusting themselves to the costs of space programs. They have curiosity, but as taxpayers they are not overeager to know about the mountains of the moon or the thin-aired deserts of Mars; they are willing to leave the topography and biology of the solar system to science fiction at a dollar a copy in paperback.

FICTION VERSUS FACT

Tiros may persuade them to reexamine their position. Tiros—it reads like the name of a Greek hero—stands for "television and infrared observation satellite." Tiros I was blasted into arbit around the earth early Friday by a combination Thor-Able rocket to revolve indefinitely, squinting through its manmade eyes at the world's low-cut, suggestive apparel and reporting back, with manmade voice and pictures, what it saw.

Tiros is, to be frank, a Peeping Tom. It will tell its collaborators here, 400 miles or so below, how Mother Earth dresses and undresses herself in cloudy raiment and the collaborators will define the terrestrial notions of what to wear in terms of weather. Every festoon of cloud will have a meaning for the psychologists of Mother Earth's moods.

Tiros is the first (repeat, the first) meteorological satellite. It is a 270-pound package of instruments shaped like a box for a very large feminine hat, 42 inches in diameter and 19 inches high. Outside it looks like an ancient monster, plated with solar cells which transform sunlight into electric power for its TV cameras and radio controls and with feelers like an insect, four transmitting antennas on one flat side and one on the other.

NOT ONLY TALK

This first Tiros will not picture or mumble its way to the position of world weather arbiter, and its sponsors do not expect it to perform astonishing things. But it has shown already that it can see and talk and its creators know what to do to make its successor—Tiros II—a complete weather gossip. Mark Twain's observation—that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it—will still be true, but to know is to be prepared. Tiros' studies of cloud patterns will not be definitive, and nobody expects them to be, but as the result of its peeping its first descendant will be equipped to report more usefully.

Tiros races around the earth in 4½ hours, which ought to give it a glimpse of almost anything that is likely to happen cloudwise and therefore weatherwise. Its equipment, however, is not the best its sponsors are capable of producing; moreover, its circle prevents it from seeing some parts of the world where weather is brewed. It flies a slanting circle which allows it to survey clouds in a belt from lower Canada to the bottom of Argentina. So there are parts of the world—or its cloud formations—which it will never see, or televise, and some of these lands, with their clouds, which belong to the enemy.

ACROSS THE POLES

But the next Tiros will be launched in a polar orbit. This means that it will circle over both poles and scan the whole world, for as the earth turns it will see everything once every 24 hours.

Tiros does not take us, taxpayers and all, into a universe that may already have learned the pitfalls of deficit financing, inflation, the welfare state, and juvenile delinquency, but it will teach us—and its own successors—how to know the world through predicting its weather. Weather is really more important to most people than anything, for it holds the answer very often to their whole living. They are captives of weather because they do not know they are.

To this day, even in the United States, enlightened as it is by television commentators, there are farmers who believe that the best crop of potatoes is planted in the dark of the moon. Solid weather knowledge will change their views and ofttimes get them better potatoes.

Over their favorite oracle at Delphi the Greeks posted a notice: "Know thyself." It went farther in Greek philosophy than other precepts; in fact it went farthest of all. Tiros and its successors extend this precept beyond dreaming. The new injunction will be, "Know thy world," and television pictures and radio signals presently will make the knowledge universal.

AMVETS Give Senator Johnson Defense Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great current national debates centers on our Nation's defense capabilities; there is little doubt of the legitimacy of this discussion or of its importance to the Nation. Some of the most outstanding contributions to this debate have been made by the distinguished Senate majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe it is significant that one of our great veterans' organizations, the American Veterans of World War II, has recognized Senator JOHNSON's achievements in the field of national defense and has honored him for his exceptional participation in this vital debate. As the AMVETS pointed out, Senator JOHNSON steadfastly refuses to concede to any other nation America's ranking in the field of military preparedness, scientific education and space exploration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for publication in the RECORD the following account of the award to Senator JOHNSON as it appeared in the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times:

[From the Wichita Falls Times, Mar. 13, 1960]

AMVETS GIVE SENATOR JOHNSON DEFENSE AWARD

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas was hailed here Saturday as a man who stands for complete military preparedness "with obeisance to no other nation in scientific education and space exploration."

JOHNSON was honored at a luncheon of the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) where he was presented the 1960 award for exceptional contributions to national defense.

In presenting the award, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, former national executive director of AMVETS, said of JOHNSON:

"By word and deed he has unwaveringly led us toward strength and, with God's help, through strength and scientific prowess toward lasting peace."

Also honored was Vice President RICHARD NIXON who was given the AMVETS' 1960 World Peace Award.

In accepting the award JOHNSON said America's defense posture today is adequate but programs for the future may involve a considerable degree of risk.

"If we step up our defenses, and they are not needed, all we lose is money," he emphasized. "If we fail to step up our defenses, and they are needed, we could lose our country."

HEADS TOP COMMITTEES

JOHNSON, chairman of both the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee and Senate Space Committee, made it clear he did not mean that the Nation faces the endless and dreary prospect of producing military hardware forever.

"Instead, our defense strength must be regarded as a shield, behind which we can—and indeed, must—take positive steps toward a peaceful future," JOHNSON asserted.

"Weapons will bring us a truce—a truce which is preferable to the destruction of our way of life. But we will meet our responsibilities only if we use that truce to build toward a world in which men can live together in understanding and the weapons become merely dusty museum relics."

UNITED STATES MUST LEAD

JOHNSON said the advent of the space age makes it imperative that this country marshal its resources to solve not only the problems on earth but those in outer space as well.

"America must take the lead in meeting this challenge," he declared. "We have concentrated too long on stop-gap measures. Even our foreign-aid program has been essentially a stop-gap reaction."

JOHNSON told the AMVETS we cannot simply buy peace at the marketplace.

"Rather, we must develop all reasonable avenues through which the people of the world can work together," he said.

H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present for the reading of the Congress a copy of the resolution adopted by the Bossier Chamber of Commerce, Bossier City, La., in support of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, bills to provide basic reform of Federal tax rates and measures:

RESOLUTION—URGING THE PASSAGE OF H.R. 3000 AND H.R. 3001, BILLS TO PROVIDE BASIC REFORM OF FEDERAL TAX RATES AND MEASURES

Whereas the present Federal tax structure stunts economic growth since it both prohibits adequate capital accumulation and destroys capital once accumulated; and

Whereas among the taxes which are causing the greatest harm in this connection are (1) the personal income tax with its heavy progressive and confiscatory rates, extending from a beginning rate of 20 percent to a top rate of 91 percent, and (2) the tax on corporate incomes with combined normal surtax of 52 percent; and

Whereas on January 21, 1959, Representative HERLONG, Democrat, of Florida, and Representative BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, introduced in the House of Representatives in Congress companion bills (H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001) providing for "basic reform to Federal tax rates and methods in five major areas" and providing for "removal of tax blocks to progress"; and

Whereas the provisions of these bills would:

(a) Moderate personal and corporate income taxes, over a 5-year period, to a top rate of 47 percent;

(b) establish more realistic depreciation rules;

(c) defer taxes for individuals on long-term capital gains until such time as the taxpayer "disinvests";

(d) reduce the rate of tax on estates and gifts; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the Herlong-Baker bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bossier Chamber of Commerce, That Congress be urged to enact the Herlong-Baker bills into law.

Latin Diplomats Urge U.S. Economic Steps Against Castro Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal:

LATIN DIPLOMATS URGE U.S. ECONOMIC STEPS AGAINST CASTRO ACTIONS—THEY DISCOUNT FEAR OF LATIN REACTION; SEE CUBA'S ACTS GIVING THEM A BLACK EYE

(By Cal Brumley)

HAVANA.—Most foreign diplomats here, including those from other Latin American lands, believe the United States should invoke economic reprisals in response to Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's anti-American tirades and actions.

This may come as a surprise to the U.S. State Department, which has been reluctant to urge any action against Dr. Castro, partly in fear of stirring up anti-U.S. sentiment in other Latin nations. In fact, just yesterday Secretary of State Herter reasserted at his news conference that the United States will not retaliate against Dr. Castro's actions. Mr. Herter said that during their trip to four South American countries over the past 2 weeks he and President Eisenhower had found that, although many Latin officials are worried about the direction in which the Castro regime seems to be headed, they oppose U.S. intervention in the affairs of any Latin American nation.

But talks with emissaries to Cuba from many countries disclose that most of them favor a cut in the price the U.S. pays for Cuban sugar; this price is about 2 cents above the world market level. Moreover, most diplomats think the United States could take this action without risking serious criticism from other lands.

"If the United States reduced its sugar premium, only the leftists in other Latin American nations would react unfavorably," one South American ambassador here asserts. Another diplomat adds: "The United States is under no obligation, moral or otherwise, to hand Cubans extra money for sugar."

CONCERN FOR U.S. INVESTMENTS

An oft-expressed worry among Latin American diplomats is that Dr. Castro's apparently successful seizure of some U.S. property may frighten away U.S. capital from other Latin countries. "Americans may get the idea Dr. Castro will set the pattern for other places in Latin America," one envoy declares.

So far, Secretary Herter's rebuke to Cuba on Monday is the sharpest official protest the United States has lodged against Dr. Castro's anti-American statements. Mr. Herter was replying specifically to charges by Dr. Castro that "U.S. interests" had been responsible for the explosion in Havana harbor of a French ship that had been carrying munitions to Cuba. When Dr. Castro called Mr. Herter's rebuke "insulting," the Secretary spoke out again yesterday, declaring that the Castro regime seems to "go out of its way" to make difficulties. Mr. Herter said the United States hasn't considered breaking diplomatic relations with the Castro government, but he conceded circumstances could arise which would make such a step necessary.

If the United States did eliminate or cut its premium for Cuban sugar—and the current Congress is due to consider such a measure in an overall study of sugar imports—the economy of Dr. Castro's government would be seriously impaired. Last year U.S. purchases of Cuban sugar amounted to nearly $345 million out of total Cuban sugar sales of $500 million. Sugar sales account for about 25 percent of Cuba's total national income and about 80 percent of its export income, which it must have to pay for imports it needs.

SOME CUBANS WANT CUT

There is no doubt a cut in the sugar premium would hurt the Cuban people, at least temporarily, and President Eisenhower says this is one thing the United States hopes to avoid. But there are some anti-Castro Cubans who would welcome the premium cut if it would help get rid of the present Cuban Government.

"You'd be surprised how many Cubans are ready to suffer through something that would help get rid of this dictatorship," says one Cuban businessman. Declares another: "Anything that would help establish a democratic government here would be an act of friendship, not economic aggression toward the Cuban people. What can be worse than being controlled by a radical dictatorship?"

Most foreign diplomats here have been hoping for a change in the Cuban Government's attitude, as has the United States. But recent events have convinced most of the envoys the United States has no choice but to take action that will point up the concern it and other nations feel toward the trend of Cuban policy. These diplomats believe a cut in the sugar premium is the least risky warning the United States can issue. One ambassador suggests the United States should cut the amount of sugar it buys from Cuba and allot the amount among such friendly sugar-producing nations as Brazil, Mexico, Peru and others. But most envoys believe this would require tedious negotiations with too many other countries.

Though cutting the sugar premium perhaps would be less dangerous than some other reprisals, there still would be risks involved. Foremost would be the safety of the approximately 5,000 U.S. citizens who live on this tropical island. "Their safety is a real concern and you just can't tell what Castro's people might do if the United States took some definite action," one American official here says.

Another consideration is American property here. U.S. investments in Cuba total about $800 million; the Cuban Government already has seized U.S. property worth about $5 million to $6 million, promising payment

in 20-year government bonds. "If the United States cuts the sugar premium it's a good bet Dr. Castro will take over other American interests," a U.S. official says. But other Americans here believe Dr. Castro eventually will take over all U.S. interests anyway.

Still another point to consider is that Dr. Castro's anti-U.S. tirades almost certainly would become even more virulent if there is any cut in the sugar premium. Dr. Castro and the Cuban government-directed press probably would scream "economic aggression," "big stick," and "Yankee imperialism." Echoes of such cries might be heard, too, from Russia, which recently signed a trade agreement with Cuba, and from leftist elements in other countries. But this possibility is shrugged off, too, by some observers. "The United States gets blamed for everything that goes wrong in Cuba anyway," is the way one foreign diplomat puts it.

LOSING FRIENDS?

Many ambassadors believe Dr. Castro's outbursts against the United States have lost him friends in other Latin American nations. One diplomat says he believes the Cuban premier "has lost the sympathy of 75 percent of South America." This diplomat notes that Peru, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and Ecuador have declined to attend Cuba's proposed fall conference of underdeveloped nations. "I think this shows what we think of him," this Latin American emissary declares.

Most diplomats appear puzzled by Dr. Castro's anti-Americanism and believe the explanation goes beyond such Castro charges as U.S. support of the deposed Batista government and American exploitation of Cuba. One envoy believes Dr. Castro's attitude "stems from the Communist influence." Another believes it is impossible to fathom Dr. Castro's motives because "he is not a logical man according to the way we understand the term."

"The bitterness may be self-justification for the seizure of private property, both American and Cuban," another Ambassador speculates. At least one diplomat thinks Dr. Castro is deliberately trying to provoke U.S. reprisals for propaganda purposes.

DISAGREEMENT ON TIMING

While most Ambassadors here believe the United States should act to curb Dr. Castro's power, there is considerable disagreement on timing. One diplomat says he "still has hopes the Cuban people will react against this government and give the United States a chance to help them." Another declares the United States "probably shouldn't change the sugar price for at least a year; the policy of tolerance has been the best so far."

But a Cuban businessman asserts that every day Dr. Castro is in power more private property is being taken over by the government. "This means that much more that will have to be straightened out eventually," he says.

Many Ambassadors express the belief that the revolutionary Cuban Government is Communist-dominated and poses a serious menace to the rest of North and South America. "I'm fully convinced the top men are 100 percent Communist," says one diplomatic observer. Another emissary believes that "Cuba may become a center of Communist imperialism in Latin America because Castro has a Simon Bolivar complex." This is a reference to the 19th century revolutionist who led uprisings that resulted in the independence from Spain of what is now Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Bolivia.

Almost all diplomats here agree that if the United States cuts the premium for Cuban sugar, it should explain its action fully and should follow it up with policies of friendship and aid to other Latin American lands. One Ambassador suggests: "You don't have to say the premium is being cut because of Cuba; do it because you're revamping farm policies or something." Another says: "Perhaps the best way to explain any action you take would be to bring it before the Organization of American States."

Imports: They're Much More Than Just a Management Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement on the subject of textile imports issued by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, which appeared March 21, 1960, in the form of an advertisement in the Daily News Record, a textile trade publication:

A STATEMENT TO THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY—IMPORTS: THEY'RE MUCH MORE THAN JUST A MANAGEMENT PROBLEM—THE SITUATION CALLS FOR JOINT ACTION

The issue of textile imports is prominent in the news of late, and we are glad this is so. It's good, indeed, to see management bestirring itself before congressional committees in behalf of a solution to this vexing problem.

Better yet is the fact that management, through advertisements in the press, is attempting to enlist public support of measures to remove one ill which plagues our industry.

But is this enough?

We say no, for the basic flaw in management's case for relief from imports lies in the fact that textile management does not speak for the million workers in its employ; nor does it speak for the many hundreds of communities which depend upon it for its economic well-being. The sad fact is that management speaks only for itself.

As a result, an industry which paints a picture of disaster only in terms of yardage, looms, and spindles cannot hope to catch the imagination and sympathy of the public, which is essential to a solution. It can't even catch the imagination of people who ought to know better.

Want proof?

We refer you to the New York Times of March 6, 1960. It is a sad commentary, indeed, on the quality of the industry's presentation when the Nation's leading newspaper, editorially reviewing the testimony heard by the U.S. Tariff Commission, has only this to say:

"If this is the best 'disaster' the protectionists can produce, then we can all relax and go about the profitable business of lowering our tariffs further."

The industry's testimony, of course, is not the best case that can be made to demonstrate the true extent of the disaster which textile imports are wreaking upon our industry. This case can best be told in terms of several hundred thousand textile workers who have been liquidated out of their jobs, and of several hundred textile communities which have become depressed because of the steady and unrelenting decline of our industry.

As long as the textile industry regards imports as largely a management problem, it will not win the ear of the public and, through it, the help of Congress and the administration. This is because textile imports are much more than a management problem. They are a worker's problem and a community problem, too.

The situation demands joint action by representatives of management and of textile workers. And the most influential voice in behalf of the worker is the Textile Workers Union of America. Unlike most management spokesmen, we are not Johnny-Come-Latelys to the cause of relief from textile imports.

For the last 15 years we have appeared before congressional committees in an attempt to alert the Nation to the dangers which unrestricted imports pose to our industry and to its workers.

More than any other single force, we were instrumental in securing the passage of peril-point legislation to safeguard the woolen and worsted industry.

The Pastore hearings were prompted in great measure by our mobilization of sentiment in behalf of such a study. And the measures it has produced are in great part patterned after the proposals we have made during the course of those hearings. In fact, there is not a single approach to the creation of new textile markets and the development of new products and new uses for textiles which does not bear, to some degree, the imprint of TWUA.

But enough of this. We're not out to pin any medals on our chests.

We simply want to call attention to the fact that the industry's frustrations stem from its failure to enlist the textile worker in its cause. The union's frustrations stem from the fact that its efforts have lacked the support of the industry.

The way out is clear. If management and the union got together, a rational approach to the problems of the textile industry could be devised.

As always, we are prepared to give it a try. Only one question remains:

How much longer is the industry going to close its eyes to this basic need?

WM. POLLOCK,
General President, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hoover Commission's Recommendations Bogged Down After 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, 5 years have elapsed since the second Hoover Commission completed its monumental research and laid out prudent, sensible guidelines for reorganization of the executive branch.

Many Members of Congress will recall that one of the Hoover Commission's primary fields of interest was Government competition with private enterprise. Former President Hoover and his colleagues on the bipartisan Commission urged prompt, effective steps to curtail and eliminate many Federal activities competing unfairly with taxpaying private business. I was happy to support this recommendation and introduced legislation to implement it.

Over the years the administration has restated many times its policy on this issue—a policy squarely in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Yet, somewhere in the lower echelons of the executive branch, this policy seems to have bogged down. Five years have passed since the Hoover Commission posted unmistakable signals to steer the executive branch to those areas where unjustified Federal competition was concentrated. But from all I have been able to gather, these signs have been largely ignored, or somebody missed a turn somewhere.

Now we find that the Bureau of the Budget, which was assigned responsibility to implement the administration's policy and keep track of its progress, has polled the various executive agencies to find out just where the program stands.

Until this survey is completed, therefore, nobody really knows how many of the Government's unnecessary business-type activities have been closed down or curtailed. Nor, for that matter, does anyone know how many new enterprises have sprung up.

All we do know is that 5 years should allow plenty of time for considerable progress, and there are few, if any, signs that such progress has been made.

Fortunately, one of our eminent colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the legislative sponsor and member of the Hoover Commission, is making it his business to find out. He is alarmed, as others of us are, by the apparent lack of interest and achievement in this program and by evidence that 5 valuable years may have been wasted. I invite the attention of all Members of Congress to the following pertinent correspondence:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1960.

The Honorable MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: As I am sure you know, as the legislative father and a member of the two Hoover Commissions, I joined in preparing the Commissions' recommendations to the Federal Government out of business competition with taxpaying private enterprise, and I have written you a number of letters on this subject.

As a result of the Commission's recommendations, some action has been taken and the President has shown a great interest in the elimination of Government competition with private enterprise.

Over 5 years ago, on January 15, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget issued a directive (Bulletin No. 55–4) setting forth a phased program to curtail certain business-type activities conducted by the executive branch in competition with taxpaying private enterprise.

One noteworthy result of this directive was an inventory of those activities that provided products or services for the Government's own use. This inventory, you may recall, listed 19,771 such activities with 266,521 Federal employees and capital assets totaling $11,863,990,569.

I am writing now to inquire as to what important results in reducing these Government activities have been accomplished over the past 5 years.

Bulletin No. 60–2, issued by the Bureau of the Budget at the direction of the President in 1959, requires a thorough inventory of all commercial-industrial-type activities within the Department of Defense. I am interested in learning the outcome of this inventory and, more importantly, the expected action to result from it.

I would like to particularly invite your attention to a passage from a report issued by the Joint Economic Committee:

"The administration appears to have lost some of its earlier enthusiasm for this program. When the program was initiated in January of 1955 it called for the phased evaluation of all commercial-industrial type activities as quickly as possible. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget testified before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business on April 16, 1957, that the Government agencies had completed the evaluation of manufacturing and service-type activities and stated that 'subsequent reviews of other classifications of commercial activities, such as construction, transportation, communications, etc., will be scheduled.' Yet it was about 2½ years after this testimony that the Bureau of the Budget got around to requesting agencies to conduct the next series of its phased evaluations program of governmentally conducted commercial-type activities. As pointed out, the administration's program has been inactive for over 2 years. As a result of this delay certain competitive Government activities have not yet been evaluated under this program."

In view of the concern expressed by a great many businessmen and their State and national organizations, as well as critical comments such as have been made by the Joint Economic Committee, I believe it is urgently important for the Bureau of the Budget to act promptly when it has evaluated the pertinent data from its current summary. A period of 5 years should have allowed time for considerable progress on this program.

As I understood the Bureau's Bulletin No. 55–4, there were to be four phases of the program to curtail unnecessary competitive activities producing goods or services for the Government's own use. These phases were as follows:

1. The inventory. As I noted earlier, this research survey disclosed the vast dimensions of the Government's commercial-type enterprises.
2. Evaluation of these enterprises.
3. Action to close or curtail these enterprises, on the basis of the evaluation process.
4. Action to limit starting new enterprises.

It would seem to me that whatever progress report the Bureau compiles should cite specific instances of progress in each of these phases of the program. This would permit a more meaningful appraisal of the results achieved, thus far, by pinpointing areas where progress may have lagged.

Illustrative of the type of comment I am receiving from business organizations on this important problem, I am taking the liberty of enclosing a letter I have just received from Elton Kile, president of National Associated Businessmen, Inc. So your consideration of this matter and the request I have made will be deeply appreciated.

If there is any further information you desire, please advise me.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Ohio District.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATED BUSINESSMEN, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1960.

The Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: National Associated Businessmen, Inc., a coalition of 700 independent businessmen, is gravely concerned about the apparent lack of progress in reducing the number of Government commercial activities that compete with taxpaying private enterprise.

Recalling your own consistent interest in this matter, both as a Member of Congress and as legislative sponsor and member of both Hoover Commissions, our organization respectfully asks your assistance in our efforts to revive governmental interest in this matter.

As you know, the Bureau of the Budget, by direction of the President, specifically called for curtailment of certain commercial-industrial activities of the various agencies in Bulletin No. 55–4 of January 15, 1955.

This bulletin declared, in part, that "It is the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise."

Elsewhere in the bulletin, the Director of the Budget stipulated that "Except where such congressional action would be required, activities should be discontinued as soon as the agency head determines that it is reasonably possible to do so. Where congressional action would be necessary to permit discontinuance, the agency head shall seek such action promptly."

Five years have passed since this program was initiated. In that period the Bureau of the Budget has issued two other bulletins dealing with this same general problem. As you are aware, the Bureau of the Budget in September of 1959 issued its directive 60–2 by order of the President requesting the Defense Department to conduct an inventory on all commercial-industrial-type activities within their organization. This inventory is scheduled to be completed within a month. National Associated Businessmen is profoundly interested in the results of this inventory and hope that strong efforts will be made in the implementation of the administration policy when the facts are made public.

This audit, we are sure, will show that relatively little has been accomplished, even in the rather narrow area of Government competition covered in Bulletin No. 55–4.

This bulletin only dealt with those business-type activities which provide products or services for the use of the Federal Government itself. It did not deal with those activities which provide products or services for the general public, such as public power projects, or those activities which serve Federal employees, such as military commissaries.

Yet, even though Bulletin No. 55–4 covered only one of the three broad classes of Federal business-type activities, it still resulted in an inventory that listed 19,771 commercial-industrial activities which capital assets of $11.9 billion and 266,000 employees.

National Associated Businessmen believe that prompt and vigorous action to remove the Federal Government from unjustified and unnecessary competition with private enterprise is essential to our Nation's economic progress. Failure to do so, in direct contradiction of repeated pledges by the administration, constitutes a tragic drain of public funds and contributes to the inflationary pressures that threaten our prosperity and growth.

We hope you will see fit to make such inquiries as you deem necessary in order, first, to determine precisely the extent of compliance with the 1955 and subsequent directives of the Bureau of the Budget, and secondly, to recall to the attention of the

Congress and the executive branch the need for strong action when the audit required by directive 60-2 is completed.

Respectfully,

ELTON KILE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the National Associated Businessmen for once again drawing attention to this problem, and I hope that all Members of Congress will take it upon themselves to examine carefully the forthcoming report of the Bureau of the Budget.

If it confirms the signs of disinterest and inaction, as I suspect it will, Congress would be well advised to place this entire matter under severe scrutiny.

I am also delighted that my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], has again taken an interest in this matter. His action in the past has no doubt saved hundreds of millions, yes, perhaps billions, of dollars for the taxpayers of this Nation.

Joseph M. Healey, Mayor of Kearny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 9, the Wilson-Gugelman Post No. 1302, Veterans of Foreign Wars, will award the VFW citizenship medal to an outstanding citizen of the community. This is the first time in its 35-year history that the Wilson-Gugelman Post has made such an award, and they have chosen as the first recipient, Joseph W. Healey, mayor of Kearny.

In announcing their award to Mayor Healey the post wrote:

The example you have set to all men has been the inspiration of this award. With your energy, high morality, and sense of neighborhood and public responsibility, you have brought to Kearny, the State, and the Nation a new kind of citizenship. Times like these require men of strong minds, stout hearts, true faith, and ready hands. These you have provided and we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars honor you for this.

I can personally attest that this is a well deserved tribute. Mayor Healey's background as a public servant, his outstanding and unselfish contributions to civic and community affairs, and his significant record of personal accomplishment make him a most worthy candidate for this high commendation. Indeed, I can think of no one who is more worthy, or more deserving; Mayor Healey has been aptly named as the outstanding citizen in the community.

As a close and personal friend of Joe Healey, and as one who has been in close association with him in community affairs, I well know his dedication and devotion to public service. I know how deeply interested he is in the welfare of the people—all of the people and each of them individually. I do not believe there is anyone in public office who has a better or more dedicated understanding of his community's needs and problems. He has given of himself unsparingly and tirelessly for the good of the people.

I therefore join in this salute to Joseph M. Healey, a great mayor and an outstanding public servant and citizen. In my opinion the Wilson-Gugelman Post made an inspired choice by designating Joe Healey as the outstanding citizen in the community.

Library Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter sent to me merely to express gratitude for Federal funds, appropriated under the Library Services Act, which made possible the extension of library service in an area so badly damaged by Hurricane Audrey in 1957. Even though this experience, I am sure, can be duplicated many times in all parts of our country, I believe my colleagues will find this letter most interesting:

LOUISIANA STATE LIBRARY,
Cameron, La., March 22, 1960.

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
Member of the House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Speaking for the Library Board of Control of the Cameron Parish Library Demonstration, I should like to acknowledge with gratitude Federal funds used so effectively—we think—in bringing permanent library service to Cameron.

After using the sample library placed in the parish for the past 20 months—financed entirely by Federal and State funds, under the statewide library development plan of the Louisiana State Library—property holders of Cameron Parish went to the polls last week and voted overwhelmingly to continue their library.

We are very proud of this record vote for a public library, and in a parish to which Hurricane Audrey brought widespread devastation less than 3 years ago. Voters supported enthusiastically a 2-mill special library tax, which will yield the library an annual income of $28,000 or more for the next 10 years. The vote for the tax carried by more than four to one in number (395 votes for, 83 against) and more than five to one in property assessment ($667,269 for, $130,404 against).

And this in Louisiana's smallest parish, with an estimated population of little more than 5,000 people.

We believe people will read books if books are given to them in plenty. Cameron people read 68,000 books since the library opened on June 27, 1958; and more than 2,000 of them are registered library users. We believe that people will support libraries from local funds, once the joys and benefits coming from reading are demonstrated to them.

So, thank you for your support which helped to make possible the financing of a successful library demonstration in Cameron Parish.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Charles W. Hebert, President, Library Board; Eraste Hebert, President, Cameron Police Jury and Ex Officio Board Member; Members of the Board: Mrs. Chas. Precht, Bell City, Donald Broussard, Creole; Mrs. Virgie LeBleu, Cameron; Mrs. Lee Nunez, Grand Chenier; Mrs. A. F. Sanner, Hackberry.

Democrats or Campocrats in Puerto Rico?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of March 30, page A2801, I had a statement pertaining to the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico. That statement was prompted by the fact that on March 19 that party had been officially registered for the first time in the history of Puerto Rico and that it would actively participate in local elections next November. The chairman of the Democratic Party there is my good friend Jose A. Benitez.

It seems that certain powerful elements in Puerto Rico are not particularly anxious to have a growing and active Democratic Party on the island, particularly one that advocates strong ties with the Democratic Party on the mainland. The result is that a controversy has been cooked up and a splinter group formed under the leadership of one Enrique Campos del Toro, and his followers are now known as Campocrats. It is no secret, however, throughout Puerto Rico that the real force behind Campos is Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, who is not very anxious to have a live and vibrant Democratic Party there which supports statehood.

In its issue of March 29, 1960, the San Juan Star published an article under the title "Democratic Birthright Sold?" The last two paragraphs of that article read as follows:

A Democratic withdrawal from insular elections leaves a clear field for the GOP, and Governor Moñoz frantically claims that the Republican White House is intervening here already.

If Puerto Rico wins statehood, on the shoulders of the GOP, island Congressmen will be Republicans despite the normal Democratic preference of Puerto Ricans.

The significance of the views expressed in the above Puerto Rican newspaper should not escape the Democratic Party and Democratic leaders in the United States. Governor Muñoz, Mr. Campos, and their followers, in their blind opposition to statehood for Puerto Rico, will drive the overwhelming majority of the Puerto Rican people into the arms of the Republican Party. Despite all that the Democratic Party and past Democratic administrations in Washington have done for Puerto Rico, it should be clearly

understood that if statehood ever comes to the island it will be the Republican Party that will receive all the credit for achieving it. And for that we shall later have to thank Governor Muñoz and his friends.

The efforts of the Democratic Party to aid the people of Puerto Rico achieve self-government is a matter of record, which dates from the 1930's during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. These efforts were continued under the administration of President Harry S. Truman who in 1946 appointed Jesus T. Pinero as Governor of the island, the first Puerto Rican to be named to this office. Various reforms followed in subsequent years, culminating in the adoption of Public Law 600 by the U.S. Congress on June 4, 1951, establishing the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I vividly recall that action in Congress for I was then a freshman Member of the House and I voted for that act.

All that good will that had been built up over the years by the Democratic Party is now in danger of being dissipated, because of the divisive and frustrating action taken by the Campos group. Their convention was illegal since it was not officially called by the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico. They are only a rump group which is not interested in building a Democratic Party on the island. They will function on paper only, and their primary purpose will be to maintain status quo and to keep others from doing anything worthwhile.

The ones who will suffer will be the Democratic Party, in Puerto Rico and on the mainland. But not only will the Democrats be hurt, the Republican Party too will suffer because the Muñoz tactics are actually antistatehood maneuvers and the perpetuation of the present system and leadership of government.

Furthermore, the real aim behind this movement called Campocrats, which is supported by Governor Muñoz, is to eliminate the influence of any party in Puerto Rico which is attached to the mainland.

The Democratic Party in the United States should not overlook these maneuvers and their true significance in the future. If we do, our party and our country will be greatly hurt in Puerto Rico for many years to come.

In the meantime, the people of Puerto Rico may rest assured that the Democratic Party of the island, which is headed by the very able and energetic Jose A. Benitez, will continue to maintain close ties with the Democratic Party of the mainland as in the past and that it will exert all efforts to build up a strong and influential party in the interests of the people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD the article referred to above from the San Juan Star:

[From the San Juan Star, Mar. 29, 1960]

DEMOCRATIC BIRTHRIGHT SOLD?

(By Harold J. Lidin)

Once upon a time, many, many, many years ago, a young idealist named Luis Muñoz Marín weaned the jibaros from their vice of vote selling with the slogan "Verguenza Contra Dinero" (Self-respect versus money).

The ballot is every man's birthright. Muñoz taught them, and is not to be sold, slighted, or bartered.

But last Sunday in the Ateneo Puertorriqueño, the minions of Muñoz took a step that smacks of birthright barter.

MAXIMUM ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION

Assembled to reorganize the "Democratic Party," the delegates pledged to deliver the "maximum" economic contribution to the Democratic 1960 presidential campaign.

In a second motion, the delegates voted not to enter the Democratic Party in island elections.

Purpose of this second motion was to repudiate the drive of rival Democratic Leader Jose A. Benitez to register the Democratic Party here for elections—in other words, to use his party's birthright.

Prominent Popular Victor Gutierrez Franqui, who handled Sunday's meeting with the same finesse he formerly demonstrated as Muñoz' senate floor leader, says the promised campaign contribution will be "at least" $25,000.

Whatever the goal, it will be reached.

RATTLE THAT TINCUP

For the treasurer of the new "Democratic" state committee is Teodoro Moscoso, a stanch Popular who happens to head Fomento. If by any chance Moscoso needs help, he can turn to Max Goldman, another prominent Popular present at the "Democratic" reorganization. As former chief of the tax-exemption office, Goldman also knows where to rattle that tincup.

To pick up the smaller gifts, the Muñoz-backed Democratic committee can use for legmen the same pack of Popular Party ward leaders and city hall employees who crowded Sunday's "Democratic" assembly.

National Democratic Chairman Paul Butler need lose no time wondering whose contribution will be larger, that of the Muñoz-backed Democrats or the Benicrats who favor elections and statehood.

For nobody in Puerto Rico can match the Popular Party fundraising apparatus.

HIGH PRICE OF BIRTHRIGHT

But Butler, and other Democratic chieftains, should take time to assure themselves that acceptance of the Muñoz-Moscoso contribution does not cost the party its birthright.

A Democratic withdrawal from insular elections leaves a clear field for the GOP, and Gov. Muñoz frantically claims that the Republican White House is "intervening" here already.

If Puerto Rico wins statehood, on the shoulders of the GOP, island Congressmen will be Republicans despite the normal Democratic preference of Puerto Ricans.

Influence Peddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the bill to eliminate influence peddling in the granting of defense contracts has aroused this Nation. The people refuse to spend their hard-earned money on excessive costs and waste brought about by influence peddling in the obtaining of procurement contracts.

One of the great fighters in exposing this situation which plagues our Nation is Drew Pearson. On March 31, 1960, and on April 4, 1960, in the Washington Post, Drew Pearson wrote two articles which crystallize the issue with telling effect.

I believe that these articles are timely and will prove informative to the readers:

VOTE ON INFLUENCE TO COST MILLIONS

(By Drew Pearson)

A vote took place in the House Armed Services Committee the other day which will probably cost the taxpayers several million dollars. It was a vote to give more leeway to the brass-hat lobby.

This lobby is composed of a long list of retired admirals and generals who jump from the Pentagon almost immediately into drawing lush salaries from big defense contractors. Their chummy relationship with the active admirals and generals who remain behind, some of whom they recommended for promotion, led to a full-scale investigation by a House subcommittee last summer headed by Congressman EDWARD HÉBERT, of New Orleans.

Some of the facts revealed by HÉBERT were shocking. Yet when the full House Armed Services Committee was called upon to vote on a bill which would provide criminal penalties for brass-hat lobbying, the full committee bowed to brass-hat defender CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the all-powerful committee chairman.

It removed the criminal penalties. This puts retired brass hats in an entirely different category from retired civilians. A civilian who retires from the Treasury or Justice Departments cannot take a case involving any matter which he handled for the Government for 2 years without going to jail for doing so.

But for a retired officer Chairman VINSON, sometimes called "admiral" because of his championship of the military, removed the criminal penalties urged by Congressman HÉBERT.

One of the biggest defense contractors today is the Glenn Martin Co., of Baltimore. It is manufacturing some of the most vital missiles in the Pentagon's arsenal—the Matador, the Mace, the Bullpup, and the Titan.

ENTERTAINMENT ZOOMED

There was a time when Martin was limping along with few Government contracts. But in recent years its business simultaneously with its entertainment of brass hats has zoomed and its hiring of former brass hats has increased.

Testifying before Congressman HÉBERT, George Bunker, head of Martin, admitted, reluctantly, to taking a long list of admirals and Air Force generals down to the swank Cotton Club in the British Bahamas for some of the fanciest entertainment given by any defense contractor. Bunker also admitted, reluctantly, that Martin had tried to deduct this entertainment from taxes as a legitimate expense but that it didn't get away with it.

Arguing with HÉBERT over Martin's right to entertain the brass hats and deduct it as a business expense, Bunker said: "But Mr. Chairman, we are a private industry."

"Totally a Government product," countered HÉBERT.

"Yes, but a private industry, sir."

"But totally subsidized by the Government," insisted the Congressman.

"I don't like the word subsidized," protested Bunker.

"I know," shot back HÉBERT, "but if the Government withdrew its contracts from the Martin Co., you would be out of business."

GOLFING LOBBYING

Bunker had no comeback.

At first Bunker denied that the Martin Co. had any memberships at Chevy Chase,

Burning Tree, or other nearby golfing clubs but HÉBERT wasn't satisfied.

"Well, then," he asked, "does the company or individuals connected with the company entertain the military in golf games over the weekend, or during the week, at Burning Tree?"

"We do play golf at Burning Tree with military people," admitted Bunker. "My answer is yes."

Martin also hired an Air Force major general, Dudley D. Hale, a few weeks after he retired, to be a glorified lobbyist in Washington.

"What was the compensation?" Bunker was asked.

"His base compensation was $20,000."

This is just a small part of the amazing confessions of some of the companies which hired brass-hat lobbyists and entertained the brass hats. Despite this, the vote against criminal penalties in the bill to prevent brass-hat lobbying was 28 to 4. Here are some of the Congressmen who bowed to Chairman Vinson to protect the brass hats: Democrats Price, of Illinois, a fine Congressman who gets nervous over Vinson's opposition; Lankford, of Maryland, another good Congressman who fears the Vinson whiplash; Stratton, of New York, close friend of Adm. Arleigh Burke; Rivers, of South Carolina; Philbin, of Massachusetts; Fisher of Texas; Hardy, of Virginia; Bennett, of Florida; Huddleston, of Alabama; Doyle, of California; Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Cohelan, of California; Morris, of Oklahoma, who represents the district in which Fort Sill is located; Wampler, of Indiana.

The Republicans voting with the brass hats included ARENDS, of Illinois; BATES, of Massachusetts; GAVIN and VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; NORBLAD, of Oregon; BRAY, of Indiana; OSMERS, of New Jersey; ST. GEORGE and BECKER, of New York; WILSON and GUBSER, of California; CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

BRASS-HAT LOBBYING BILL UP TODAY

(By Drew Pearson)

The question of brass-hat lobbying which has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars on defense contracts comes before the House of Representatives for an important vote today.

The House will attempt to fix penalties for the admirals and generals who have become "influence peddlers" for the big munitions companies in such numbers that it has caused President Eisenhower to speak out against the evils of the "munitions lobby."

The retired generals and admirals are paid fancy salaries—far more than their retirement pensions, which they draw simultaneously—to lobby with their old friends in the Pentagon. These fancy salaries also are paid, indirectly, by the taxpayers, because they are added to the cost of missiles, airplanes, tanks, and other weapons which make up the biggest part of the national budget. Even the cost of lavish entertainment for the brass hats on active duty is added onto the tab which the taxpayer has to pay—if Internal Revenue isn't alert enough to stop it.

DOUBLE STANDARD

However, both President Eisenhower and congressional Democrats now want to set up two standards of ethics for lobbying—one for civilians and the other for the military. Ike has fired FCC Chairman John Doerfer for going fishing with a big broadcaster but has condoned lavish fishing-golfing trips by the Air Force and Navy to the British Bahamas Cotton Club arranged by the Martin Company, one of the biggest missile manufactures.

Likewise, Chairman CARL VINSON of Georgia, omnipotent defender of the brass hats, pushed through his armed services committee a powder puff bill providing no criminal penalties for retired officers who lobby on defense contracts within 2 years after retirement. He would only have them forfeit retired pensions. These mean little.

In contrast civilians retired from Government usually get no pensions anyway, and face a jail term if they handle Government cases within 2 years after retirement.

Powerful Chairman VINSON urged northern Democrats and Republicans to fall into line for this mild slap-on-the-wrist bill in his committee. Today, however, he faces a lot of southern opposition. Significantly some of it comes from his equally potent friend, HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, leader of the Dixiecrat-GOP coalition.

"This bill doesn't do anything," Smith told VINSON when he reported the brasshat-lobbying bill out for full debate. "We are granting you a rule, but you are likely to get one your rare lickings on the floor of the House."

VINSON CRACKS WHIP

Louisiana's Congressman EDDIE HÉBERT, former news editor of the New Orleans States, was much blunter inside the Armed Services Committee. He called attention to the fact that VINSON himself had sponsored a tougher bill with criminal penalties, then changed his mind. He did not mention the fact that the military had come to VINSON privately and persuaded the chairman, whom they call Admiral, to change his mind.

"These are your amendments, Mr. Chairman," needled HÉBERT, referring to VINSON's previous stand for criminal penalties.

"All right," blustered VINSON impatiently. "I am offering them to give the committee an opportunity to vote," slyly continued HÉBERT. "I will stand by you, Mr. Chairman, I won't run away from you. I won't repudiate you. You can repudiate yourself."

The crusty Congressman from Georgia ignored HÉBERT's dig.

"I trust everybody will vote correctly this morning, like they did the other day when the committee adopted my viewpoint," said VINSON, cracking the whip. "I am satisfied that the committee is going to continue that same viewpoint."

"I——," HÉBERT tried to speak.

"Let's vote," interrupted VINSON.

"I admit, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will sustain you," HÉBERT finally got in his word. "But I want to give you an opportunity to sustain yourself."

"Call the roll," thundered VINSON.

As almost always happens when Chairman VINSON makes it a personal issue, his committee bowed. The vote was 28 to 4 in his favor. Only votes against him were two southerners and two Republicans—HÉBERT, of Louisiana, WINSTEAD, of Mississippi; with Republicans ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin and WILLIAM HESS, of Ohio.

The vote today before the full House will attempt to reverse VINSON and put the same criminal penalties into the brass-hat lobbying bill which apply to civilians.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a thoughtful letter from the Right Reverend Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of the Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

As the mutual security bill of 1960 will soon be coming to the floor for consideration, I am calling these views to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the people of America.

The letter follows:

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES—NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE.
New York, N.Y., March 30, 1960.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: The problem of mounting stores of surplus farm commodities is one that I know is of great concern to all the Members of Congress and the officials of various departments of our Government.

Through Public Law 480 you have given the American voluntary relief agencies a wonderful opportunity to accomplish great good among the poor and distressed in all quarters of need throughout the world. All of us have made an effort to make the fullest and most effective use of this opportunity.

From time to time the directors of the other voluntary agencies and myself are asked for suggestions for the better use and distribution of these commodities.

We have found by years of experience that there are various factors that seriously impair the efficiency and extent of the programs that our agencies are carrying on overseas on behalf of the needy in which we use title III, U.S. Goverment food supplies. It seems that some of this could be resolved through proper action on the part of Congress.

The purpose of this letter is to lay these problems before you and the members of congressional committees concerned in the hope that all or some may be resolved.

They are as follows:

1. The problem of landlocked countries. Such countries as Laos, Paraguay, and Bolivia, among others have no seaports to which our food supplies can be shipped. These countries are, of course, very poor ones and in great need of the supplies that we could make available to them under a title III program in larger quantities were ocean freight funds utilizable to the point of entry of these countries. At the present time we can only ship these supplies to a seaport in a neighboring country. The problem of overland transportation of the supplies from such a port to the point of entry of the countries concerned might be resolved by an expression of intent of Congress concerning the use of the ocean freight funds. Government lawyers have already decided that their interpretation of the use of these funds limits them to what is strictly ocean freight. This, of course, works a hardship both on the agencies carrying out programs in landlocked countries and on the landlocked countries themselves.

2. According to present understanding of Public Law 480, all food supplies used by voluntary agencies under title III must be distributed to the needy without exacting any form of recompense from them. This in effect means that these foods cannot be used to pay workers who might be engaged in community effort activities. Many agencies are interested in projects of public interest nature such as the building of schools, small roads, drainage ditches, dikes, bridges, etc. Very often the people of underdeveloped countries could be induced to engage in community efforts of this kind if title III foodstuffs could be used as a recompense for their labors in behalf of a community project. Such a use of these foods would have important social, as well as economic, benefits since community spirit would be fostered thereby and the value of copoerative effort for social betterment would be made known.

3. According to the present regulations under which we operate, food must be distributed as it is received, or its conversion into other end products must be paid for by some source other than the recipient. The food itself cannot be used in any case to pay for its own conversion into other end products. In effect this means that the lack of adequate resources on the part of the voluntary agency operating the program or on the part of local groups cooperating with the program limits the amount of wheat flour that could be converted into bread or noodles, for example. This in turn limits the usefulness of the supplies. In occupied areas around the world after the last war the Army used a part of these supplies to pay for their conversion. Also title I and title II supplies are sold in a variety of manners. It would be a great help to the efficiency of the operations of title III programs if the actual work of converting the supplies into other end use products could be paid for with a part of the supplies themselves. Specifically, bakers could be paid in flour for the baking of bread or the making of noodles. The end result of such a possibility would be to give the poor items that could be used immediately and to familiarize them with new types of food that would be much more beneficial to them than some of those that they are presently using.

4. The use of corn for animal fodder. The people of Asia need meat and are particularly fond of pork in most countries. If corn could be used as food for animals it would be possible to convert large quantities of our surpluses into meat. The details of this would have to be worked out very carefully, of course, in order that the meat go to needy people. Something that might be considered would be, for example, the supplying of corn to people who would raise pigs under contract with us to return to us a pound of pork for a set quantity of corn delivered to them. This may seem like an almost impossible thing to attain, but we should remember that at one time it was illegal to purchase American surplus in the United States for use as animal fodder. At a later date this procedure was made legal. If it could be made legal overseas also, I am sure that we could do a great deal of good in many countries with the resultant product.

Over the past few years representatives of some of the other agencies and myself have offered these suggestions in whole or in part at various hearings on the mutual aid and agricultural bills. I hope that by presenting them to you and some of the other leaders of Congress in this form they may be of some further help to Congress in its deliberations on these matters.

With a word of kindest personal regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

A Publisher's Eulogy for Russell V. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we Members of the House of Representatives knew our late colleague, RUSSELL MACK, as a Congressman and servant of the people in the Third Congressional District of Washington. Other persons knew him in other ways. For example, many knew him as a newspaper publisher.

I believe it is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the eulogy presented by Edwin J. Alexander, publisher of the Olympia News, be included in the permanent RECORD at a point following the other tributes to our colleague prior to adjournment of the House on March 28 out of respect to his memory.

This eulogy is as follows:

EULOGY FOR CONGRESSMAN RUSSELL V. MACK

(By Edwin J. Alexander, publisher, the Olympia News, funeral services, First Methodist Church, Aberdeen, Wash., Apr. 2, 1960)

"The other day a friend of mine died. Into my throat came a strange dry lump, and to my heart a depressing weight. Something had gone out of my life. I felt a sense of personal loss and sadness." From a booklet written and published by RUSSELL V. MACK in 1946.

Now our noble friend has fallen—pierced by the arrow of death. The places that have known him shall know him no more, but his virtues are written on tablets of love and memory.

RUSSELL V. MACK was truly one of nature's noblemen—a good man, a true friend, and honored citizen.

Many of you here in this church this morning remember RUSSELL as a boy and as a young man and in the years that followed—know full well that he had won his crown in Heaven ere he had reached the middle period of his good life.

From cub reporter to business manager on the Aberdeen Daily World to publisher of the Grays Harbor Daily Washingtonian—from publisher to Congressman—RUSSELL was a constant exemplar of the cardinal principles that constitute the highest order of the brotherhood of man.

RUSSELL was intensely patriotic. He loved his country with great passion and enthusiasm. RUSSELL linked his personal destiny with the destiny of his country and its flag.

RUSSELL was a powerful champion and defender of our American faith and our American way of life. He went back and forth across this district—yes, this State and our Nation—teaching and preaching and practicing the gospel of Americanism and quickening the spirit of American patriotism in the hearts and minds of our people everywhere.

RUSSELL loved his Grays Harbor and these nine counties and our great State of Washington in such a zealous and ardent manner that it verily excited the local pride within all of us to nearly a bursting point.

People liked RUSSELL because RUSSELL liked people. He enjoyed being with his friends, making new friends and meeting strangers. No one was a stranger for long in Russell's warm and friendly presence.

A great newspaperman, editor, and publisher, many of us in this place this morning knew him as a kindly, considerate, and generous employer, counselor, and friend.

As a fraternalist we knew him as one sincerely devoted to the principles of brotherly love and fidelity whose outstretched hands were ever ready to assist those in need.

As a citizen we knew him as a dedicated public servant, a dynamic leader, and honored Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, where his brilliant record of service and devotion to country will stand as a lasting monument and tribute to the true patriot that he was.

RUSSELL died as he would have wanted—standing on the floor of the Congress voting for his beloved country.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Dodge County, Wis., Owes Fame to Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the Washington aura of broad scope programs, multi-billion-dollar budgets, far-flung policies, and conquest of outer space ideas, there may be an inclination, from time to time, to overlook the grass-roots human and natural forces that make communities "tick" in this great country.

As a nation, however, we are dependent upon our local communities linked together in a strong chain of economic, cultural, patriotic, spiritual ideals and principles, for the key to progress for the future.

Today, I would like to refer specifically to an outstanding community in Wisconsin—Dodge County—one of the leading 100 in the Nation.

Dodge produces more cheese than any other county in Wisconsin; it is No. 2 in the State in total cash income; and No. 3 in milk production.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published two informative articles—one by Robert W. Wells, entitled "Busy Dodge County Owes Fame to Cow," and the other, by a staff correspondent, "Dodge Tops State in Cheesemaking"—on the historical and present significance of the economy of this particular community.

As a splendid review of the significant way in which the people of Dodge County are moving ahead and contributing to progress in the State and Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 31, 1960]

BUSY DODGE COUNTY OWES FAME TO COW—THE HOLSTEIN MADE IT A FARM LEADER IN UNITED STATES—IF COWS, CALVES, BULLS, AND HEIFERS STOOD NOSE TO TAIL IN A STRAIGHT LINE, IT WOULD REACH 270 MILES; BEAVER DAM IS THE BIGGEST CITY AND JUNEAU IS THE COUNTY SEAT

(By Robert W. Wells)

JUNEAU, WIS.—Dodge County residents are too busy with the milking to erect a statue to their leading resident, but the Holstein cow deserves one. She's made the county what it is today.

And what is it today? Well, Dodge is one of the Nation's 100 leading farm counties. It produces more cheese than any other county in Wisconsin. It is No. 2 in the State (behind Dane) in total cash income to farmers. It is No. 3 (behind Dane and Marathon) in milk production.

If you could persuade Dodge County's cows, calves, bulls, and heifers to stand nose to tail in a straight line it would stretch for 270 miles. If you added the county's 79,000 pigs and its 565,000 chickens to those 137,000 cattle, you could stretch the line all the way from Hustisford to Ashtabula, Ohio, and cause a lot of comment.

MILK IS PLENTIFUL

If Dodge citizens were required to consume all the milk produced in their county, each would have to drink 10,387 pounds a year.

Actually, the Dodge County populace is willing to share its lacteal bounty with paying customers elsewhere. Most of it goes to Wisconsin and Illinois consumers, but some of the fluid milk is trucked to points as far away as Florida. And residents of practically anywhere in the Nation are apt to find themselves eating Dodge County cheese.

The county is second in the State in egg production—about 100 million a year—and is among the top five counties in the United States in the sale of green peas and sweet corn.

INCOME IS HIGH

Cash income for the county's 3,700 farms averages over $10,000 a year. The annual total of about $38 million includes over $20 million from milk and $33 million from all livestock and livestock products. County Agent Edwin A. Bergstrom estimates that more than three-fourths of the county's farmers primarily are dairymen.

As you may have surmised from those statistics, agriculture is the county's biggest industry by any standard, including employment. About one-third of the county's breadwinners are farmers. About 20,000 of the county's 60,000 residents are farm families.

It should not be supposed that Dodge County is entirely rural, however. It has 11 villages and 7 cities. Of these, Watertown and Waupun are divided between Dodge and adjoining counties.

BEAVER DAM IS BIGGEST CITY

Manufacturing employs 28 percent of the workers, mainly in the Beaver Dam, Horicon, Mayville, Watertown, and Waupun areas. The county's biggest city is Beaver Dam, with an estimated 12,800 people. (Watertown is about the same size, but most of its residents live in Jefferson County.)

Wages are somewhat lower in Dodge County plants than in those around Milwaukee or Madison, but living costs also are lower. The county is about midway between those two cities, but a little too far for commuting to be popular. What commuting there is in Dodge County mostly is from the country to the small nearby cities, such as Beaver Dam.

Juneau, with about 1,500 residents, is the county seat. The 69-member county board meets here. The biggest development in town at the moment is a $275,000 addition to the county jail. The facilities are said to be quite an improvement and if you have to go to jail, you could do worse than Juneau County.

BUILDING IS BRISK

Buildings are going up at a lively pace in Beaver Dam, too. A new city hall is being built at a cost of $550,000, and the YMCA has a fine new building under construction. Since the addition of a new wing at St. Joseph's Hospital recently, it's now possible for 210 persons to occupy beds in the city's two hospitals at the same moment.

Beaver Dam Lake, formed by a dam not built by beavers, is at the city's doorstep. It especially is popular with bullhead fishermen, some of whom come all the way from Milwaukee for the purpose. Fox Lake, a few miles to the north, is a popular summer resort, lined with cottages whose owners claim it's the best fishing lake in the county. They come from Milwaukee, Chicago, and elsewhere to prove it.

The third large lake in the county—there are about 20 all told—in Sinissippi, formed by damming the Rock River at Hustisford. Year-round homes gradually are replacing the summer cottages around it.

HOMES ARE MOVED

Milwaukeeans whose houses have been bought to make way for expressways might be surprised at what's happening in the towns of Ashippun and Rubicon, in the southeast corner of Dodge County. The thrifty residents of those communities, who know a bargain when they see one, have been busily bidding at auctions held in Milwaukee to dispose of the houses on expressway land. County Agent Bergstrom estimated that close to 100 of the dwellings from Milwaukee had been moved out to that part of Dodge County.

An earlier move from Milwaukee occurred at Theresa. Solomon Juneau came there to get away from the horse-drawn traffic jams and founded the place in 1847. His house still is a Theresa landmark.

STATE PRISON IS LANDMARK

Another landmark in the county was begun only 4 years after Juneau's homestead and has been growing ever since. It's the State prison located on the Dodge County side of Waupun. It has about 1,200 prisoners at the moment, plus 400 who are on the 9 outlying farms, for a total of 1,620. That's almost four times the population of Theresa, which would have suited old Solomon just fine.

A medium security correctional institution is planned for the northwestern corner of the county, north of Fox Lake. It will have about 400 prisoners, some of them from the prison and some from the State reformatory at Green Bay.

The history of the county begins in 1836 when the first territorial legislature established it and named it for Henry Dodge, the territorial governor. At the time, it was a county with no permanent residents. But 2 years later Jacob P. Brower and his family set up housekeeping on the north side of Fox Lake.

POPULATION SOARS

By 1850, the county's population had increased to 19,000. The next decade was the time of Dodge County's greatest growth. The population more than doubled in the 10 years. The increase between 1850 and 1860 was larger than that during the next century.

Dodge County was settled mainly by Germans, although Irish, Poles, Dutch and Welsh also came along with the east coast Yankees. German is still spoken extensively in some parts of the county, but only 2,000 of the present residents were born abroad.

Like the farmers of many other areas of Wisconsin, those in Dodge County specialized in wheat at first. But various factors, including the chinch bug, discouraged them and many went into dairying.

Along with farming, the Dodge County residents developed a diversity of industry.

Beaver Dam, for example, has 21 plants that turn out such things as stoves, silos, canned vegetables, shoes, metal products, and, of course, cheese.

Dodge County's urban population, like its rural variety, is inclined to be stable and thrifty. The executive secretary of Beaver Dam's Chamber of Commerce, George J. White, reports that 80 percent of the houses in that city are owner occupied, which is a pretty good indication of how things are around Dodge County.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 31, 1960]

DODGE TOPS STATE IN CHEESEMAKING—69 FACTORIES LOCATED IN COUNTY; MUNSTER, BRICK ARE THE MOST POPULAR TYPES

THERESA, WIS.—The three sons were busily at work at the John A. Widmer & Sons cheese plant. The bottom of one stainless steel vat was covered with what looked like cottage cheese, but wasn't. In a second vat were shredded chunks of what would be Cheddar when the Widmers got through with it.

The stuff that looked like cottage cheese turned out to be one stage in the production of Dodge County's best known product, brick cheese. This variety was originated in the county and Dodge still leads in its production in the State. It also leads in the production of munster (or, if you prefer, muenster) and in the total output of all types of cheese—close to 50 millions pounds a year.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED POUNDS A DAY

Like most of the founders of the county's 69 cheese factories, the elder Widmer came from Switzerland. He has been making cheese for 53 years, he said, and has been at the present location for 38. His three sons, John, Jr., James, and Ralph, help run the family enterprise.

The Widmer plant is midway between the giants like Kraft and the small operations. It turns out about 1,800 pounds a day, some of which is sold over the counter. The rest is marketed through distributors, and winds up in markets in Milwaukee and elsewhere.

Ralph Widmer undertook to explain what was going on.

"We get the entire milk production from 29 farms in this area," he said. "When the milk comes in, we pasteurize it and then fill the vats. Rennet is added to the milk to coagulate it. In a half hour, it becomes as thick as gelatin.

HEATED TO 100°

"The stainless steel vats have double sides. Steampipes run inside them. Once the milk is coagulated, the steam heats the mixture to about 100°. That's the cooking process, and it takes about a half hour.

"It requires 100 pounds of milk to make less than 10 pounds of cheese. The rest is whey. You remember little Miss Muffit? The whey is drawn off—most of it goes back to the farmers for hog feed—and what's left is the curds.

Wire cutters—a rectangular device with numerous small, tightly drawn wires—are drawn through the curds to break them into small pieces. Then they are dipped into wooden forms.

"At this point, Ralph said 'the stuff looks like cottage cheese and tastes like rubber."

SALTED FROM OUTSIDE

After the curds are dipped into the forms, a wooden top is put on the cheese and a brick is placed on the top to weigh it down. That's how brick cheese got its name, Widmer said.

The brick cheese is turned several times. Then the next day it is put in a vat of brine.

"Brick cheese is salted from the outside," Widmer explained, "and Cheddar from the inside—that is, the salt is mixed in."

The other brothers were busy with this latter process while the conversation was going on. One sprinkled handfuls of salt into the vat, while another took a curd fork and mixed it in. The instrument resembled a pitchfork, except that the tines were turned back on themselves at the ends.

After the brick cheese has spent 12 hours in the brine vat, it goes to the curing room, where it is kept 7 to 10 days, Widmer said. The Cheddar takes longer. It is cured about a month before it is ready for sale.

START AT 3 A.M. MONDAY

John Widmer, Jr., took time off from his chores to mention that times had changed in cheese making. In the old days, everyone worked 7 days a week because, as soon as the milk arrived from the farms, it had to be made into cheese.

Now the plant has a storage tank where excess milk can be kept cool and the family no longer has to work on Sunday.

"But we have to be here at 3 a.m. Monday to take care of Sunday's milk and get it out of the way in time to handle Monday's milk," Widmer said.

The elder Widmer bought the Theresa plant in 1922. His son John said the history of cheesemaking in the building probably dated back to 1900 or so. The building has been enlarged and modernized in recent years.

HAD DOZEN PLANTS

The first brick cheese made anywhere was produced by John Jossie, a Swiss immigrant who came to Wisconsin in 1865 and operated a farmer-owned limburger cheese plant at Richwood. It was in 1875 that Jossie observed that when the curds used in making limburger were drier than usual a different texture and flavor resulted.

He began to experiment and, first thing he knew, he had become the world's first maker of brick cheese. In 1877, he built a plant 8 miles northeast of Watertown and made it the first factory for brick cheese. It remained in operation until 1943.

At one time, Jossie had about a dozen brick-cheese plants in Dodge and Jefferson Counties. He switched to farming in 1883 and turned the cheesemaking over to his brother Jacob, who joined in partnership with John Habbeger and set up operations in Watertown. Their interests were eventually acquired by Kraft Foods.

Many other kinds of cheese are made in Dodge County. Since pizza became the fashion, Italian types have been growing in importance and Dodge is now third-ranking county in Wisconsin in their manufacture.

Family Farm Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, to say merely that there is a difference of opinion between the Eisenhower-Benson-Nixon administration and the majority in Congress concerning farm legislation is a gross understatement. Congress has passed five farm bills outlining their preferred approach which have been voted. When the legislation on the books was expiring, Congress had to accept the administration's proposals or there would be no legislation and under these circumstances, Congress was bludgeoned into passing the flexible price support law and granting the authority requested by the administration. Experience has shown this Eisenhower-Benson-Nixon approach of low prices and no controls to be a miserable failure based upon economic theories applicable only to countries with food and fiber shortages. I do not feel disrespectful toward those who, with intellectual honesty, cling to these old, thoroughly discredited theories, but Members of Congress who are seeking solutions in good faith and are even willing to make reasonable compromises become somewhat disgusted when those who are apparently barren of constructive ideas, make statements based upon false interpretations of proposed legislation rather than offer any constructive alternative. The National Republican chairman, Senator MORTON, in a speech in the district I have the privilege to represent, followed this negative approach. Instead of coming forth with some constructive and reasonable alternative, Mr. MORTON embarked upon a negative intemperate and irresponsible tirade against the possibility of various approaches possible under the Poage bill.

It is obvious that the farmers and all taxpayers lose under the administration's approach of producing for Government bins. The only ones who gain from this are the newcomer, fly-by-night grain storage operator who was never in the grain merchandising business and the processor who now has his normal inventory carried by the Government. The Morton speech places the "new team" of Nixon and Morton squarely behind the Benson approach and repudiates the President's apparent offer to start working toward a compromise bill. It is disappointing and discouraging to taxpayers, farmers, and those in farm related industries, and in fact to everyone except those few fly-by-night storage cronies of the administration who don't want their playhouse wrecked.

The Des Moines Register on Friday, April 1, 1960, published a short, temperate and constructive analysis and summary of the situation which I commend to the attention of the Members of the House. It is as follows:

GOP ON FARM POLICY

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, national Republican chairman, employed three main arguments in his speech at the Iowa GOP finance dinner appealing to farmers to vote Republican in 1960:

1. "Since the 1954 elections, the Democratic Party has controlled Congress—and it is Congress alone which can write farm legislation."

2. The farm problem exists in some other countries, too, and it "is much bigger and broader and far more complicated than the people with quick and easy solutions are willing to admit."

3. The Democratic farm bills in Congress are "all-out regimentation"; they are "an alleged family farm income program" but they would "cut farm income, drastically reduce jobs both on and off the farm and sharply increase food prices and other living costs to consumers."

Senator MORTON's first two points are true enough as they stand. But it is also true that until 1959 Congress followed the recommendations of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson to a considerable extent, especially in lowering price supports. Congress passed farm legislation in the last 2 years which the President vetoed.

The way farm programs are administered has a great deal to do with their effects.

For example, the Government's corn surplus would not be so large if Benson had not made price support available to farmers who did not comply with acreage allotments.

So we doubt that MORTON's attempt to pin the blame on the opposition for the farm program mess and the decline in farm income will be successful. The administration has to take responsibility for leadership in farm policy and for carrying out the Government programs.

As for the current Democratic bills, which provide authority for strict production controls, there may be plenty of things wrong with them. But just to label them "regimentation" is not a constructive criticism.

The bills provide for 90 percent of parity price support for a commodity if two-thirds of the producers of the commodity vote in favor of production control. This may be regimentation, but it is regimentation voted upon themselves by the farmers. If the programs reduced farm income, as Senator MORTON predicts, then farmers could throw them out.

A wide variety of methods of controlling supply, including quotas in bushels or pounds, is available in this proposed legislation, and a wide variety of price support methods, including deficiency payments. There would be room for considerable experimentation to see what would work best for each commodity.

Whatever else may be said about these farm bills, at least they represent a flexible approach to what everyone realizes is a "complicated" problem which cannot be solved by any one-shot, "quick and easy" method. They are an attempt to end the pile-up of surpluses and reduce Government costs, while raising farm income.

Senator MORTON could hardly be expected to outline a new farm policy for his party at this time. But the Republicans badly need a new farm policy if they hope to gain strength in farming areas.

It will not be enough to ditch Ezra Benson (MORTON did not even mention his name) while continuing the same policy. The GOP will have to come up with practical proposals for dealing with the crushing surpluses which are bearing down on farm prices and incomes.

Changing the Mixture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, there appeared in the April 4, 1960, issue of Aviation Week one of the best editorials on the defense budget that I have seen in recent months, entitled "Changing the Mixture."

I believe this will shed new light on the great defense debate that has been underway here for many weeks. Additionally, it raises grave doubts as to whether we have an adequate defense and traces the steps that have become necessary to assure this defense upon the urging of many of our colleagues in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING THE MIXTURE

The fiscal 1961 defense budget has not stood the test of 3 months of public debate very well. Public debate and legislative scrutiny have disclosed that this budget fails to meet the vital defense requirements in a number of critical areas. There are hopeful signs that the three military services, with tacit administration approval, are already taking action to remedy the most obvious of these defects.

The number of changes that are already in the mill for the fiscal 1961 defense budget, even before the key debates over it have begun in the Congress, must stir many questions in the minds of the taxpaying public as to the adequacy of the military budgeting process. It seems difficult to believe that a budget that was so stoutly defended as adequate on its presentation to Congress in January should require so many major changes only a few months later. It suggests that there is something radically wrong with the procedures and policies by which this budget was prepared.

Looking for the moment only at the Air Force aspects of the defense budget, we find an astonishing number of major deficiencies that have been spotlighted by legislative scrutiny and public debate. Among them are:

Lack of any modern military airlift and little action to develop any for the forseeable future.

Lack of a top priority program to develop a mach 3-plus replacement for the current fleet of subsonic B–52's and mach 2 B–58's.

Lack of sufficient urgency and scope for the interim Atlas and Titan ICBM programs during the critical years of the missile gap.

Lack of sufficient funds and priority for developing an airborne alert capability for the B–52 fleet of Strategic Air Command in this same critical period.

Lack of urgency, funding and priority for developing military space systems, both for the warning and reconnaissance satellites already under development and for advanced manned space vehicles.

Lack of sufficient technical effort devoted to the increasingly important problem of monitoring and detecting nuclear explosions required for any realistic program of nuclear arms control.—Robert Hotz.

Mrs. Anna Harmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANDALL S. HARMON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, an editorial from the North Vernon Sun of April 5, 1960, by Mr. Richard Mayer, Jr., editor:

MRS. ANNA HARMON

The odds are that we would have never known Mrs. Anna Harmon if it hadn't been for the fact that her son, RANDALL, a North Vernon native, had been elected to Congress in the 1958 election. It's our good fortune—for whether her son was elected to anything or not, we would have been the loser in life if we hadn't met her and had the distinct pleasure of talking to her a number of times.

She was a fine and wonderful woman, devoted to her church. We suspect that she had worked hard throughout most of her life, and had known, perhaps, more than her share of the hardships that go with life. The good things came to her late, but happily, not too late.

Somehow, in our conversations with her, she always reminded us of that wonderful story about the Roman noblewoman, who when asked where her jewels were, drew her sons closely around her and said: "These are my jewels."

The elevation of her son to nationwide prominence left Mrs. Harmon with mixed feelings. She was most proud of her son, as only a mother, who had borne him, who had nurtured him, who had hoped for him, could be, and yet motherlike, she was terribly upset by some of the unkind words that the press wrote about her son. "He can handle himself; don't worry about it," we once told her. But it didn't stop her from worrying. Many a mother, had wished along with her that the world could view her son through a mother's eyes.

RANDALL HARMON may run last in the 1960 election. The big city press may affix the unhappy sobriquet, "Front Porch," on him. But the memory of the deep love that his mother bore for him makes him a most fortunate man, whatever his destiny may be.

To write an editorial is nothing. To be elected Congressman or even President is not much more. But to be a successful mother like Mrs. Harmon was. Ah, there is the rich and the true achievement of life.

Competitive Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conducted hearings last September, in Knoxville, on the peculiar behavior of certain manufacturers who consistently submitted identical bids to the Tennessee Valley Authority, in what appeared to be a bypassing of competitive bidding at the expense of the TVA.

Following those hearings, a Federal grand jury in Philadelphia indicted 18 equipment manufacturers for alleged antitrust violations.

It also should be recalled that last year the Tennessee Valley Authority purchased heavy electrical equipment abroad, because of a considerably favorable price differential between the bid by a British manufacturer and the bids by the major U.S. companies.

On the basis of information received since then, it would appear that a certain amount of price competition has been revived by the major American manufacturers of electrical equipment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "This Price Cut Caused by an Electrical Shock," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean be printed in the RECORD as a significant commentary on the subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THIS PRICE CUT CAUSED BY AN ELECTRICAL SHOCK

It may be, as General Electric says, that the Tennessee Valley Authority's decision

last year to purchase heavy electrical equipment abroad had nothing to do with GE's price cut this week on the same sort of equipment.

But that is somewhat difficult to believe.

Particularly is this true when one traces the history of events since TVA announced last February it was going overseas to purchase a large turbogenerator for the Colbert steamplant at Tuscumbia, Ala.

The squawk that followed this announcement created quite a stir at the time. The big electrical manufacturing firms accused the Government agency of everything but treason.

They insisted they could not compete with foreign firms because of the high cost of American labor. They insisted only a domestic firm could provide proper maintenance. They predicted all sorts of catastrophes in the event of nuclear attack if a foreign-made product was on the power production line.

These firms demanded an investigation and flooded the press with unsubstantiated releases purporting to show how unfairly this massive public agency was treating them. They prepared a march on Congress to get themselves a law that would cut out foreign competition and, of course, give themselves something of a cartel-type monopoly.

Into this fray, naturally, jumped the private power companies. For they have developed conditioned reflexes which leap to reaction when the initials TVA are used. The manufacturers were exactly right, they chimed, and this was just another example of what socialism will do.

Some citizens were inclined to sympathize with General Electric, Westinghouse, et al., until TVA, in a lengthy statement, debunked every argument the manufacturers offered, point by point, and in cold, hard figures.

But the electrical companies were not really quieted until the authority, in a second statement, calmly laid out the identical bids these great competitors had been submitting for years.

One upshot of the identical bidding disclosure was a so-called shakeup at GE. Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the board, admitted that some of his firm's executives had indeed been discussing prices with competitors before bidding on big Government contracts. As a result, the executives were sort of being shifted around, as we got it.

And now, close on the heels of another debunking job turned in at Pittsburgh by TVA Board Chairman Herbert D. Vogel, GE announces that its better and more efficient production has made it possible to cut prices on heavy electrical equipment.

It is ironic that among the beneficiaries of this whole affair are the private power companies. For they, too, can now expect to pay less for equipment they buy from the abused manufacturers.

This fits a familiar pattern as old as TVA itself. In showing the way to cheaper power production, this efficient agency (made up of dedicated men instead of wasteful bureaucrats) has made it possible for private power companies to increase their profits.

Now—for a while anyway—perhaps we shall see some real down-to-earth competition among the domestic firms. Maybe there will be some old-fashioned price competition instead of the phony type that talks of free enterprise for public consumption and gets together—behind the scenes—in the interest of guaranteed profits which are also guaranteed to be high.

Once again, TVA has saved American power users—both public and private—a considerable wad of money. Once again it has demonstrated that an organization is not necessarily cursed because it bears the name "public." And that the suffix "private," is not invariably sacred.

Why I Am Proud To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to an essay by John Matthews of Marietta, Ohio, which is one of the winners in Ohio of the American Legion essay contest this year.

There are many aspects of daily life which are illustrative of our freedoms that too often go unnoticed. In this refreshing statement by an 11th grader, we have a perceptive reminder of the deeper meanings of so much which we take for granted in our activities each day. John Matthews' essay is as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By John Matthews)

When I walk down the street in a typical American town or city, I can see things that make me proud to be an American. As I enter the business district, I catch sight of people hurrying from place to place. On the corner I may see two old men telling of the good old days and relating events that should make the country and every person in the country proud.

As I proceed, I watch as a storekeeper and customer conduct business without fear of being interrupted and maybe thrown into jail by the police. The storekeeper cannot be told what to sell, how to sell it, or at what price it is to be sold. If he wants to make his prices lower than the prices of the store across the street, he can do so. This competition keeps one person from getting a hold on any product and selling it at very high prices. On down the street is a court where I can go and be assured of having a fair trial by impartial people. Close by may be the police station and on down the street the fire department. The men who are employed at these places are there to help and not hinder me.

By this time I have reached the river and pause to watch the boats carrying goods, up and down, stopping and going, in an almost continuous process. This sight is symoblic of our wealth and great trading ability.

Along the side of the river is a quiet little park. As I enter it, I see statues commemorating famous happenings and famous people. I look at these monuments with pride, knowing that these happenings and people helped make the United States what it is today. Then, as I leave the park, I look down and remind myself that George Washington or maybe Thomas Jefferson may have stood upon the exact spot on which I am standing. This should remind me that the early Americans fought and died so that I might have a country in which all men are created equal. They did not stop after securing independence. They set up a system of government which is one of the best, if not the best, in the world.

Continuing down the street, I see a small common church. In this church I can worship God without interference from anyone. But this is not the only church; there are many others, each having its own beliefs. This shows that the United States is surely a country with complete freedom of religion.

As I proceed back toward the center of town, I am passed by a young boy selling newspapers. In our country I have the freedom of writing and printing for everyone to read what I believe. Focusing my eyes down the street, I see the figure of a man. He is standing on the steps of a building telling everyone what he believes is wrong with the mayor of the city. He will not be arrested for what he says against the officials of the city, the State, or the Federal Government. The freedom of speaking when and how you want is an important privilege in the United States.

A few blocks down the street is a building with a flag in front of it. Through the window at the front of the building, I can see people receiving a ballot and going into a booth to vote. In the United States the citizens can nominate and vote for the person who they think could fill the office best.

Our liberties and freedoms are not just things we have; they are things we use every day. This is why I am proud to be an American.

The Importation of Brass Mill Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the domestic brass industry is facing increasing competition from imports of brass mill products.

The situation facing the industry was clearly outlined by Mr. Joseph O'Brien, president of the Bristol Brass Corp., of Bristol, Conn., in a letter distributed to all employees of the company along with the annual report.

Mr. O'Brien points out that nearly 95 million pounds of brass mill products were imported in 1959, representing about 1,300 American brass mill jobs—jobs that have been taken away by low-priced, foreign-made brass.

Mr. President, this is a serious problem, of mounting concern to thoughtful American working men and women, and deserves the careful attention of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRISTOL BRASS CORP.,
Bristol, Conn., March 18, 1960.

To Bristol Brass Men and Women:

Here is your copy of our annual report for the year 1959.

It was a good year for Bristol Brass, with operations at a satisfactory level for most of the period. But, as pointed out in the report, it was also a good year for importers of foreign-made brass mill goods.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census figures show that imports of brass mill products totaled 94,660,000 pounds in 1959—an increase of 25 million pounds over 1958. Put another way, that nearly 95 million pounds of brass represents about 1,300 American brass mill jobs—jobs that have been taken away by low-priced foreign-made brass.

One of our most important customers recently told us they had made a thorough study of the possibility of using imported brass strip instead of U.S. made. Their

analysis showed they could buy imported strip of good quality—just as good as ours—for considerably less than we have to charge for our strip.

This customer eventually decided not to buy imported brass, and I think you will be interested to know why. There were two reasons: First, they want good service and felt that Bristol Brass and other U.S. mills could be depended on to provide that service. On the other hand, they were doubtful about service on imported brass. Secondly, this customer believes that it is good business policy to buy from U.S. sources. They know that the American people are their best customers and that you and I will not be able to buy cars, refrigerators, and watches if we do not have jobs. That's why one customer decided to buy American. It is obvious from that 95 million pounds of imported brass that other customers made different decisions.

Last year, imports of brass mill goods increased by 37½ percent—the largest increase in recent years. This shows how important it is for us to provide top quality and the best of service, while keeping our costs as low as possible. Quality and service are the best weapons we have to keep imports from increasing more and thus to protect our own jobs.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH O'BRIEN,
President.

So You Want To Be a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Judge George F. Eyrich, Jr., of Cincinnati has been the capable and dynamic chairman of the Hamilton County, Ohio, Republican organization for 18 years. Under his leadership, the Republican Party in the Cincinnati area has been a tremendous force for good and effective government.

An article written by Judge Eyrich appearing in the April 3 issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer is a fine and comprehensive analysis of basic Republican Party principles. It has been the adherence to these fundamental principles over many years that enabled the Republican Party in Hamilton County to maintain its position of leadership.

The article follows:

SO YOU WANT TO BE A REPUBLICAN

(By George F. Eyrich, Jr.)

The young men and women of America in increasing numbers are answering with a resounding "Yes," to the statement, "So you want to be a Republican."

This is pleasing and encouraging, but it is by no means surprising.

It is to the young people of today that the future belongs. What could be more natural than that thinking young people, concerned about the future, should turn to the political party that is dedicated to the kind of government on which the future can rest securely?

Any comparison of the policies of the two major national political parties on the national, State or local level makes it obvious that the Republican Party is that party.

A prime precept of Republicanism has always been a refusal to barter the resources of the future for immediate political advantage. It calls for each political and governmental decision to be carefully weighed against the effect it will have on the future.

For example, Republicans have never subscribed to the idea that the cure for every problem is an appropriation of Government money. Republicans know that such appropriations are advances drawn on the earnings of future generations and must be used only when they will contribute to a lasting solution to the problem. In other words, we Republicans demand a full value for the taxpayers' dollars that we spend.

It has always been the policy of the Republican Party to find a lasting solution to the problems of the day rather than sweep them under the rug with temporary compromises. This has been true since its birth in 1854.

The Republican Party was born in the consciences of Americans those 106 years ago, when the dispute over whether one human being should be the property of another threatened to tear our Republic apart. Some men of that day wanted to postpone a decision by further compromise with the institution of slavery.

But the Republican Party, led by the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, demonstrating the concern for the dignity of all men that is still a characteristic of the party, knew that the situation could be met only by dramatic action. The slavery question meant that it was inevitable that the United States would face a civil war. Those early Republicans chose to fight that war during their own generation rather than leave it for their children to face.

Republicans in the years since have continued to demonstrate such concern for the future. In those years, they have come to be recognized as the party that stands for the dignity of the individual and have earned the title of the "Grand Old Party."

Of course, the facts stick in the craw of some of the partisans of the other party. In their desperate attempts to distort the facts, they treat the American public to such bland doubletalk that it is actually funny when the emotion is stripped away and their statements are left stranded completely void of logic or truth. For example:

We see the candidates of the other party, multimillionaire would-be Presidents, charging that the Republican Party is the party of the rich man.

We hear the cry from the opposition that the lack of congressional action on important legislation is the fault of the Republican Party when the other party has a majority in both Houses of Congress.

We see the Democratic Senator, who was Secretary of the Air Force in 1947, now singing hysterical soprano in the chorus of his Democratic Party, trying to say that the Republicans have caused the missile lag.

Whereas the facts are as follows: On February 19, 1947, Dwight D. Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Congress and pleaded for more money for research and development of missiles. He said, "In the field of guided missiles * * * we have no more than scratched the surface of possibilities which we must explore in order to keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appallingly few hours."

Congress granted the money but President Truman impounded $75 million of it. The contract with Convair for intercontinental missiles was canceled and not renewed until 1951 after we got into Korea. From 1945 to 1952 only $3.5 million was expended on intercontinental missiles (during that period we spent $117 million supporting the price of peanuts).

And among the most ridiculous we find prophets of gloom parroting the other party's line that depression is just around the corner, whereas under the Republican administration our Nation has reached its greatest prosperity.

Of course, the fact that can be learned from any history book is that throughout its entire history the Republican Party has brought both peace and prosperity to America when it was in power.

This matter of peace is certainly one that should be of interest to young people. After all, it is young men who must fight wars. And young women have their share of heartbreak from wars. The fact is that during no Republican administration in the 20th century has America gone to war. Conversely, under each and every administration of the other party during the same period America has seen its boys march away to war. And frequently after the other party's President was elected on a promise to keep us out of war.

All of these add up to the reasons that young people are placing their trust in the Republican Party.

As a young person, you would find a ready welcome in the Republican Party. The Young Republican movement is an important factor in the party and offers young people, from teenagers to young adults, an opportunity to try their political wings in the company of their contemporaries.

Organized on a structure that parallels that of the senior party, the Young Republicans have their own national committee, State committee, and local officers. They hold conventions that blend social activity with mature concern for good government, while giving the participants a basic education in political practice.

Out of the Young Republican movement have come many of the programs that have been adopted as administration and legislative aims of the party as a whole. The Republican Party is always receptive to vigorous young ideas.

Here in Hamilton County our Young Republican organization is one of the mainstays of our party. From it we draw our leaders of the future and from it we receive help and direction that translates into ballots for good government in Washington, Columbus, the courthouse, and city hall.

In addition to the Hamilton County Young Republican Club, there are in the county a number of ward and township Young Republican clubs as well as an active organization at the University of Cincinnati. Any reader of the Enquirer's Saturday Youth Page will find a warm welcome awaiting him in any of them.

He will also find that Republican political activity can be fun. The thrill of trying to influence one's fellow citizens to vote for a good candidate running on a sound plaform, is one that has captured the lasting imagination of many a young man or young woman. It offers an opportunity for young people to put into practice their own fresh new ideas, for a vigorous party is always looking for new ideas and better ways of getting results.

The excitement of election day and watching the results come in that night, proving the effectiveness of your efforts, can be tremendous indeed. But even more important, with the thrill and excitement goes the satisfaction of knowing that one is contributing to the kind of government that will make America a better place in the future.

That the Republican Party is the party of youth can be readily seen from its slate of candidates as they shape up for the fall elections. All the way from the presidential ticket with RICHARD NIXON, to our slate of candidates for office here in Hamilton County, is a preponderance of young people.

They are young people who, a few years ago, found their way into Republican ranks through the Young Republican movement because they recognized the Republican Party as the one interested in America's future.

You can be one of them.

Unused Plant Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Democrats Hit Unused Plant, Men," written by Frank C. Porter and published in the Washington Post of April 7, 1960. The article discusses the economic philosophy as espoused by eminent Democrats.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS HIT UNUSED PLANT, MEN—"INFLATION CRY" MASK FOR INACTION, KEYSERLING SAYS

(By Frank C. Porter)

When electioneering for the Presidency begins in earnest later this year, the Republicans can expect a barrage of charges that their "second-class economic performance" has let the national growth rate slip precariously.

Already the controversial issue has cropped up more and more in Democratic speeches. Through inability to put unused plant and manpower to work, runs the argument, the annual growth rate has fallen to 2.3 percent during the Eisenhower tenure. Democrats insist it can and should be maintained at 4.5 percent or better.

Thus far there has been little clear-cut Republican reaction to the Democratic jibes on growth. It fell to Fortune magazine last week to map what may be the first cohesive GOP counterattack. In an article by Max Ways, it took note of Republican embarrassment over the issue and urged party leaders to attack Democratic proposals for specific growth targets as a "mask for big government."

To Leon H. Keyserling, Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, and who for many years has been considered one of the chief architects of Democratic economic policy, the "big government" warning is pure nonsense.

He considers his proposal for a national prosperity budget, whereby the President would include in his annual economic message specific goals for public efforts, and also general goals to improve the perspectives of private industry after consultation among business, labor, and farm leaders, educative rather than coercive.

It is, he insists, no more than is called for by the Employment Act of 1946, passed overwhelmingly by both parties but "honored by Eisenhower only in the breach thereof." The act specifically requires the President to set forth maximum goals for employment, production, and purchasing power and the policies needed to achieve these goals.

Had the President observed both the letter and the spirit of the act, Keyserling argues, the United States might not find itself hobbled with such gigantic waste in unused manpower and plant today. He estimates that if the economy had grown at an annual rate of 4.7 percent he ascribes to the Democratic period 1947–53, rather than at the 2.3 percent rate he claims for the Eisenhower years 1953–59, we would have been $200 billion richer in gross national product, would have received about 65 billion more in public revenues at all levels at the same tax rates and would have avoided 15 million man years of unnecessary unemployment.

Keyserling projects a 5 percent growth rate through 1964 to show that the Nation would realize $400 billion more in gross national product than the 2.3 percent 1953–59 rate, 19 million man-years more employment, and $100 billion more in public revenues at all levels at the same rate, of which about $70 billion would accrue to the Federal Government.

He quotes these estimates to drive home his point that our economy is total and indivisive, that the public and private sectors are mutually supportive. The Republicans, Keyserling charges, on the one hand isolate the national budget from the general economy, tying the great national priorities such as defense and education to fiscal shortages, while inhibiting the private economy (whence come public revenues) with repressive monetary policy on the other hand.

Keyserling also rejects the mature economy theory of a fellow Democratic economist. In "The Affluent Society," John Kenneth Galbraith suggests that a high rate of growth is no longer of prime importance, and that resources from the private economy must be transferred to the public sector to improve the quality of American life.

To Keyserling, this is "unnecessary heroism" and a "redistribution of scarcity." He contends that our private economy can sustain great further growth, that public projects cannot be augmented by stunting the private sector, and that the latter is far from affluent today.

"Why should you mortify the flesh by rationing scarcity when you have the technological capabilities to satisfy all needs?" Keyserling asks.

Keyserling would use all the tools of Government, but particularly monetary and fiscal policy, to lead a "symphony of nationwide effort" toward three goals: Optimum and steady economic growth, the use of this growth to "service the great priorities of our needs and aspirations as a people, and the extirpation of economic injustice."

Keyserling contends that the administration's "inflation cry has been a mask for not doing the things we should have done." By concentrating single mindedly on a tight money policy, the Federal Reserve Board, in his opinion, has failed in its three major missions: Establishing priorities of need, promoting growth, and controlling inflation itself. To Keyserling, "inefficient slack" in an economy is just as inflationary as "inefficient tautness."

What about Russia? Keyserling is alarmed by what he considers a vastly superior Soviet growth rate but not obsessed by it. His main concern is the unity of Soviet economic purpose. The Russians have established priorities: "Now that they've built their industrial base and educational system, they'll begin improving their standard of living."

But he wants no part of authoritarian techniques, Keyserling insists. He emphatically rejects the price and wage controls gingerly suggested by a few Democratic economists. And he argues that what is needed is "leadership, not totalitarianism * * *. What we should seek is the middle educative way."

What Do They Mean—Lagging?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world is witnessing today two of the most significant achievements in the history of this youthful field of space exploration. I refer of course to the Pioneer V sun satellite and the Tiros I weather satellite. Every one of us can be proud that these two scientific marvels were launched into the heavens from American soil. They are the fruits of American ingenuity and American effort. They represent no more than has been expected by those of us who have maintained confidence in the space program of the Eisenhower administration. They come as no great surprise to those of us who have been able to look at our space program in an objective manner.

These achievements further substantiate my consistent contention that the United States is clearly equal or superior to the Soviet Union in every field of space exploration save that of propulsion. And we will soon remedy this deficiency in thrust capability that was willed us by the previous Democrat administration.

I should also like to include, for the edification of many of my colleagues, an editorial written by Mr. Alexander Jones in the April 4 Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal. It serves notice that the people back home have not been taken in by the Washington prophets of doom. They are clearly able to separate the wheat from the chaff.

The editorial follows:

WHAT DO THEY MEAN—LAGGING?

(By Alexander F. Jones)

There is an expression of the native fishing guides in the Caribbean when a shark or barracuda moves into a bonefish feeding grounds, causing them to dart about nervously.

"Something is spooking the fish," the guide will say.

Something is spooking me in outer space.

It is that picture taking, tape recording, tub-shaped satellite named Tiros I which is whirling around the world 450 miles up snapping shots of this revolving globe and sending them back to earth for Ike and the rest of us to marvel over.

And there is another camera in that tub that is taking pictures of cloud formations that are regarded as so confidential the Space Administration is not putting them out. They are said to reveal weather secrets.

In addition, while this miraculous experiment is causing the scientific world, including Moscow, to look our way again, the satellite, Pioneer V, is orbiting the sun and sending back messages that it is now 2,588,056 miles away from the earth and still traveling.

In talking about our space efforts, the man who is head of this space business, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, says we may put a man up 120 miles in a rocket this year and will put another astronaut into orbit in 1961.

And there will be an American on the moon within 10 years, Dr. Glennan says, adding that this is a conservative estimate.

He calmly reports the U.S. space program is going along very well and the only advantage the Soviet Union holds at this time is having a rocket engine with a greater thrust. With the completion of our giant Saturn missile this deficiency will be eliminated, Dr. Glennan said.

Here is a man who knows what he is talking about. He is top administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and has been since its inception. He is president of Case Institute of Technology of Cleveland and a former Atomic Energy Commissioner.

He now has many more satellites of various types whirling around in space than the Soviet Union.

What I like about Dr. Glennan is his modesty in success and his determination to overcome obstacles in failure.

He was simply purring as he happily took the outerspace pictures to President Eisenhower but his only comment was that Ike thought the Tiros I coup "a magnificent thing."

So it is and it is as good an answer to the people who are charging Ike with lagging behind in space and missile efforts.

Just about the time folks start saying your Uncle Samuel is dragging his feet, scientifically, he puts on a breathtaking sprint that startles the world.

Any time a 270-pound tub filled with cameras and weather checking apparatus can send back pictures from 450 miles up, and another satellite can send coded messages from 2½ million miles away, the lagging laments of some of our politically minded critics sound pretty silly.

The fellow who gets the biggest charge from accomplishments is the man in the White House.

Ike is grinning from ear to ear.

The TV Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Forgotten Clues to the TV Crisis," written by Jack Gould, and published in the New York Times magazine of December 13, 1959. The article is an excellent analysis of and a positive and constructive approach to the great problem of TV in the communications world.

Associated with that article, and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "FCC Study of Payola Is Far From Conclusive," written by Lawrence Laurent, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 7, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Dec. 13, 1959]

FORGOTTEN CLUES TO THE TV CRISIS—THE AIRWAVES ARE PUBLIC AND THE BROADCASTERS WHO USE THEM HAVE A DUTY TO THE PUBLIC, WHICH THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CAN AND SHOULD REQUIRE THEM TO PERFORM

(By Jack Gould)

Television is at a crossroads. The sighs of disappointment over the fall of Charles Van Doren in a rigged quiz game have given way to a rising clamor for fundamental changes in the medium that enters 45 million homes.

For the moment, video has a full-time job in merely tabulating the diversified indictments of its behavior. The aftermath of the hanky-panky in the isolation booth has taken on the proportions of a coast-to-coast morality play, involving the ethics of big business, the efficacy of American education and the solubility of aspirin.

Two governmental agencies, one branch of the executive department, innumerable congressional committees, pedagogues, economists, industrialists and salesmen are examining the TV medium in varying depths. Moreover, the TV world itself is split over the most becoming posture to assume in its moment of crisis. The chaos of TV, in short, cannot be pictured in black and white; it comes in living color.

But there are two fundamental conditions governing television that have tended to become obscured in the welter of words over the future of an industry on which everyone is an expert.

First, the broadcaster receives free of charge, a publicly owned channel that can be a veritable gold mine—a source of gross income running into millions of dollars a year. In exchange for this grant it is his responsibility to use that facility in the best interests of the people. Yet that responsibility has not been properly accepted.

Second, the Government, through the instrumentality of the Federal Communications Commission, should assure that television channels actually are employed as broadcasters, in order to obtain their licenses, promise they will be used. To give away a public treasure and then be indifferent to how it may be abused amounts to an abdication of government. Yet this is what has happened in TV.

Much of the growing argument over television's shortcomings and accomplishments suffers from a common weakness: too many people are speaking from prepared positions. The defenders of the status quo are erecting a wall of publicity handouts to conceal the problems which traditionally they have been loath to face; the reformers are convinced that a living room poll of their intellectual acquaintances provides the answers for the medium's future. Not until the hard facts are spelled out dispassionately can one achieve a realistic assessment of television as it is and as it might be.

At the outset it should be noted that, while television is a business, it is not like any other business. Of course, video must make money but at the same time it must perform a public service. Unless television rests on a firm and realistic economic foundation, it simply will be unable to offer the alternative types of programs that should accompany the more popular mass wares.

Inherent in an appraisal of television is the role of the American public. In this respect TV shares a problem common to all media catering to large segments of the population. Many people—a large majority—do not see the need for keeping abreast of the vital issues facing the world; unfortunate and undesirable as it may be socially, there are millions who do not yearn for education or uplift. Broadcasters often have been accused of underestimating the American intelligence; but reformers often have been just as guilty in overestimating it.

American television is not unusual in this respect. For many years in Great Britain there was only one television service—the noncommercial British Broadcasting Corp. In terms of cultural objectives its performance was unique; free from the competitive pressures of the marketplace, it could pursue the loftiest of goals. Three years ago there was inaugurated a commercial, advertising-sponsored TV network with a high proportion of typically American offerings. The popular wares have run away with the majority audience in the British Isles.

It is the same story in many another country—Japan, Canada, Italy, Australia. Most people most of the time do want to be entertained.

But where the television industry became sidetracked was in its decision to allow the doctrine of "giving the public what it wants" to obscure its companion duties and obligations to the viewing public.

Surely, television should be free to entertain and sell goods or the big shows enjoyed by many will become impossible. But, as part of its pledge in accepting a license, the television station must accept its share of the awesome job of elevating the public's awareness of major issues, of slowly inching forward toward a higher cultural level, of making sure neither the medium nor its audience succumbs to a state of stagnation.

In television's case this obligation to pursue balance is not theoretical. One of the engineering shortcomings of television has been that its place in the spectrum was restricted to a limited number of channels. There is not enough room on the air for all who might wish to try their hand at broadcasting; this explains, for instance, why New York does not have an educational channel. In short, the active broadcaster occupies space that is in scarce supply and may be sought by others.

Despite the uproar over quiz deceits, dubious commercials and the need for reforms, it should be recognized that TV has done good things. Edward R. Murrow's famed program on the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was a major aid in restoring national perspective in an era of hysteria; the Columbia Broadcasting System's recent study of birth control was a first-class illustration of arousing the public to think about a touchy issue.

One of the great services performed by television in the public affairs area, of course, is the medium's ability to provide a graphic and personalized view of major events, such as the recent trip of Premier Khrushchev to the United States. The power of the medium to make constructive contributions should not be minimized.

The criticism of television is that this power has not been used as it should be. The TV networks have not fully realized that their influence can be negative as easily as affirmative. To shield 100 million people from the harsh realities of contemporary existence night after night can be a major cause of a most dangerous trend—national apathy.

As salesmen, sponsors may wish to bask in the warming radiance of happy programing that makes for coast-to-coast contentment. But if network broadcasters are to make their full contribution to the country's future, they must disturb, awaken and excite viewers to think for themselves. That is the acid test of citizenship in broadcasting. The current crisis of TV involves not so much what is on the air as what is not.

Responsibility for maintenance of balance rests in the first instance with the Federal Communications Commission, the agency established by Congress to license stations and see that the airwaves are used in the public interest.

In entertaining an application for a license, which runs 3 years, the FCC examines the character and financial qualifications of the would-be broadcaster. Detailed data on stock holdings in the station also must be listed. But when such factors are roughly equal for two applicants competing for a single license, the Commission may give primary consideration to broad promises in programing.

In the broadcasting world the matter of promises is rather cynically regarded. A station owner can swear that he is going to flood his viewing area with nothing but cultural treats and news in unlimited volume and do a fine job reflecting local interests and problems. Once he receives his license, however, he can stop worrying, insert multiple commercials at every opportunity and just flick a switch and run movies, network quizzes or whatever makes the most money. Not all individual broadcasters do, of course; some station owners are conscien-

tious community leaders. But the FCC is notorious for not asking a broadcaster whether his performance matched his promise.

The caliber of the members of the FCC admittedly is not as high as it should be. Few have the background—or have displayed much searching interest—in the broad social and philosophical aspects of administering a medium of enormous influence. The Commission is overworked and undermanned, but Congress canont escape its share of responsibility for encouraging the existence of a weak commission. There has been too much political hanky-panky surrounding the FCC.

In the absence of minimum standards, the broadcasting industry has largely functioned in a vacuum where the strongest economic forces could make the ground rules. These forces have been the sponsors and their advertising agencies. By the power of their buying dollars, they have assumed control over the content of programing, even to dictating the types of plays that could be done, actively censoring scripts and avoiding the slightest hint of controversy. All too often their concept of competition has merely meant imitation.

With a weak Government agency and strong sponsor influence the wonder is that TV did not encounter disaster long before now. Indeed, the joke is making the rounds of Madison Avenue that in generations to come Charles Van Doren may emerge as a historic figure. It was he, after all, who initiated the reform era in TV.

Plans for the improvement of television are a dime a dozen, most of them concerned with form rather than substance. Much has been made of the issue of control in TV, whether it rests with sponsors or networks. But in the last analysis the man who pays the bills always is going to exercise a high degree of control, whether he himself produces a show or someone else seeks to satisfy his taste.

Also in the present crisis of TV there has been the usual flurry of suggestions that either the White House or the broadcasting industry should appoint a citizens' committee to review TV, a neat way of using a bit of window dressing to defer action on serious problems. Advertising-sponsored television in London also has been suggested as a model (but even the British have not elected to do away with the middle commercial).

It must be recognized that there always will be certain types of programs essential to a well-rounded schedule that may not appeal to advertisers. It is in this area that the networks have been primarily remiss. If sponsors are reluctant to offer penetrating news shows, plays of controversy and discussions that may offend, then it becomes the task of the broadcaster to take up the slack and assure the social validity of television's output.

The job confronting both the networks and the FCC is to preserve what is good in the present system while laying the groundwork for continuing improvements.

Surely, the FCC already has the legal authority to ask a broadcaster to demonstrate that he did on the air what he said he was going to do. If there is a wide gap between promise and performance, then renewal of his license should be held in abeyance until the situation is clarified. Once it was established that a broadcaster really risked his franchise if he did not keep his pledge to the Government, there would be a basis on which meaningful self-regulation could function.

Such a policy of weighing performance against promise would not involve censorship or dictation of television content. Programing needs never can be put in a bureaucratic straitjacket. All the FCC would do is demand that a broadcaster actually meet those standards that he set up for himself.

The second step is to require the networks, as the primary sources of programing, to set forth in advance what they think is a desirable diversity of programs for their evening schedules. In other words, they should take it upon themselves to draw up a blueprint of programing intent that would be known and understood by sponsors, station affiliates and viewers.

It is a tradition of advertisers that, once they know what a medium's regulations are, they will conform. If the networks can summon up enough courage to let the world know who is boss, in fact as well as publicity release, then sponsor dominance will begin to ebb.

But the networks at the same time must face up to an unpleasant yet important fact. If they are to perform a public service within the true meaning of the Federal Communications Act, then at some point there is going to be a limitation on how much profit they can make.

Actually, the future of television constitutes a genuine challenge to the resiliency of the free-enterprise system. The test that lies ahead is whether the profit motive can survive without compromising cultural values that are just as vital to a well-rounded society. What appears tomorrow on television's 21-inch screen is not a narrow matter of electronics or show business; it also will be a reflection of democracy in action, one way or another.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1960]

FCC STUDY OF PAYOLA IS FAR FROM CONCLUSIVE

(By Lawrence Laurent)

One thing about the preliminary results of the Federal Communications Commission's study of "payola": It will please and it will sadden just about everyone. "Payola" figures were released this week, for the first time, by FCC Chairman Frederick W. Ford in a speech before the National Association of Broadcasters.

Now, the image merchants can go to work. Both sides can make an effective argument. It all depends on how one chooses to interpret the figures.

The broadcasters can proclaim that most of the stations are blameless. Chairman Ford said that 2575 (59 percent) stations claimed that "no payola in any form was found in connection with the station's operation."

Ford also gladdened broadcasters by summarizing:

"Thus, 4,131 or 88 percent of the radio and television stations on the air stated in effect that they either received no 'payola' or it was limited to free records."

Before any cheering begins, however, there is the other side to Ford's report: "This leaves 515, or 11 percent of the stations on the air, in which the station or its employees had received cash or other consideration for broadcasting material without the required sponsorship announcement having been made."

You may be certain that many will be shocked to learn that 515 stations have been a party to violations of section 317 of the Communications Act. The number (515) is large even if the percentage (11) is small.

For many years, it has been the practice of the FCC chairman to go to the broadcasters' conventions and to assure each licensee that the future will be happier. Ford observed the custom at the close of his speech:

"In summary, the public can be assured that 'fixed' quiz shows are a thing of the past, and actions are in process which will prevent their recurrence.

"'Payola,' or as it is more technically known in broadcasting, the failure to announce the sponsorship of material being broadcast, has been symptomatic of a certain degree of laxity of licensee responsibility. There is reason to believe that the exposure of this practice by the Harris committee (the Committee on Legislative Oversight), and the proposed actions now underway, can give the public assurance that it will no longer be a part of the broadcasting scene."

Taking Another Look at Grain Storage Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress who have been carrying on grain storage investigations during the last few months, it seems to me, have been more interested in making headlines, and in uncovering a few spectacular instances of profits, rather than trying to dig up the true facts of our entire commodity storage program. It seems rather peculiar that in the carrying out of the so-called investigations, those in charge never saw fit to call in representatives of the grain storage industry.

It seems to me that if not direct, at least implied criticism was leveled at the Department of Agriculture for the grain storage rates that were in effect. The Department has carried out a very comprehensive investigation into the question of the cost of providing grain storage and has recently announced that it is their intention to reduce rates on future grain storage agreements. It seems real interesting to me that some of the first ones criticizing the Department for considering rate reductions are some of the very people who implied that rates were too high only a very short time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news release I prepared on the subject of grain storage, and released from my office on April 4.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Recent developments indicate that some Democrats interested in making headlines have stirred up a hornets nest among farmers and grain dealers that will unquestionably have political repercussions.

One presidential aspirant and one Congressman thought they saw an opportunity to make some political hay by carrying on an investigation of the Commodity Credit Corporation grain storage program. They had discovered some instances of generous profits and hoped to point an accusing finger at the administration of the CCC which is the Government Corporation charged with the responsibility of safely storing the huge stacks of grain surpluses now accumulated under the grain price support program. So sure were they that all was not well with CCC that they went ahead with their investigations, making headlines, and thinking that the American public would be favorably impressed. It's fair to assume that most citizens were disturbed at what the limited investigations uncovered. What was not dis-

closed was that there are thousands of elevator operators who are not necessarily reaping undue profits from storing Government-owned grain. No attempt was ever made by the investigators to meet with representatives of the grain storage industry. No evidence has been uncovered that the vast rank and file of storage people are enjoying undue profits at the expense of Uncle Sam.

It must be remembered that storage rates have of necessity been set at a rate to encourage construction of grain storage facilities. Faced with the responsibility of preserving the quality of all grain falling into Government ownership under the working of the price-support program, CCC has had no choice about setting rates and occupancy agreements that would assure adequate storage facilities. Since 1956, the Government has put up no storage facilities of its own due to a mandate from Congress that commercial facilities rather than Government owned should be used. There has been a natural reluctance on the part of grain handling people to make large investments in grain storage facilities when no one knew for sure how long our present price-support program would last. Presently almost every proposed revision of farm legislation contains features that would reduce surpluses rather than allow further increases. I believe it is a true statement that most country elevators in North Dakota somewhat reluctantly got in the business of storing grain for the Government.

In the normal course of their business, but later under a spotlight from the Democrat-inspired grain-storage investigations, the CCC set out in March 1959 to reevaluate the storage rates and agreements in effect. This is their responsibility and a part of the job of taking a new look from time to time at the uniform grain-storage agreement entered into between the USDA and the storage people.

After a comprehensive investigation of the cost of providing or constructing grain-storage facilities and their maintenance and operation, CCC decided to reduce the present rate of 16 cents per bushel per year to 13 cents. Country elevator people were immediately up in arms, as well as farmers who reseal some grain in their own granaries. The 16-cent rate is not a windfall either to farmers or small elevators even if it does happen to be rather profitable to some large storage companies. The USDA, however, hesitated to establish different rates for different facilities or different areas because the cheapest storage would have to be given preference at all times, as required by the General Accounting Office. This would channel grain out of small elevators or farm storage any time a terminal had space available.

Democrats are now trying to place the blame for all this on USDA. In an attempt to discredit the United States they got themselves in the position of criticizing CCC storage rates. Now when CCC attempts to revise rates downward in accordance with pretty general feeling about storage costs and a thorough survey of the industry, the Democrats are attempting to reverse themselves. One Congressman has even gone so far as to introduce legislation that would prevent CCC from lowering storage rates. The farmer's interest seems to have become secondary since he would benefit from reduced rates on grain he stores in his local elevator and puts under CCC loan. Grain-storage representatives will meet with USDA officials shortly to iron out final details of a new grain-storage agreement.

American Slovaks Request That Slovakia Be Included in U.S. Public Law 86–90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following speech appeared on March 23, 1960, in the Katolicky Sokol, official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol:

AMERICAN SLOVAKS REQUEST THAT SLOVAKIA BE INCLUDED IN U.S. PUBLIC LAW 86–90

(The following keynote address of Joseph G. Prusa, president of the Slovak Newspapermen's Association of America and supreme secretary of the Slovak Catholic Sokol was delivered on Sunday, March 20, 1960, at the 21st anniversary celebration of Slovak Independence Day at the Holy Trinity Parish Auditorium in Perth Amboy, N.J.)

We are gathered here today to celebrate the 21st anniversary of Slovak Independence Day. In order to fully understand the significance of this day, let us examine the historical facts. March 14 is known as the Day of Slovak National Resurrection. The Slovak Parliament was elected on December 18, 1938, according to the laws of the Czechoslovak Republic as a representative body of political sovereignty with legitimate rights to execute the will of the people in a federated republic.

On March 14, 1939, Dr. Emil Hacha, then President of Czechoslovakia, called the Slovak Parliament—which Parliament unanimously proclaimed the Slovak independence.

It should be noted that Slovakia had several political parties and that their duly elected representatives to the Parliament unanimously voted for an independent Slovak Republic.

Let us not forget that the Slovak Republic was not the creation of World War II, because when this war started, the Slovak Republic was already in existence.

The Slovak nation, with its many struggles and sacrifices in the past thousand years, proved to the world that it is worthy of freedom and independence.

On Monday, March 14 at 12 o'clock noon, one of the most significant events took place in Washington, D.C., which in my opinion is the turning point in the crusade for the liberation of Slovakia and its long desired independence.

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, president of the Slovak League of America, and the cooperation of Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN, the Chaplain of the House of Representatives invited Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore Kojis, O.S.B., of Cleveland, Ohio, to open the deliberations of the Lower House of Congress with a prayer.

In this opening prayer, Abbot Kojis beseeched the Heavenly Father, the God of mercy, to mitigate the sufferings of all enslaved victims of brutal communism, and in particular, on this solemn occasion of the 21st anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence. He implored Almighty God to grant the same blessings of freedom to the Slovak nation as He bestowed upon the United States of America, so that Slovakia, likewise, could have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This invocation appeared on page 5037 of the March 14, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was very happy to read that among the first Members of Congress to respond to this invocation of Abbot Kojis was his own Congressman, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, an American of Czech descent from Cleveland, Ohio, who made the following declaration:

"Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you and my colleagues that the prayer opening today's session of the House was delivered by a distinguished resident and religious leader of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. Serving as today's guest chaplain, the Right Reverend Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey in Cleveland, Ohio., represents the Slovak community of America, which today commemorates the 21st anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence.

"Abbot Kojis' prayer was offered as an inspiration of hope and courage to Slovaks behind the Iron Curtain whose misfortune and enslavement are a constant reminder to freedom-loving people everywhere of how precious is our liberty.

"We cannot take our democracy for granted. We need only look around the world and those regrettable instances where sovereign peoples embraced an ideology only to find that they surrendered their freedom and lost their national integrity."

It was indeed a wonderful moment and a great historical day, when we could read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A2221 words of praise from our American Congressman of Czech descent, who is acknowledging the commemoration of the 21st anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence.

This should give us an impetus to take cognizance of what our friend, the Honorable Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, Ohio, said at the commemoration of Slovak Independence Day last Sunday, which is registered on page A2262 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14.

I wish to quote especially the paragraph in which Congressman FEIGHAN stated: "The 86th Congress enacted the Captive Nations Week resolution which is known as Public Law 86–90. This Public Law 86–90 is a public declaration of American foreign policy and intention toward all the nations and people held in Communist bondage. This declaration of intention states simply and clearly that the United States recognizes the right of all these submerged nations to their national independence. It is imperative that President Eisenhower make certain that the Russians understand that we mean business by the terms of this resolution. He can do this best by challenging the Russians to permit free and independent elections in all the captive nations, but such elections to be under United Nations' supervision. Such action on the part of President Eisenhower will put into sharp focus the basic and fundamental cause of world tension."

We agree wholeheartedly on this 21st anniversary of Slovak Independence Day with the firm stand of Congressman FEIGHAN. However, in all due respect to Public Law 86–90, which he mentions as a public declaration of American foreign policy and intention toward all nations and people held in Communist bondage, it is time that we raise our voices and ask our President and the Members of Congress, why the Captive Nations Week resolution did not include the Slovak nation as a separate and distinct nation, as Congressman FEIGHAN stated on March 14.

It is an established fact that the Slovaks are a separate nation and have their distinct ethnic origin in the family of Slavonic nations, which is recognized even by the present Communist government of Czechoslovakia. We should, therefore, raise this important issue especially now, just before the 1960 census, which also recognizes the Slovaks since 1910 as a separate and distinct nation.

A few years ago the Honorable Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, presented a

House resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee in which it was requested that Slovakia be granted a right to free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. I wonder what happened with this important resolution?

I feel it is time that we as American citizens of Slovak descent should take immediate steps to forward a resolution to President Eisenhower and to the Members of the U.S. Congress asking that Slovakia be recognized as an independent and distinct nation, and be placed on the roster of the Assembly of Captive Nations.

Permit me to state further the fact that U.S. Senator THURSTON M. MORTON, of Kentucky, on the occasion of this 21st anniversary of the commemoration of Slovak Independence Day, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, issued the following statement:

"The inherent right of all people of every nation for freedom and independence has been endowed to civilized human beings by God since time immemorial.

"It is according to this right that the Slovak nation commemorates this date which is an important day in their struggle for freedom and independence. The Republican administration wholeheartedly supports the desire for freedom and self-determination of all nations now deprived of this most cherished ideal; the freedom which separates the civilized from the slave.

"The ultimate objective of our administration is, and will be to continue to uphold this determination that the Slovaks shall once again take their rightful place among the society of free nations in a free world."

After reading these important statements, I believe it would be more than proper at this time to petition the two Congressmen from our State of New Jersey, namely, Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN and the Honorable GEORGE M. WALTHAUSER, who greeted Abbot Kojis during his visit to the House of Representatives to have the Slovak nation included in Public Law 86-90 and thus make this 21st anniversary of Slovak Independence Day as the most outstanding event in the present plight of the Slovak nation for its freedom and recognition, and, above all, the God-given right of independence.

The Slovak state was created from American ideals. It was a democratic state, on the basis of equal rights to all people.

Inasmuch as the Slovak nation is at present under Communist domination, American Slovaks as the descendants of that noble nation with a rich cultural history of over 11 centuries, have assumed the responsibility to speak and act for it in the free world.

Slovaks will never give up their right for an independent state and March 14 will always remain a most solemn and memorable day in their history.

Resolution of the Franklin County Medical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Franklin County Medical Society in Massachusetts concerning health legislation:

Whereas the current session of Congress will see renewed and crucial drives for the passage of the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) or similar health legislation the result of which will bring another large segment of our population under centralized bureaucratic control; and

Whereas such legislation seriously undermines the responsibility and integrity of the individuals; and

Whereas such legislation will have an unpredictable financial impact on the social security program, bring about increasing Government intervention in the lives of the people, and in itself is a political approach to a nonpolitical problem; and

Whereas the State of Massachusetts has in operation an adequate medical care plan for public assistance; be it

Resolved, That the Franklin District Medical Society unanimously reaffirms its belief in the democratic ideal of the value and the future of the individual, and its support of voluntary insurance systems; and be it further

Resolved, That the Franklin District Medical Society will study and support, where merited, local and individualized health programs designed to lighten the financial load on the older members of our population, a load mostly unforeseen a generation ago before the rises in costs of services and medicines.

The Dangerous and Unjustifiable Common-Situs Picketing Bills H.R. 9070, H.R. 9100, H.R. 9089, H.R. 9123, H.R. 9140, H.R. 9175, H.R. 9373, and All Other Identical or Similar Bills Now Pending Bring to Life Again and Would Make Legal Secondary Boycotts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the evils inherent in H.R. 9070, H.R. 9100, and all of the other pending so-called common-situs picketing bills, have been so smoothly glossed over and their true implications and objectives so effectively concealed that I, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, feel it vitally essential that an accurate analysis and discussion of the so-called common-situs picketing bills, H.R. 9070, H.R. 9100, and other pending bills of exactly the same or similar language, is timely and necessary.

You may have been told or you may have heard that all H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9100 and these other pending common-situs picketing bills do is to guarantee the right of a union to engage in a primary strike at the site of a construction project. You may have been told or you may have heard that the Supreme Court decision in the Denver Building Trades case makes it illegal for a union to engage in a primary strike at the site of a construction project and that the enactment of H.R. 9070, or H.R. 9100 or one of the other pending common-situs bills, is necessary to overrule that decision.

Neither of these assertions is correct. Primary strikes are not prohibited in the construction industry under existing law. Perhaps I should explain here that a primary strike is one in which a union strikes the particular employer with whom it has a labor dispute. Nor did the Supreme Court in the Denver Building Trades case hold that primary strikes are illegal in the construction industry. What the Supreme Court did hold was that when the building trades unions picketed contractors and subcontractors on the construction site, other than the particular subcontractor with whom they had the dispute, in order to cause the other contractors and subcontractors to cease doing business with that subcontractor, they thereby engaged in secondary boycott activity in violation of section 8(b)(4) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

What then is the purpose of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9100 and the other so-called common-situs picketing bills. The purpose is to legalize secondary boycotts at the site of building construction projects by permitting a union which has a labor dispute with one building contractor to strike and picket all other contractors and subcontractors merely because they happen to be working on the same building project and without regard for the fact that neither they nor their employees are involved in such labor dispute.

Under section 8(b)(4)(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the harassment of contractors and subcontractors on a construction project by a labor union with whom they have no dispute, in order to force them to cease doing business with a particular contractor or subcontractor with whom the union does have a dispute, is as the Supreme Court held in the Denver Building Trades case, unlawful secondary boycott pressure against neutral employers and their employees.

A basic purpose of section 8(b)(4)(B) is to protect neutral employers and their employees from harassment by a union, with whom they have no dispute, and whose object in such harassment is to force or require such neutral employers and their employees to cease handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of and to cease doing business with another employer with whom the union does have a dispute. Nothing in section 8(b)(4)(B) restricts the right of a union to engage in a primary strike against the particular employer with whom its dispute exists. In fact, a proviso attached to section 8(b)(4)(B) specifically states that "nothing contained in this clause (B) shall be construed to make unlawful, where not otherwise unlawful, any primary strike or primary picketing."

The enactment of H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9100 or any one of the other common-situs bills would mean that the protections from union harassment in connection with labor disputes in which they were not involved, which are contained in section 8(b)(4)(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act, would no longer be available to neutral employers and their employees on a construction project. The enactment of any one of these pending common-situs bills would mean that any union having a dispute with a particular contractor or subcontractor on a con-

struction project could legally and immediately proceed to strike and picket each and every contractor and subcontractor on that construction project even though no dispute existed between them and the picketing union. Needless to say the normal result to expect from such striking and picketing activity, would be the cessation of all construction activity on the construction project until such time as the striking union and the particular contractor or subcontractor with whom it had the dispute, reached a settlement of their differences.

These pending common situs picketing bills would legalize secondary boycott strike, picketing, and work stoppages "at the site of construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure or other work." These bills contain no definition of the terms, "construction" or "site" or any of the other terms which are used. Presumably Congress is expected to legislate in broad generalities and wait for the administrative agency and the courts to define and spell out whatever meanings they may see fit to apply to those general terms. A construction project at any particular construction site might involve construction, alteration, painting, repair or other work on a multiplicity of buildings and other facilities, for example, at an army base, or a missile launching site. A single building project might involve a geographic location encompassing 100,000 acres of land and a building program providing for the construction of innumerable buildings, towers, pipelines, powerlines and other facilities too numerous to mention. These structures and facilities might be separated from each other by distances measured in miles. The number of contractors, subcontractors and subsubcontractors might be as many as 50 or 100 or even more—the total employment might add up to thousands of employees.

The Landrum-Griffin Act already gives the building trades unions special privileges enjoyed by no other class of unions. For example, the building trades unions can enter into collective bargaining agreements with employers in the construction industry, which require that all employees must join the union within 7 days. In other industries employees cannot be required to join a union until 30 days have elapsed. This and other concessions made to the building trades unions in the Landrum-Griffin Act will, if any of the common situs bills is passed, have the inevitable result of bringing about the return of the closed shop in the construction industry. What is the need or the justification for this legislation? The construction industry industry is one of our most highly organized industries. Wages of our construction workers are among the highest in our entire industrial economy. Any construction trades union, anywhere, anytime can strike against the particular contractor or subcontractor with whom it has a disptue. That dispute can involve wages, hours, working conditions. That dispute can involve a real or an imagined grievance. Yes, the union can strike an employer with whom it has a dispute in support of a cause which is just or in support of a cause which is unjust. The scope of the union's freedom to strike against an employer with whom it has a dispute, whether that employer be in the construction business or some other industry, is broad indeed. Statistics show that in 1958, a total of 4,790,000 man days of labor were lost in the construction industry because of strikes and work stoppages.

If we enact H.R. 9070, or any one of the other pending common situs picketing bills, we will enlarge the broad scope of the legal power to strike which building trades unions, including the Teamsters Union of James Hoffa, now have to strike any building contractor with whom they have a dispute, by adding thereto a right to strike and harass all neutral contractors and subcontractors and their employees who happen to be working on the same building project as the contractor with whom the unions happen to have a dispute.

If this legislation is enacted any one of them may legally use the secondary boycott strike and picketing weapon to shut down any construction project in its entirety, including vital national defense projects, any time it suits their whim or fancy.

The Building Trades Unions contended in the Denver Building Trades case that all contractors on a construction project should be regarded as a single employer. They and other proponents of H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9100, and the other pending common situs picketing bills, attempt to support this contention by arguing that a building project is analogous to a factory with various categories of employees. This contention was refuted by the Supreme Court in its decision in the Denver Building Trades case, holding that the fact that the contractors and subcontractors were engaged on the same construction project, did not eliminate the status of each as an independent contractor or make the employees of one the employees of the other. The business relationship between independent contractors has been recognized for centuries and as the Supreme Court pointed out in its Denver Building Trades decision, is well established as a matter of law.

In many other respects the attempted analogy of a construction project to a factory operation fails to withstand close scrutiny. For example, unlike a construction project, a factory is under the ownership and control of a single employer. The employees in the various departments of the factory are all employees of the same employer and they work under a system of unified supervision and a common labor policy originating with and emanating from the office of their common employer. Most often if the factory is unionized, all of the production and maintenance employees, and not infrequently even the office employees, are all represented by a single industrial union. Thus the employees working in a factory for a single employer and represented in respect to their wages, hours, and working conditions by a single union, have a community of interest which does not exist between the highly skilled employees of one craft and the highly skilled employees of another craft each of which is represented by its particular craft union and employed by a separate employer in the construction industry.

Unlike the manufacturing industry which has become basically a mass production operation with employees of a particular factory operator generally represented by a single industrial type union, the construction industry has remained basically a craft operation where the employers as well as the employees continue to operate within the craft concept. This system of multiemployers—contractors and subcontractors—and multicraft unions has been perpetuated in the construction industry, largely and primarily because the building trades unions have so vigorously and effectively opposed and resisted all efforts to adopt the single employer type of operation which is common in the manufacturing industry. Yes, the building trades unions have always insisted upon and continue to insist upon and fight for the preservation of the multiemployer—contractors and subcontractors—type of operation which is traditional in the construction industry, and to insist, for example, that the electrical work be done by an electrical contractor and that the plumbing be done by a plumbing contractor. And the same is true with respect to other crafts. Each of the crafts has always guarded its jurisdiction over that work in the construction industry which requires its particular skills and craftsmanship. Each craft union has historically sought to preserve the identity and jurisdiction of its craft and any attempted infringement by one craft union upon the work jurisdiction of another has uniformly been met with vigorous resistance and many disputes between craft unions in the construction industry have involved such jurisdictional questions.

Indeed, it is only for the purpose of avoiding the legal restraints and prohibitions against engaging in secondary boycott strikes and secondary boycott picketing against neutral and innocent employers and their employees that the building trades unions want all contractors and subcontractors on a construction project to be considered as a single employer. For all other purposes they have always insisted and will undoubtedly continue to insist that the system of multiemployers—contractors and subcontractors—with each employer limited to the performance of that portion of the construction work which falls within the limits of his specialty, be continued and perpetuated in the construction industry.

It follows, therefore, that on a construction job each contractor, if he is unionized, deals exclusively with the craft union which has jurisdiction over the particular work which he has contracted to perform. No other contractor and no other craft union can exercise any control or influence with respect to the relationship and problems which exist between him and the craft union which zealously guards its position as the exclusive representative of his em-

ployees in regard to work jurisdiction, wages, hours, and other working conditions. That being the typical situation as it exists in the construction industry, there can be no justification for a craft union involved in a dispute with a particular contractor or subcontractor to picket and harass the other contractors and their employees who are members of and represented by other craft unions, in order to bring about a cessation of their operations and employment in respect to a dispute in which they are not involved and over which they have no control. The consequence of legalizing such harassment of neutral employers and employees would bring untold hardship upon such construction contractors and often upon the taxpayers because of the delays and increased costs which inevitably result from such shutdowns. Also the loss of employment which would ensue as a result of such tactics would impose a disastrous hardship in many situations upon the other craft employees who were not involved in the dispute.

The devastating effect which such secondary boycott harassment can have on our national defense effort is exemplified by two specific examples involving the use of such tactics at two of our Nation's most vital defense installations—Redstone Arsenal and Cape Canaveral. In 1958, the Electricians' Union had a dispute with a contractor who had a contract with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the construction of substations and distribution power lines at Redstone Arsenal. On August 12, 1958, the Electricians' Union placed pickets at all of the gates leading into Redstone Arsenal and thereby brought about the cessation of construction operations of all of the other contractors and subcontractors engaged in construction at Redstone Arsenal. The Electricians' Union by the maintenance of these picket lines around the entire military base shut down the entire construction program of all of the other contractors and subcontractors for a period of 32 days even though none of the other contractors and subcontractors had any dispute with the Electricans' Union and even though they were in no way involved in the dispute between the Electricans' Union and the particular contractor with whom the Electricians have a dispute.

In 1956, the Plumbers' Union, which had a dispute with a subcontractor at Cape Canaveral, picketed the entire construction project and brought about a cessation of operations of all of the other contractors and subcontractors engaged in construction at Cape Canaveral and was able to keep the entire construction program shut down for a period of more than 2 weeks. The financial loss of one of the contractors on that project who was not involved in any dispute with the Plumbers' Union amounted to $100,000 as a result of the shutdown of his operations. Other innocent contractors and subcontractors on the job also suffered financial loss as a result of the shutdown of operations caused by the picketing of the Plumbers' Union. Several other incidents of this same type of illegal picketing have occurred at Redstone Arsenal and Cape Canaveral during the past 5 years. Needless to say, such tactics employed with respect to vital defense projects could, in the event of a national emergency, result not only in financial loss but also in endangering the very preservation of our country.

Another military installation that is of vital importance to our national defense effort is a missile launching base at Cheyenne, Wyo. Under construction at that project are nine separate missile launchers. These missile launchers are physically separated from each other by distances of 30 to 40 miles. The distance around this missile-launching base is 400 miles. The entire construction project has been let to one prime contractor and a group of subcontractors. This entire missile base construction program encompassing an area, the circumstance of which is 400 miles, constitutes a single construction project. The enactment of any of the pending common situs bills would permit any building trades union having a dispute with any subcontractor on that construction project to legally strike and picket the prime contractor and every other subcontractor on that entire project, and bring to a halt the construction work on all nine of the missile-launching bases.

Sponsors and proponents of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9100 and the other common situs picketing bills which are pending, argue that the building trades' unions need the secondary boycott weapon which this legislation would provide so that they can protest the employment of nonunion contractors and nonunion employees who would undercut union scales of wages and union working standards. What these sponsors and proponents do not tell you is that this secondary boycott weapon has been used and would undoubtedly continue to be used to protest the employment of nonunion contractors and nonunion employees even though their wage scales and working standards equaled or exceeded those of the unions. Nor do the sponsors and proponents of this proposed legislation tell you that this secondary boycott weapon has been used and will certainly continue to be used with even greater frequency if legalized, on construction projects which are completely unionized—where every contractor and subcontractor has a contract with a building trades union and every employee is a union member. Innumerable examples could be cited with respect to completely unionized construction projects, where a dispute between a building trades union and a particular contractor or subcontractor, has resulted in such union striking and picketing all of the other contractors and subcontractors and thus causing the shutdown of the entire building project.

For example the painters union might have a contract with a small subcontractor employing six painters on a vast and completely unionized construction project covering an area of 100,000 acres and involving the construction of a multiplicity and wide variety of structures, facilities and equipment. A large number of other contractors and subcontractors and thousands of employees might also be engaged in work on the construction project—some of them working miles distant from the location where the small painting subcontractor was engaged in his functions. The dispute between the painters union and the painting subcontractor might involve a question of whether paint brushes or spray guns should be used.

If H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9100 or any one of the other pending common situs picketing bills is enacted into law, the Painters Union could legally strike and picket all of the contractors and subcontractors on that vast construction project and bring about a cessation of all construction activity.

A second example of a dispute arising on a completely unionized construction project could be one involving a refusal of the Sheetmetal Workers Union to install a certain metal product on the job because it had been fabricated at a factory that employed members of the United Steel Workers Union instead of members of the Sheetmetal Workers Union. The Metal Trades Union could contend that it was seeking to protect its own job standards and working conditions on the construction job and could legally strike and picket every contractor and subcontractor on the construction site, if any of the pending common situs bills is enacted into law.

It would be easy indeed to go on and cite a hundred examples of disputes which have arisen and could arise again on completely unionized construction projects. Such disputes could involve real or fancied grievances. The union involved in such a dispute might be 100 percent right or it might be 100 percent wrong. In either event the enactment of any of the pending common situs bills would legalize the use of the secondary boycott strike and picketing weapon by such union against every other contractractor and subcontractor working on the same construction project with the inevitable result of bringing all construction work to a standstill.

Construction is the largest industry in our Nation. The volume of construction put in place each year amounts to more than 15 percent of our gross national product. This industry accounts directly or indirectly for about 15 percent of this Nation's total employment. Construction is the laregst consumer of steel, cement, brick, stone, and gravel. In addition this industry is one of the largest users of wood, copper, aluminum, glass, and a great variety of other materials. The hauling of all these materials and fabricated products from their places of origin and or manufacture to the job sites makes the construction industry one of the largest users of transportation facilities—trucking, railroads, ships, and even airlines. Also the construction industry is one of the principal purchasers of machinery, equipment and tools—including hundreds of items varying widely as to size and cost. Seventy-three billions of dollars were expended for construction in 1959. It is estimated that construction

expenditures in 1960 will total or exceed $76 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these facts so that the Members of Congress may have before them a clearer picture of what the construction industry involves and what goes into its operations and thus be able to understand more readily how closely the economic welfare of a great number of our industries and indeed the well-being of our entire national economy are interwoven with and dependent upon our construction industry.

It has been accurately stated that the role of the construction industry is to provide the physical facilities for all of man's activities—the homes where people live; the offices, factories and stores where they work; the schools their children attend; the churches where they worship; the hospitals which administer to them when they are ill; the highways, railroads, waterways, and airports necessary to their travel and transportation; the dams which control floods, aid navigation, produce hydroelectric power, and provide irrigation where needed; and the construction of all facilities and projects necesary to our national defense, including missile-launching bases, atomic and hydrogen bomb facilities, bomber bases, hangar accommodations, and airstrips. For all these and many other products and facilities esential to our national welfare and to the survival of our Nation and the free world we are dependent upon our construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Members of this Congress will vote to enact into law H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9100, or any of the other pending common situs picketing bills. The enactment of such legislation would legalize the use of the vicious and dangerous secondary boycott strike weapon by the leaders of each of the building trades unions of which there are approximately 20. These international unions are among the oldest and most powerful unions in our country. Included among their number are the Teamsters Union and the International Union of Operating Engineers. The corruption discovered by the McClellan Committee investigations with rerespect to these two unions and some of their officials shocked the American people.

I think you should know that there are literally hundreds of thousands of Teamsters Union members working in the construction industry and it is the Teamsters who transport the construction materials to and on the construction job site. Yes, the Teamsters Union is very much in and very much a vital part of the construction industry's operations.

I cannot believe that this Congress will vote to enact H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9100 or any of the other pending common situs picketing bills which would legalize the use of another devastating weapon in the arsenal of Mr. Hoffa and the Teamsters Union—the most powerful union in this country. No, I cannot believe that this Congress could so lightly regard its sacred trust on behalf of the American people that it would enact legislation to legalize the use of the dangerous and unjustifiable secondary boycott strike and picketing weapon by Mr. Hoffa and the other leaders of the Teamsters Union, or by any other union leaders, and thereby bestow upon them the legal power to bring chaos to our Nation's largest industry, shackle our efforts to construct vitally needed facilities for our national defense, and imperil the very safety of our Nation.

The following is a partial list of the unions that would be in a position to shut down construction by taking advantage of the "common situs" provisions of H.R. 9070 and the other pending "common situs" picketing bills:

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America.

International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers.

International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers.

Bricklayers', Masons' and Plasterers' International Union of America.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

International Union of Elevator Constructors.

International Union of Operating Engineers.

The Granite Cutters' International Association of America.

International Hod Carriers', Building and Common Laborers' Union of America.

International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers.

The Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers' International Union.

International Association of Marble, Slate and Stone Polishers, Rubbers and Sawyers, Tile and Marble Setters' Helpers and Terrazzo Helpers.

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America.

Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association of the United States and Canada.

United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

United Slate, Tile and Composition Roofers', Damp and Waterproof Workers' Association.

Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.

Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America.

Unions that might be in a position to shut down construction by taking advantage of the "common situs" provisions of H.R. 9070 and the other "common situs" picketing bills:

Aluminum Workers' International Union (AFL–CIO).

Building Service Employees' International Union (AFL–CIO).

International Union, United Plant Guard Workers of America (independent).

District 50, United Mine Workers of America.

United Construction Workers, United Mine Workers of America.

United Marine Workers, United Marine Workers of America.

Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers (AFL–CIO).

A Salute to the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, beginning under the inspired guidance of Henry Watterson and continuing through the present able leadership of Barry Bingham, Mark Ethridge, and Russell Briney, editor in chief, publisher, and editor, respectively, the Louisville Courier-Journal has achieved an enviable reputation throughout the country. That the Courier-Journal has made its impact on the general public as well as fellow journalists is evidenced by its having been named on every survey as among 10 great U.S. newspapers. Once again the Courier-Journal has been honored by placing 6th in a list of 15 in a poll of the Nation's newspaper editors conducted by Scholastic magazines.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Courier-Journal in the Top Half of the 15 Best U.S. Newspapers" which appeared in the April 4 issue.

The article is as follows:

COURIER-JOURNAL IN THE TOP HALF OF THE 15 BEST U.S. NEWSPAPERS

NEW YORK, N.Y., April 3.—What are the 15 daily newspapers in the United States "most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service?"

A poll of the Nation's newspaper editors conducted by scholastic magazines selected the following, in order of preference:

1. The New York Times.
2. The Christian Science Monitor.
3. The Milwaukee Journal.
4. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
5. Washington Post and Times Herald.
6. The Courier-Journal.
7. The Wall Street Journal.
8. Atlanta Constitution.
9. Chicago Tribune.
10. Des Moines Register.
11. The Kansas City Star and Times.
12. The Baltimore Sun.
13. The Miami Herald.
14. Chicago Daily News.
15. Los Angeles Times.

The poll was conducted in connection with a special issue on "How To Read Newspapers," published annually by Practical English, one of the scholastic magazines for high school students.

The poll was taken in two parts, the magazine publishers said. First, a list of all newspapers in cities with 200,000 population or more was sent to all editors of daily newspapers in the United States. Editors were asked to check the 12 newspapers that, in their opinion, were "most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service." Room was allowed for write-in votes.

A "runoff ballot" was then drawn up, including newspapers that polled at least 12 votes. Write-in candidates with two or more votes were also included. More than 335 editors voted in the final runoff ballot.

The results of the runoff showed such a close vote that 15 newspapers were chosen instead of 12.

Forty-four Undergraduates of Groton School Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 20, 44 undergraduates of Groton School, Groton, Mass., accompanied by two of their masters, came to Washington at my invitation and I arranged for them to visit various departments of Government during the following 2 days, Monday and Tuesday. The object of their visit was to learn something about their Government in operation at firsthand.

Monday morning, March 21, they visited the White House and afterward went to the State Department where they listened to a discussion of State Department activities by the Secretary of State and others. J. Edgar Hoover greeted them at the Federal Bureau of Investigation and at noon they arrived at the House of Representatives where they witnessed from the gallery the activities of the session. On that afternoon they went to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Secretary Arthur S. Flemming talked to them about the work of his Department. On leaving HEW they went to the Smithsonian Institution and Dr. Leonard Carmichael, the Secretary, explained the work that was done there and they took a tour of the buildings. That evening at dinner at the Capitol Hill Club, they listened to remarks on politics by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

On Tuesday morning, March 22, they met with the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, at the Treasury Department, and he explained to them something about the work that is done there. Later they visited the Department of Labor and listened to talks about the Department activities given by those in the high echelon in that Department. At 12:30 they had luncheon in the Speaker's dining room and listened to a very inspirational address by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. He was followed by a talk on Foreign Affairs by Congressman WALTER JUDD. After lunch they went to visit the National Gallery of Art where they were met by Mr. John Walker, the Director, and were taken on a tour of the gallery.

These young men were very much impressed by the work being done by their Government and I am pleased to append letters I have received from them, which explain themselves:

MARCH 23, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I can't tell you what a grand time I had here in Washington. I tried to count the number of things you did for me and the rest of my fellow "Grotties." It was a real sacrifice on your part and I'm gratefully indebted to you. To me the most interesting thing I saw was the 2d session of Congress; but the highlight of my whole visit seems to have been the dinner at the Speaker's dining room. I was impressed by the two speeches, and above all, by your tactful and friendly hospitality. Thanks an awful lot, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, I had a wonderful time.

Best regards and with great respect,

L. KIM BIGHAM.

SALEM, CONN.

MARCH 24, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: It is really impossible for me to thank you enough for providing us with such a very wonderful trip. Groton is uniquely lucky to have a graduate such as yourself who very generously provides its boys with such a thrilling supplement to their education.

The trip was especially interesting for me because I think that I would like to make the service of my country in the Foreign Service and maybe even someday in elected office if I am lucky. It is for this reason that I am greatly indebted to you for giving me the opportunity to meet great men like Joe Martin, Sam Rayburn, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Flemming, Walter Judd, and yourself. To meet, listen to, and talk with these men was an inspiring and humbling experience. Meeting these men made me realize how honorable a profession politics is and how necessary a one, too. Meeting these men also made me realize how hard a boy is going to have to work to half fill their shoes and, in these troubled times, how necessary it is for him to completely fill their shoes if the country is to go on being as great as it is today.

Again, thank you very much for a wonderful experience.

Very respectfully and sincerely,

CHARLES MAGOWAN.

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: It is my great pleasure and honor to thank you for the wonderful trip you gave us to Washington. Living in Baltimore has afforded me with the opportunity to see Washington often. Yet I can honestly say that I have never had a trip or tour of Washington the like of yours.

Again it is my pleasure to repeat the fact that I am a Democrat and have rather strong feelings on the subject of party allegiance. I was quite impressed by our Republican speakers but have to admit that the high point of the trip was when the Speaker gave us a short talk. The second high point was Mr. JUDD's speech which was certainly a masterpiece of thought.

I do hope in the years to come that I will be able to stop into your office when I am touring the Capitol. Of course this reflects the idea that you will be reelected. I certainly would vote for you.

Again many thinks for all your trouble. It was well appreciated by all.

Sincerely yours,

GILL COCHRAN.

THURSDAY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I just wanted to drop this note to again thank you for everything you have done to make this Washington trip possible for us. The trip just couldn't have been more of a success. But I still am amazed at the time and effort you must have spent arranging all those appointments.

Personally I was entirely impressed by the entire 2 days. Aside from the fact that I have lived in Washington for 10 years, I found out that I still had a lot to learn about this city. I think it tremendously important that more young people should be exposed to the internal structure of the Government. We should see how it operates and functions. After all, it is our Government, and if it is our Government, we should know what is going on behind those tremendous walls. We are obligated to know. Fortunately, I am lucky enough to have been included on such a trip and I only hope the other boys from Groton enjoyed it as much as I did.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SARGENT.

MARCH 24, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I really can't thank you enough for the marvelous time that you gave me in Washington these past few days. It was my first trip to the city and it certainly will be my most memorable thanks to you. I hope I can partially realize the great amount of time and trouble that must have gone into this trip and I am fully appreciative of those things which I am aware of—namely, the pains to have arranged such a full and interesting schedule for us with your Washington colleagues and such things as renting us the bus and giving all 46 odd of us those two delicious meals. I might add that I thought those meals were probably the most informative of the whole trip for while the appointments dealt with the immensely interesting specific parts of the Government, such as finance and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Messrs. RAYBURN, MARTIN, and JUDD (not to mention yourself), all gave very interesting aspects of the Nation as a whole and foreign affairs which I thought was great.

I also believe that as a result of this trip, I am beginning to understand how the Government of our country operates, something which previously I could not claim. All in all, I thank you once more for one of the most thrilling trips of my life. I really learned a lot and had a whale of a time doing it.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN BANGS.

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: This is just a short note to thank you for all the trouble and expense you went to to show us Washington and the Government. Words are really not enough to show you how much I appreciate what you did for us. I can truthfully say that I have never been on a trip during which I had so much fun while learning so much. Also, I couldn't really say that I dislike steak or chicken too much.

Thanking you for everything.

Yours,

JOHN DUNDAS.

MARCH 25, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I don't know how to begin to thank you for all you did for us this week. A trip like that transforms names in a newspaper into people. You really get a feel for how the Government operates and what it's doing. It's also very amazing how simple big things like foreign policy and international finance become when you have the experts tell you about them.

I hope to go to Harvard by the Holloway plan of Naval ROTC. That might very well lead to a Government career. Who knows?

For now, all I can say is, thank you.

HERB MOTLEY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I really can't thank you enough for the great time you gave us down in the Capitol. The whole thing was so much different from going on a sightseeing tour, because there you never see any of the big names in the city.

When I took a taxi out to Georgetown on Tuesday night, I sat in the car with the Representative from Tennessee. I think his name was REECE. He was really very nice because he came from Massachusetts as do I or he had gone up there a lot and we had a nice chat.

Thank you again for all the work you obviously put into the trip. It was really terrific fun.

Sincerely,

GARDNER JACKSON.

FRIDAY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: A thank you note seems totally inadequate to thank you for such an interesting and thoroughly enjoyable trip. Now that I'm back at home and have had a chance to look at the events of the 2 days in retrospect, I am surer than ever that it was an invaluable experience, that I will never forget. Although hardly an expert, I feel that through listening to all the learned men I met that I have a general idea of how this great country of ours operates. I know that I can't begin to thank you, but I assure you that I greatly appreciate all the arrangements and difficulties you must have gone through to have planned such an impressive itinerary. Many thanks for making my first trip to Washington such a success.

Very sincerely,

BOBBY DEVENS.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I am writing to thank you for the trip which you organized for us. I have never had such an enlightening 2 days in my life. The most enjoyable times were the two dinners, because of your stories and the speech which Mr. JUDD gave at the luncheon which I can remember as though I had just heard it. I now feel much more in contact with problems that the Government has to deal with, and have much less criticism of what is being done. I also have much more confidence in the Government after having met and listened to people like you and Mr. JUDD, not to mention any of the others.

Those 2 days were about the most valuable 2 I have ever had, and I can't thank you enough.

Respectfully yours,

PATRICK HARE.

DEAR SIR: I would like to heartily thank you for the wonderful time I had on the trip. It was much better to see the Government in action and not just the city of Washington in action.

Thanks again,

F. C. GRANT III.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you very much for arranging the wonderful trip to Washington for all of us from Groton, and for everything you did for us while we were there. All the people we met were very interesting and I particularly enjoyed talking to you and Mr. MARTIN at the dinner on Monday night.

You did an awful lot for all of us and I certainly appreciate it.

Sincerely,

BRUCE EMORY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINLOSS: I can't express my appreciation for the trip you arranged in Washington. I am very thankful I didn't pass it up. Probably never again will I get such a good opportunity to see the "inside" of Washington which you gave me on the trip. It was especially valuable to be able to listen to such men as Congressman Judd and Speaker Rayburn, because I have been taking a history tutorial with Mr. Congleton on government and American foreign policy. I thought the highlights of the trip were the dinner and luncheon which you provided for us. Seldom is one exposed to as many good speakers in such a short time. It is with great gratitude that I express my thanks to you.

Sincerely yours,

PARKIE KEYES.

MARCH 26, 1960.

DEAR SIR: I will always feel indebted to you for your time and effort spent in making our trip such an enjoyable one. Without doubt, I learned more about our Government in these 2 days, than in any course on the subject in school.

I have for some time been very interested in the running of the Government. Without wanting to impose on you, I would be very thankful to you if you could give me some idea as to the possibility of getting a summer job when I go to college next year in some way connected with politics. Maybe you would tell me whom I could write for such information.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

PAUL OFFNER.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I don't know how I can thank you enough for the terrific tour of Washington. All I can say is that ever since my mother took my two older sisters down in 1950 I have begged every year to be given a trip to Washington. I never dreamed I would get such a terrific trip in the end.

I am taking my second year of American history at Groton this year and plan to major in it at college. This trip did more than anything else to stimulate my interest in the subject and when I resume my studies this April I'm quite sure this trip will throw new light on many things.

I hope you are successful in the coming election as you certainly deserve to be. My grandmother, Eleanor Whitney, comes from Rumson and I'm sure you can count on votes from her family. I only wish we could vote—you would receive a certain bloc of 42 right away.

Many thanks for the wonderful trip and all the trouble you took to give us an outstanding time. The pictures arrived safely and will be exhibited to all friends, relatives, etc.

Yours sincerely,

WHITNEY LLOYD.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: After noting the volume of mail that comes across your desk, I will try to make this relatively short and to the point.

Thank you very much for planning and hosting the terrific Groton trip to Washington. Meeting people who are expert in their fields and seeing the structural formation of our great Capital added up to an enlightening and provocative experience, which I shall always fondly remember.

The two meals (complete with great after-dinner speakers including yourself) were superb—food and thought mixed in a most gratifying manner for mind and stomach.

I left Washington realizing that an America with the will can face her problems squarely now and in the future, and will succeed in solving those problems.

Sincerely,

GEOFFREY GUND.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: My trip to Washington with the boys will stay long in my mind as one of the very worthwhile events of my life, and I cannot thank you enough for having made it possible. It is one thing to visit the great city and view the architecture and treasure houses—anyone can do that at their leisure—but it is something else again to come face to face with the men and women who are shaping the Nation's way of life. Most Americans have no more than an occasional opportunity to meet, whether formally or informally, with the people who make up the national political scene, and are apt to get a distorted view of the type of person a politician really is. To my mind, it was quite inspirational to move from one department of government to another and meet person after person of high caliber, and the integrity and air of devotion that you and your colleagues evinced was most heartwarming. It it in this area that you have done such a great service to us at Groton. It is easy enough to expose young people to a worthwhile experience, easy to show them the books and the documents and the works of art, but it is a much more difficult thing to show them what inspires men to do great deeds and to catch them up in the same spirit. I am sure that you and Mr. Martin and Mr. Rayburn and Mr. Judd and Mr. Flemming and Mr. Anderson have left a mark, a touch of inspiration, on us that is very deep and may take some of us very far, and for this there are no thanks great enough.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES RIMMER.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you very much for those wonderful experiences you made possible for us in Washington from March 21 to the 22d. Those memorable times I shared with my fellow Grotonians will be some of the proudest in my life. As a Malayan, I have come to a newer understanding about this country. When I return to my native land, I shall share this closer understanding and those unique experiences with my fellow Malayans.

Thank you very much again and I look forward to the opportunity of meeting you in the times to come.

Yours respectfully,

DAVID T. S. TONG.

DEAR SIR: I'm afraid that none of us who went on the Washington trip will ever be able to thank you enough or appreciate what you have done for us. The physical aspects of the trip that you permitted us to put you to—renting a bus for transportation for us for 2 days, and two most excellent and delicious meals—were impressive in themselves, but what was really more awesome and inspiring than those were mere material realities were the people and interviews you had arranged for us. Imagine. The chance to see and meet four Cabinet members and department heads, as well as two of the most important and influential persons in U.S. politics today, plus most informative and outstanding talks and interviews or briefings by such well-informed and astute men as WALTER JUDD, the department heads themselves, or if they were not available, as were the cases of the Departments of Labor and State, equally competent officials, would have been well nigh impossible to match on your own or through many other channels. One cannot overestimate the value of such talks by such men as Anderson or Flemming, or the impressions we derived from them. Of equal interest were the tour and meetings with the heads of the Smithsonian, the National Galleries, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

From a personal viewpoint, however, the trip was most interesting and, strangely enough, reassuring. I guess since I have been brought up in an era of materialism, payola, the strain of cold war threats, and H-bomb fears, and a world where cheating on your income tax or rigging a quiz show, do not seem to be such heinous crimes, and this coupled with a marked ignorance and a conditioned youthful cynicism about my Government did not lead me to know what to expect from it. Having returned from Washington, I now feel that I know a little bit more about my Government and how it works, and I am assured of its competence and knowledge in external and internal affairs. Furthermore, I feel now, on the basis of such men as RAYBURN'S, JUDD'S (and yours) patriotism, coupled with their personal acuteness and knowledge, that the Government is "in the right hands," regardless of whether they are Democratic or Republican, for one of the things that left a deep impression on me that you emphasized was the camaraderie that existed between the two parties and the fact that they were working for the same common goal, although they might have slightly different ideas of how to obtain that goal.

One of the things that Groton has done for me was to stress the importance of a strong and liberal foreign policy, and I was very interested and reassured to find that the State Department and men like JUDD were well aware of this, and were carrying out their views.

Again, I don't think we can ever thank you enough for the trip as a whole, or for what you might have done for us individually.

Respectfully,

F. S. CHEEVER, Jr.

DEAR UNCLE JIM: I don't know how I could possibly thank you enough for providing such a wonderful opportunity for myself and all of us to learn as much as we all did about our Government.

I thoroughly enjoyed the whole trip, and found Representative Judd, Representative Martin, and Secretary Flemming were especially good, in that order. I am sure that I learned more from those three men and from what I saw on the tour than I could ever learn from books.

Again let me say thank you for all you did for me and the others, for I certainly did enjoy every moment of it.

Yours truly,

GORDON ROBBINS.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: We all had a great time in Washington, thanks to you. In the past I have been too lazy to look at the newspapers. Now I read them. I have a much better picture of the work which operates this country. I am getting some ideas of the work involved in campaigning, too, since my father is helping a Mr. Pope run for the House.

Thank you for such a nice trip and particularly for the pictures.

Respectfully yours,

TONY HYDE.

DEAR GRANDFATHER: I can't thank you enough for the trip around Washington, which you arranged. It is a terrific and invaluable experience for one to see exactly how our Government functions. I had been lucky enough to be a page in the House as you will remember, but even there I didn't get a complete scope of our Government with all its bureaus and departments. On a trip like this last one a person finds out just what dedicated and responsible men run our Government. All of us on the trip got a taste of Washington and her men and it was a new taste to all of us. We are all greatly indebted to you.

I remember that you were worried that the trip might not be a success. I must admit that prior to getting down to Washington, I had my doubts. The reason for these doubts was that the school was excited about the trip and looked forward to it. The boys had great expectations because the trip which you had arranged 2 years ago had been such a great success. I would say, however, that the trip lived up to and surpassed all hopes that the boys and the masters had. It couldnt' have been better.

I don't think there has ever been a boy as proud as I was during that trip. The boys were impressed with you, and were drawn to you and your humor and love of your country. I, in short, was proud that I should be related to you.

Everything around here is fine. Mother, Lee, Gail, and Parker send you all their love.

Once again I thank you.

Respectfully,

DAVID.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I wanted to add my thanks to Tony for the wonderful time you gave him and his Groton schoolmates in Washington. It was a splendid thing to do—they have come away with a vivid picture of our Government which will lend meaning to their reading of news, to their courses in history and Government, and to their own future role as citizens.

Tony has had an opportunity, since his Washington trip, to observe the grassroots aspect of the political picture, as we have been helping Fred Pope in his effort to have a primary in our town of Weston—he seeks the Representative nomination to Congress from Connecticut's Fourth District.

Thank you again for your kindness and generosity.

Cordially yours,

Mrs. ALBERT F. HYDE.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I want to say thank you so much for the truly great trip you arranged for me and my classmates in Washington. Those 2 days were about the most interesting that I have ever spent. I was also greatly impressed by the people that spoke to us. They all had something interesting to offer and they delivered their information so well. It's reassuring to know that the country is run by people like them, so thank you so much again.

Ever your cousin,

BILL SLOAN.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you for giving us such a good time on the Washington trip. All of us enjoyed it to the full. I had realized that politics was intricate, but I hadn't known that it could be so intriguing. Visits to the various departments were especially enlightening. I thought that Secretary Anderson was the most interesting department head and JOE MARTIN seemed to be a real character. However, I thought that Senator JUDD gave a really brilliant speech—one of the very best that I've ever heard.

Thanks again for such an enjoyable and educational trip.

Sincerely yours,

JEREMY KELLER.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you very much for your kindness to us during our visit to Washington. It was a warm and fascinating experience, and I am very grateful to you and the other gentlemen who made it so interesting. Your hospitality was almost sufficient to change a southerner into a Republican. Thank you very much again.

Sincerely yours,

GRAY TEMPLE, Jr.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: This letter is to thank you for all you did for us on the Washington trip—the bus, the meals, the hotel reservations, and especially the Congressmen and Cabinet members you arranged for us to meet with and speak to—Martin, Rayburn, Judd, Flemming, and Anderson. I was very impressed with them, and also with what I could see of the civil rights debate in the House and Senate, which seemed to come right out of "advice and consent."

I feel that I really have a better understanding of how our Government works, how it really is our Government, and the privileges and responsibilities of being a part of it. I would appreciate it if you could send me some literature on job opportunities in Government, especially the Foreign Service.

Sincerely,

BILL PEDERSEN.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Somehow it always seems hard to express any kind of gratitude and thanks, and the more words one uses to try to express sincere appreciation, the less sincere the words must seem to be. So maybe the best way to thank you would just be to say thank you very much for a very wonderful 3 days in which you probably had to put up with all sorts of inconveniences. The chance to see the Government in a way that only you could make possible comes to a person like myself only once in a lifetime and I'm really grateful for that chance. The opportunity to stay in your home was something that I didn't deserve, but it was wonderful. Everything about it was the best.

Dave and I, thanks to you, flew up to New York last night, and strange as it may seem, made it in one piece. He made it to his grandmother's birthday just in time. I took your advice and went up to New Haven this morning to see Yale. Thanks again, sir, for everything; the bed, the advice, and the chance to see the Government. I hope someday to be lucky enough to see you.

Yours truly,

EMLEN HALL.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I want to thank you very much for the wonderful time you gave me in Washington. It was really terrific. I would never have been able to see so many important people and will probably not be able to in the future if I try to go on my own.

I stayed down in Washington a few extra days with a friend and was able to see a few extra things which we did not have time to see with the group, such as the Medical Museum and the Washington Monument. The whole trip was very thrilling.

I can't thank you enough.

Very truly yours,

JAMES BORDLEY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you very much for a wonderful time and a great experience. I had never been to Washington and hardly knew a thing about our Goverenment. I thought the Treasury and the Department of Labor were the most interesting. Jerry, the busdriver, told us that Ripley said, "If you spent 1 minute on every object in the Smithsonian Institution you'd spend a lifetime." Next year I hope to go down again and stay with friends and see more. Everyone had a great time and I learned a lot about our Government. I hope it'll help me in U.S. history during the rest of the year. We'll all cast our votes for your reelection.

Most sincerely,

RICHARD C. PARKE.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AUCHINCLOSS: I want to thank you for all the hospitality which you showed our class and the sixth form while we were in Washington. The trip was not only enjoyable but was also educational. Although I had of course read, both at school and elsewhere, about the functioning of our Government, it was quite different to actually see it in operation.

It was especially interesting to me to watch the two Houses in session and to see some of the civil rights debate. I also enjoyed the speeches which you arranged for us, particularly the one by Representative RAYBURN (even if he is a Democrat.)

Thank you again for all your trouble, dinners, speakers, and appointments.

Sincerely,

BOB SPEARMAN.

DEAR JIM: My grandson, Bill Pedersen (Groton 5th Form) has just returned radiant over the grand time you gave him and all the other Groton boys. His enthusiasm was most unusual. I thought I would write you a line just to tell you that once in a while you are appreciated at your real value. Don't bother to answer this but remember you will always be welcome at our spare room (with private bath) at the above address on any trip to New York.

Affectionately,

HOWLAND AUCHINCLOSS.

Earl Hogan: A Hard-Working Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting an editorial from the Lawrenceburg (Ind.) Press, which describes the activity of my colleague, the Honorable EARL HOGAN of the Ninth District of Indiana, in the location of U.S. Super Highway No. 64.

This editorial points out the fact that the Ninth District of Indiana is represented by a hard-working and dedicated Congressman, who is going to do all that he can to advance the best interests of his congressional district in our State of Indiana.

The editorial follows:

A FEDERAL SUPERHIGHWAY HERE?

Congressman HOGAN appeared before the Bureau of Public Roads hearing in Washington March 24 in support of relocating proposed U.S. Superhighway 64 substantially along the route of U.S. Highway 50 as it was originally planned. He described as a political expedient the proposal that it be shifted to enter Indiana between Princeton and Evansville, 30 miles south of the original plan, and across the Ohio River into Louisville at New Albany to tie up with such a road coming from the east and passing south of Cincinnati.

Other road and bridge elements of this area have assumed that the hearings being held and to be held are formalities only and that the Federal bureau has already determined on the southern route. To this date the Congressman appears to be the only outspoken proponent in favor of approximating the route across Indiana roughly to this area. His reasons are given in the following words:

"The matter of national defense must remain a determining factor in the location of the highway. The Crane Naval Ammunition Depot (between Bedford and Bicknell) is unquestioningly of vital importance to the defense of our country as is the availability of fast exit road to the residents of the 9th district in the event of an enemy attack. I cannot, at this point, even entertain the idea which has been propounded that U.S. 50 will be developed in the event that Interstate Highway 64 is relocated to the south. The plan of an outgoing Governor cannot be accepted as fact when it will be up to a new administration to carry out the plans projected during his fading months in office.

"Already the State has included in its current program involving right-of-way acquisition two projects involving $274,500 in interstate funds. Whether a revision of projects will allow justification of the spending of these moneys or not, I charge the very expenditure is proof of the honest intent insofar as the northern placement of this highway is concerned. I have been in Washington for less than 2 years but already I have learned how easy it is for conversation to carry six digit figures without the blink of the eye. Upwards of $275,000 still is a lot of money to me, a Hoosier, however, and I want to assure you and the other officials of the Bureau of Public Roads that the Congress will eye, with a great deal of interest, just what happens, budgetwise to these funds.

"It is my understanding that both Federal-aid interstate funds and Federal-aid primary funds are participating in the Illinois development of the highway between Vincennes and Olney (U.S. 50 route) in the sum of $1,534,149. This money was spent, undoubtedly, in good faith in connection with the interstate highway planned program. What has changed in the geographical picture of the defense potential or the economic situation that would justify a shift in the location of this highway No. 64? Believe me, the population of the communities I represent will total an equal to the city population of Evansville; 9th district residents have the same need for this fine highway outlet for their products; an equal need for a fast and direct means of exodus in the event of enemy attack and—a safe, rapid, means of transporting the defense weapons from Crane.

"Moreover, this area has too long been denied the benefits of the tax payments by its residents. For too long, 9th district residents have been paying Federal taxes with meager return. The comparative economic benefit to be derived from the northern routing of highway 64 is overwhelming. The people of this area need the highway, deserve the highway, and I hope you will see fit to allow them the privilege of having the highway."

Post Office Department, a Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial, which appeared recently in the Baltimore News-Post.

There has been much discussion in regards to President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase. The point of view advanced by the Baltimore News-Post certainly merits the attention of the public.

POST OFFICE IS NOT A BUSINESS

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which is easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore, mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the Post Office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in everyday fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

It is true it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal judiciary system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted. But the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about $2½ billion a year. No other Government department produces anywhere near as much revenue. But because the postal establishment costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Postal rates actually are a form of taxes. The Post Office does not keep the money it gets for selling stamps, but turns it into the Treasury. Thus in urging a postal rate increase, the administration is seeking an indirect tax increase.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense. Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska? Would a business operate a branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, most of them losing money because of slight patronage? Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

Connally Reservation Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Calumet of Friday, April 1, 1960, evidencing the results of the poll of attorneys conducted by Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Fourth Congressional District of Illinois.

The replies stanchly support retention of the reservation as an instrument to enable our Government to maintain jurisdiction of our affairs with respect to the World Court.

The editorial follows:

CONNALLY RULE UPHELD

The hundred of readers of the Chicago Daily Calumet who wrote to their Congressmen to oppose the repeal of the Connally reservation which would deprive the United States of sovereignty in the World Court will be happy to know that their efforts were not in vain.

According to the latest information from Washington, the Connally reservation has not been repealed and will not be in danger of being eliminated for this session of Congress. The issue, created by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, is being allowed to die quietly.

The Connally reservation, it will be remembered, is a proviso in the 1945 Congressional resolution on the rights of the World Court which stipulates that the World Court may have jurisdiction over internal affairs of the United States only "as determined by the United States."

Senator HUMPHREY would repeal this vital clause, giving the Communist-dominated World Court the right to meddle in our internal affairs. The shocking aspect of this obvious betrayal of our Nation's sovereignty is that none of the Communist countries has indicated the slightest intention of doing likewise. They have, in fact, refused to do so.

A poll of attorneys in the Fourth Congressional District conducted by Representative

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI (Fourth) showed that 83 percent of them are stanchly against repeal of the Connally reservation. The East Side Lions and other local groups formally went on record against the repeal.

Their efforts, combined with those of thousands of other indignant Americans across the country, paid off. It does pay to write your Congressman. In this one instance it prevented a disgusting sellout of our country.

Washington, Lincoln, and Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of New Jersey's most dedicated and patriotic citizens is George E. Stringfellow. Although he is a longtime resident of New Jersey, his family has deep roots in Virginia going back to colonial days.

Mr. Speaker, the finest historical traditions of Virginia—deep religious conviction, sterling character, flaming independence, sacrificial patriotism, and gracious hospitality—constitute the heredity and form the background of the formative years of George Edward Stringfellow, who was born in Reva, Culpeper County, Va., son of James and Elizabeth F. (Bowers) Stringfellow.

The first George Stringfellow to arrive in Virginia came from England in the year 1720. He brought with him the family coat of arms which his American descendants valued highly.

Five of George E. Stringfellow's early forebears preached the gospel as it was taught in the theological Seminaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Reverend Horace Stringfellow, who left Virginia to cope with the evils of Washington, D.C., as rector of Trinity Church, was described by Daniel Webster as "God Almighty's prosecuting attorney." Others were farmers, merchants, lawyers, physicians, and educators. Like many other early and courageous pioneering families the Stringfellows fought in their country's wars—from the Revolutionary through World War II. Many participated in various ways in the war between the States; one being one of General Lee's most daring and dependable scouts, another being an educator during the days when Virginia was known as "Military District No. 1".

Robert Stringfellow's Retreat house, near Racoon Ford on the Rapidan River in Culpeper County, Va., was, until it was burned in 1864, a gracious center of Stringfellow hospitality. Another ancestoral estate on the Rapidan has been in the family since it was built in 1832 by Thornton Stringfellow.

George Stringfellow believes that the statement "Once a Virginian always a Virginian" is a true one, if not in geography, then certainly in terms of graciousness. To be his guest in New Jersey is to know Virginia hospitality at its best.

It was with this early background of historic patriotism and tradition that Stringfellow began his productive years in New Jersey and built a modern noteworthy American career.

His outstanding achievements in business, his constructive independence in the affairs of government, his enduring contributions to civic life and to charitable and educational organizations, and his daily devotion to our fraternal activities constitute a record which is eloquent in its demonstration of his unusual qualities of leadership.

These qualities were recognized by Thomas Elva Edison, the "wizard of Menlo Park," when he appointed George E. Stringfellow manager of his manufacturing firm's Washington office and 5 years later made him general manager of the corporation's largest business in West Orange, N.J. For more than a decade he was a daily business associate of Mr. Edison. He is now vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of the McGraw-Edison Co. and a director of a number of nationally known corporations.

Before coming to New Jersey George E. Stringfellow married Carrie M. Fearnow, a charming and vivacious young lady of Washington, D.C., who was born in Berkeley Springs, W. Va.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stringfellow is past president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association and first president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society; served two terms as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City; served two terms as president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; served four terms as president of the board of managers of the New Jersey Home for Disabled Soldiers; represented Kiwanis International at the United Nations; served on the board of trustees of the Central Brick Presbyterian Church, East Orange, and Elberon Memorial Church, Elberon; and was former chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party of New Jersey.

He is currently serving as a member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College and holds membership in a number of professional organizations. He finds time for a heavy speaking schedule. His speeches are often editorialized, receive wide circulation and many have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

George Stringfellow has been the recipient of honorary degrees from various colleges in recognition of his many accomplishments: Doctor of humanities, doctor of fine arts, doctor of laws.

He received the Citizen Award for outstanding achievement in industrial statesmanship from the New Jersey Society of Professional Engineers; was made an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society and was the recipient of the American Cancer Society award for his leadership and work in founding and supporting the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society; and was cited by the brotherhood committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects.

During World War II he served as a member of several important committees of the War Production Board for which he received a Medal of Merit.

Mr. Stringfellow was recently elected to honorary membership in the national chapter of Sigma Mu Sigma, an organization dedicated to faith in the dignity of man and confidence in the integrity of youth.

In May 1958, he received the 1958 Academy of Medicine of New Jersey annual Citizens Award for rendering extraordinary service to the health and welfare of the public.

While residing in Washington, Mr. Stringfellow was raised a master mason in Hiram Lodge No. 10 F. and A.M. He was exalted in Washington Chapter No. 2, R.A.M. and served as excellent high priest. He was knighted in Washington Commandery No. 1, K.T. He became a noble of the A.A.O.N.M.S. in Almas Temple.

He served Salaam Temple as potentate in 1947 and was unanimously reelected in 1948, the first potentate of Salaam to succeed himself in 43 years. He also served as imperial potentate A.A.O.N.M.S. for 1958–59.

He is currently member of Hope Lodge No. 124, F. and A.M., East Orange, N.J.; the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite in the Valley of Trenton, Trenton, N.J.; Crescent Temple, Trenton; Washington Commandery, No. 1, K.T.; St. Quentin Conclave No. 75, Red Cross of Constantine; Crescent Court No. 65, Royal Order of Jesters, and is an active member, International Supreme Council, Order of DeMolay.

Mr. Stringfellow was elected to the Imperial Divan in Chicago, Ill., in 1949. He is an honorary member of 148 temples.

Among the clubs in which he holds membership are the Railroad Club and Kiwanis Club of New York City, Advertising Club of New Jersey, Duquesne Club (Pittsburgh), Montclair Golf Club, Montclair, N.J.

I am indebted for much of this background material on Mr. Stringfellow to Dr. Edmund L. Tink. Dr. Tink is superintendent of schools in Kearny, N.J., an executive member of the commission on higher education and a trustee of Syracuse University. Dr. Tink was appointed by President Eisenhower to the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board and still serves on that Board. He has been officially commended by the State Department for his activities in fighting communism.

On February 11, 1960, George E. Stringfellow made an address to the Kiwanis Club of Staten Island, N.Y., on "Washington, Lincoln, and Edison." As one who had a long and close association with Thomas Edison, his remarks about Edison are particularly interesting. I ask unanimous consent to have this fine address reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, AND EDISON

(By George E. Stringfellow)

Thank you fellow Kiwanians, for your invitation to address you on Edison's birthday. This is the third time you have asked me to speak to your club. I am complimented by your invitation for a repeat performance.

Each of the 12 months in our calendar year is important. However, I think that February is one of the most important in that Washington, Lincoln, and Edison were born in February.

It was in February that Washington said, "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

It was in February that Lincoln said, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."

I shall mention briefly the philosophy of Washington and Lincoln and will deal more extensively with Edison, with whom it was my privilege to have been a daily business associate during the last decade of his long and productive life.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington was born February 22, 1732—228 years ago. Washington looked after the welfare of our country as a father looks after his child. He fought for and helped make our country grow strong. He guided it when it was young and gave leadership in developing the greatest form of government, in the words of Gladstone, "Ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

No man in the history of the world did more for his country than Washington did for ours. He and his associates gave us a system of government which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. Nowhere in the world do men enjoy as much freedom and as high a living standard as we, thanks to Washington's courage and wisdom. Washington truly earned the imperishable title of "Father of His Country."

Our forefathers bequeathed to us a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of the Government. Our benefactors gave us a system of government that recognizes the dignity of the individual and encourages high moral and ethical standards. They gave us a system of government born of the principle that all men have the right to pursue happiness and to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Our forefathers gave us a system of government which provides everyone an opportunity to make the most of what he has and rewards him according to his ability. They did not subscribe to the philosophy that government owes everyone a living.

Our forefathers glorified the individual, not the state, as the Communists do. They worked like Trojans to build a strong America and they roared like lions to establish and maintain freedom. They had granite in their character and iron in their backbones. They kept government the servant of the people and so must we, if we are to remain free men, and thus be worthy of our great heritage.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln was born on February 12, 1809—151 years ago tomorrow. He was one of the world's truly great men. He will live always in the minds and hearts of people everywhere. In his memorable Gettysburg address and in other speeches and writings, Lincoln expressed his belief in the American people and in our system of government. He never lost touch with the people and millions knew him for what he was, "Honest Abe."

Lincoln held the Nation together in the trying sixties, and thus preserved the system of government which made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country, but to the betterment of the world.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Thomas A. Edison was born on February 11, 1847, and today we celebrate the 113th anniversary of that great event.

It is generally recognized that Edison was the world's greatest inventor. How, you may ask, did Edison, a poor boy, raise the money to build and equip his research laboratory, and staff it with capable assistants.

Edison raised the money by the sweat of his brow and the exercise of his fertile brain. Edison received no subsidy from his Government, as is all too often the case today.

Edison was known as the "Genius of Menlo Park." He was asked on one occasion to define "genius." He replied, "Genius is 95 percent perspiration and 5 percent inspiration."

One of Edison's first major inventions was the universal stock ticker, which he sold for $40,000. He used much of the proceeds from the sale to build, equip, and staff his laboratory.

Edison believed in and practiced the four basic principles of management: (1) Plan, (2) organize, (3) delegate, (4) supervise.

Edison's favorite invention, the phonograph, was patented February 19, 1877. It was the most original of his 1,100-odd inventions. Having conceived the idea of recording and reproducing sound, Edison sketched his idea on a scrap of yellow paper and handed it to John Kruesi, one of his assistants with instructions, "Kruesi, make this."

A few days later Kruesi handed the inventor a queer looking contraption. Edison wrapped a sheet of tin foil around the cylinder of the device and as he turned the crank that revolved the cylinder, he spoke these historic words, "Mary had a little lamb," into a brass horn attached to a recorder riding on the tinfoil. As Edison reversed the operation of the contraption, he heard those words repeated and thus was born sound recording and reproduction as we know it today.

Edison's most widely known and used invention is the incandescent lamp which illuminates the world. As you perhaps know, radio and television are predicated upon the principle of the incandescent lamp.

If Edison had lived under a Communist state, it would have been necessary for him to have gone to the "Bureau of New Ideas of the Division of Engineering of the Office of Social Improvement" to obtain essential commodities with which to experiment in his efforts to produce the electric light and his 1,100 other inventions. It would have been necessary for Edison to have revealed his educational qualifications to the Communist bureaucrat. Having none, Edison would doubtless have been denied the use of materials for his experiments and thus we would have been deprived of the electric light and the other great inventions which Edison's genius and industry produced which have enriched the world.

If Washington and his associates had not given us our system of government, if Lincoln had not held that Government together in its most trying period, it is safe to assume that Edison would not have made his great contribution to civilization.

Ours is a great system of government. It is our duty and our responsibility as citizens to keep it intact as it was passed on to us by our wise benefactors.

If we heed the advice of Washington and Lincoln in matters of government and if we emulate Edison's industry, integrity, and initiative, the future of America will be beyond man's comprehension.

"America," said Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the wisest of Americans, "is another name for opportunity. Her whole history appears like a last effort of divine providence in behalf of the human race."

Problem of Humane Medical Attention for a Large Segment of our Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, few people are aware of the growing problem involved in the need for health protection for the aged and unemployed people of our Nation. The problem cannot be solved by propaganda, scare slogans, or indifference. We must face the problem and solve it on the basis of facts. We must explore our capabilities for solution, both from the standpoint of economics and political possibilities. We must, and I believe we can, solve this problem within the structure of our American way of life, as we have solved many of our great national social problems. Let us study this problem calmly and objectively in the light of present facts and our past history.

By 1980, according to estimates prepared by the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, 26 million Americans will be over 65 years of age. Eighty-five percent of them will have incomes under $2,000 a year. What private insurance companies are going to insure them adequately at rates they can afford to pay? It is doubtful that any private company can pay for all the surgical and nursing and hospital care these elderly persons are indisputably going to need.

There are, of course, a great many companies in the United States selling health insurance of protective value, and some make a special point of catering to elderly folk; but no more than about one-third of the persons over 65 have hospital insurance, most of it with inadequate benefit coverage. Private insurance companies provide splendid protection for wage earners. But the cost of insurance inevitably goes up as the likelihood of illness increases with age, and sometimes is prohibitive for those who have retired. Most of the policies can be canceled on the basis of an age limitation or after paying a stipulated maximum level of benefits.

The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program, and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as socialistic without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire. They might just as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the

fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was to promote the general welfare.

It is a fact of record that the American Medical Association has violently resisted our present social security system ever since its inception in 1937. Today it is supported by both political parties. Although it is far from perfect, it does form the basic hope for security in old age and retirement for more than 58 million working people. At the present time 13,750,000 people have qualified and are drawing social security benefits.

The average doctor—secure in his own relatively high income bracket—refuses to consider the plight of the 22 million people over the age of 65, whose income ranges from zero to $2,000 annually. These people are no longer able to work or cannot find employment. It is common knowledge that our large industries resist the employment of individuals beyond the age of 45 or 50 years.

Even though the aged husband or wife may have a modest retirement annuity totaling $1,500 or $2,000 annually they cannot afford adequate hospitalization, surgical and medical expenses which are involved in chronic illness or major sickness. Many of these people are not eligible for social security benefits of even a meager type. This group of people are completely dependent on public or private charity.

The doctors of America will not solve this problem through blind opposition to every attempt on the part of Congress to find a solution to this growing problem. The denunciation of every legislative approach in terms of socialized medicine will not stem the tide of humanitarian sympathy and social responsibility for the millions who are unable to pay the cost of decent treatment for their physical survival.

It might be wise for the members of the American Medical Association to take a leaf from past history and remember their fruitless tactics in opposition to social security. If they want to forestall the adoption of a system of universal socialized medicine in its worst and most inadequate form, they might well support a reasonable and constructive solution.

If there is a better solution than our present formula for providing retirement annuities under the social security system, let the American Medical Association members and doctors everywhere come forward with a better plan. Their suggestions to date have proven inadequate to meet the humane problems involved. Let me sound a note of solemn warning.

Under our system of Government you cannot ignore the just and humane needs of a large segment of our society for a long period of time. Our great system of mechanized industry has proven its ability to produce goods and services in such an abundance as to meet tremendous and abnormal needs in times of war. It must be called upon to produce the relatively smaller needs to conserve and preserve human values in times of peace.

Thomas H. MacDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, transportation, the movement of people and goods, has always played a tremendously important part in human progress. The means of transport have helped to fashion kingdoms, and highroads have fostered freedom in many countries—including our own.

April 7, 1960, marks the third anniversary of the death of a great roadbuilder. Thomas H. MacDonald was almost unknown to the people of this country yet they are perhaps as much indebted to him as to any nationally known figure in our American history. For 34 years Thomas MacDonald headed the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which administers the program of Federal aid to the States for highway construction. His imaginative foresight and strong but selfless leadership are truly reflected in the vast highway transportation that today provides the sinews of our national economy, the arteries of our national defense.

When Federal aid for highways was initiated in 1916, we needed a man of rare ability and varied achievements to envisage and formulate our road patterns for the future. From all over the country recommendations pointed toward one man—Thomas MacDonald, then head of the Iowa State Highway Commission. He was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads in 1919. Serving consecutively under 7 Presidents and 17 Congresses, Mr. MacDonald epitomized the ideal public servant, forceful yet cooperative, visionary yet practical, nonpartisan and completely dedicated to a career of service which embraced the welfare of the whole people. With rare insight he proclaimed that improved highway transportation was not an end but a means, inseparably linked with our national economy, our social and cultural well-being—our very way of life.

When Thomas MacDonald began his long and unrivaled career, the plan of Federal-State cooperation was an untried venture, without form or precedent. A man of lesser wisdom might have sought to mold the new program directly, by fiat from Washington. But not Mr. MacDonald; with an unerring sense of the future he immediately turned to our State highway officials, acting through the American Association of State Highway Officials, in shaping and developing Federal-aid procedure.

At a time when the concept of a highway system was tenuous indeed, when local views were prevalent, Thomas MacDonald set us upon a course befitting the highway needs of a great nation. During his many years in office, he consistently pursued this broad pattern of cooperative effort and focused his extraordinary vision on the national implication of highway policies. His and our reward has been the unparalleled development of 3.5 million miles of interconnected roads and streets, spanning a continent.

Mr. MacDonald was a man who believed in group rather than individual development and decision, and while he set his goals high and urged others to go along, yet he recognized the will of the majority, the need for the realistic approach. Under his leadership the relations of the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments came to be widely recognized as an outstanding example of harmonious, productive intergovernmental teamwork.

Reflecting Mr. MacDonald's role, highways and highway transportation have become so essential to our well-being that this service ranks with such fundamental undertakings as national defense, education, and the maintenance of law and order. Indeed, these basic functions are closely linked with highway transport.

When Mr. MacDonald took office in 1919, Federal-aid authorizations amounted to $50 million for the year. When he retired in 1953 the amount had increased tenfold, to $500 million. During his 34 years as head of the Bureau of Public Roads more than $6 billion of Federal aid for highways was authorized; matched 50–50 by the States, the $12 billion worth of highway networks which resulted represent one of the most valuable assets the Nation possesses.

It is a fitting tribute to Mr. MacDonald's high ability and integrity that not once, through changes of Government administration and subject to pressures from widely divergent interests, were Federal highway expenditures or the policies governing their use ever seriously questioned.

He was not an acclaimed public figure, nor did he wish to be. In his view the States were the prominent part of the cooperating team; the organization he headed more important than its individual members, including himself. But in the highway transport field, among legislators, officials and leaders in the industry his competence and vision commanded the utmost respect and admiration.

To Thomas MacDonald successful highway development depended as much upon research and planning as upon construction, and under his leadership the Bureau of Public Roads ranked high in every phase of research. He sought not only better ways of building roads, but the development of the most efficient and economical highway transportation for the use of the public as a whole. He recognized, too, the importance of driver behavior and vehicle performance in safe highway design.

Mr. MacDonald's role as the principal architect of our modern highway system is exemplified by the series of important Bureau reports prepared under his direction for Congress. The first of a major series, prepared in 1939, expounded and substantiated the need for mod-

ernization of the Federal-aid primary highway system, both rural and urban, for improved secondary and feeder roads, and for construction of a select system of interregional highways to meet both the requirements of national defense in time of war and the growing demands of peacetime traffic.

Thus Mr. MacDonald's vision and the sound logic of these reports gave rise to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways authorized by the Congress in 1944. With the intervention of the war period and the difficulties of implementing and financing so bold a program, scheduled construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System did not become a firm reality until 1956, after Mr. MacDonald had retired. But surely this system, the ultimate in highway transportation, is a monument to him above all men.

Thomas MacDonald was a strong advocate of highway improvement as a necessity in the solution of economic problems throughout the world, especially in underdeveloped countries. Under his direction, the Bureau of Public Roads supervised the joint work of the United States and the central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway, now nearing completion.

He welcomed the opportunity granted his organization under various legislative authorizations to aid other countries, in Europe, Africa, and Asia, in repairing war-torn roads and especially in launching the development of highway systems suitable to their needs. With characteristic vision he strongly believed that our aid could best be utilized in helping these countries establish their own highway departments and in teaching their own people how to plan, build, and manage their highways.

Mr. MacDonald was keenly interested in sharing the knowledge and know-how of the United States with highway engineers and administrators of other countries. Through his efforts a host of such men, from college students to top officials, came to the United States to learn and exchange ideas. This fine precedent is being followed today.

Cooperation was a basic tenet of Mr. MacDonald's philosophy and this broad outlook embraced those concerned with all forms of transportation. He envisioned a new type of transportation research institute in which each field of transport would be represented, but in which the economic and social impact of transportation would be studied as a whole.

Over the years he discussed this concept with his old friends, Gibb Gilchrist and DeWitt Greer, of Texas, and they proposed to set up such a research organization and urged Mr. MacDonald to consider joining it as a keyman when he retired. In June 1950, the plan took form with establishment of the Texas Transportation Institute in the Texas A. & M. College system.

When Mr. MacDonald retired from his long public service career in 1953, he joined the institute staff with the title of "Distinguished Research Engineer." There, until his death on April 7, 1957, his ideas, knowledge, and influence provided brilliant guidance and inspiration to the institute staff.

Shortly after Mr. MacDonald's death, a group of his friends conceived the idea of memorializing this great man's accomplishments and continuing the work he had undertaken in his last years. With this aim in mind, they proposed to establish at the Texas Transportation Institute a Thomas H. MacDonald Chair of Transportation, endowed with gifts from his many friends and admirers and from the many segments of commerce and industry that have benefited from his great work and recognize the further gains that may follow from its continuation.

A campaign to raise funds for this purpose is underway. No greater or more appropriate memorial could be raised, nor one more to his own liking than this chair of transportation designed to carry forward Mr. MacDonald's philosophy and vision.

His dedicated career was ably summarized by a close friend and longtime associate who declared:

If ever a man deserved the name of prophet it was he. If ever a public servant could truly boast of an administration of the people's business virtually without flaw, it was he. If ever in any man there can be combined just that conjunction of the qualities of the able engineer, the perceptive political economist, the skilled diplomatist and the sure and faithful administrator that it takes to make a great highway engineer, it was in Thomas H. MacDonald that these qualities found their rarest blending.

Cranberry Growers Eulogize the Late Representative Russell V. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State delegation attended the funeral April 2 of our late colleague, Russell Mack, at Aberdeen, Wash. All of us thought highly of him and have expressed our esteem, but there are also others who considered Russell Mack a selfless public servant.

Before I left Aberdeen to return to the Capital, I clipped a statement prepared by the Grayland Cranberry Association from the Aberdeen Daily World, which I believe indicates the affection the people of the Third Congressional District had for this fine man.

The statement follows:

CRANBERRYMEN EULOGIZE MACK

A statement eulogizing the late Representative Russell V. Mack was issued today by the Grayland Cranberry Association. The statement follows:

"The average U.S. citizen of this day and age realizes little of the selfless service rendered by some of our public servants until it is impressed on his mind by action such as Russell V. Mack's efforts on our behalf in our hour of need.

"For services rendered at the expense of a much-needed rest and holiday at home, Mr. Mack has established for all of us a new rule by which we shall henceforth measure the merits of all those who hold or aspire to hold public office.

"This may not be exactly the right thing to do, but that's life. A new standard has been set, not only for the growers and other citizens of his district, but has been impressed on the grateful thoughts of all cranberrymen of this country."

Action of Indiana Democrats Enables Hoosier State To Participate in Rural Library Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, from April 3 to April 9 we are celebrating National Library Week in the United States. The celebration of National Library Week this year will have a special significance for the State of Indiana because of the laudable action of the House of Representatives on March 29 in passing an appropriations bill which contained the full authorization of $7.5 million for the rural library services program instead of the $7.3 million recommended in the President's budget.

The reason for the budget recommendation of $7.3 million rather than $7.5 million is that the State of Indiana, which normally allocated about $200,000 annually, has so far refused to participate in the rural library program.

GOVERNOR HANDLEY DENIES HOOSIER TAXPAYERS RIGHT TO USE OWN FUNDS

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Indiana is the only one of the 50 States and 3 Territories in the Nation which has, by its refusal to take part, denied to its people the benefits provided under the Library Services Act of 1956. The funds allotted to Indiana have been rejected by the Republican Governor of our State, Harold W. Handley, in pursuit of a policy which can only be characterized as obstinate and shortsighted.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we in Indiana pay taxes just as other American citizens do, Governor Handley's refusal to permit our State to receive funds under the library program can fairly be described as a willful giveaway of the hard-earned dollars of Hoosier taxpayers to the citizens of the other 49 States of the Union.

It is instructive to note that Governor Handley is most anxious that Indiana receive Federal aid for the construction of highways and harbors.

INDIANA DEMOCRATS UNITE TO URGE THAT HOOSIERS RECEIVE LIBRARY FUNDS

In March of this year I was pleased to join with six of my Democratic colleagues from Indiana in the House of Representatives and with our distinguished junior Senator, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE, as well as with all four of the

announced candidates for the Democratic nomination for Governor, State senator Nelson Grills, State auditor Albert Steinwedel, secretary of state John R. Walsh, and State senator Matthew E. Welsh, and with the speaker of the Indiana General Assembly, the Honorable Birch Bayh, Jr., to urge the House Appropriations Committee to approve the full appropriation of $7.5 million for the Library Services Act for fiscal year 1961 in order that Indiana might look forward to receiving her fair share of these funds for those Hoosiers who still need library services.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE APPROVES FUNDS FOR INDIANA

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply gratified that the Appropriations Committee saw fit to agree to our request, and I should like to insert the following portion of the committee's report on the 1961 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies:

Grants for library services: The bill includes $7,500,000, an increase of $200,000 above the request, and an increase of $1,400,000 above the amount appropriated for 1960. The budget request was based on the assumption that the State of Indiana would not participate in the program. On the basis of the assurances of so many influential people, including several Members of Congress from Indiana, that the State will participate in the program next year, the committee has added funds to allow for full participation by all 50 States.

HANDLEY'S HOMETOWN PAPER CRITICIZES HIS ATTITUDE

Mr. Speaker, shortly after these distinguished Hoosiers urged Indiana's participation in the library program, there appeared in the La Porte Herald-Argus, a very fine newspaper published in Governor Handley's hometown, a splendid editorial dated March 5, 1960, and entitled, "Accepting U.S. Funds." This editorial called on Hoosiers who believe in a full chance for every fellow citizen for enlightenment as opposed to ignorance to rally behind U.S. Senator HARTKE and Congressman BRADEMAS in their effort to persuade the Handley administration to take a stand for acceptance of Federal aid for the State's rural library program. The editorial follows:

ACCEPTING U.S. FUNDS

Hoosiers who believe in a full chance for every fellow citizen for enlightenment as opposed to ignorance should rally behind U.S. Senator HARTKE and Congressman BRADEMAS in their effort to persuade the Handley administration to take a stand for acceptance of Federal aid for the State's rural library program.

Governor Handley has consistently refused to have anything to do with this aid program, one accepted by all other States in the Union. As of now this State could move to accept $200,000 which would provide a small beginning of extension of free library service by bookmobile to rural Indiana areas which now have none. Congressman BRADEMAS of the third district estimates there are 800,000 Hoosiers without library service and that a million others have inadequate service from libraries in the State.

Handley's argument from the time in 1957 when he first rejected this Federal assistance has been that he fears centralized government and the Washington bureaucracy. He has said time and time again that Indiana will make its own way, a declaration which becomes laughable when the Federal millions sent into Indiana for highways, education, farm price supports, veterans' assistance, urban renewal, lunches for schoolchildren, welfare service are tallied up. Indiana receives its millions just as do all other States.

When the values of library service to Hoosier young and old and of every condition of life are pondered, it is the ultimate in trivial thinking to block any source of support for expansion and improvement of that service. Indiana, which boasts sometimes of its educational progress, finds itself on the intellectual defensive when 800,000 of its people, in very small town and rural areas, have no library service accessible to them.

Those persons in power in State government should be pleased to accept the $200,000 the Federal Government has allocated to help Indiana bring the delights and stimulation of reading, so basic in a democracy, to more of its people. All other States jumped at the chance for assistance.

What Indiana needs even more is to help counties and local communities set up and support library service where none exists now and much better service in regions where libraries are still the poor relation of all the public services. Until we build more and better libraries we are only half-heartedly entering into the continuing, vital experiment of representative democracy.

LA PORTE HERALD-ARGUS SAYS "INDIANA LAGS BEHIND"

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the La Porte Herald-Argus of Thursday, March 24, 1960, entitled "Indiana Lags Behind," indicates the bewilderment of many Hoosiers at our Governor's continued refusal to accept Federal funds for our rural libraries:

INDIANA LAGS BEHIND

April 3–9 has been proclaimed as National Library Week in Indiana by Governor Handley but it is ironical that the Governor persists in his refusals to accept Federal grants for stimulating and strengthening rural library service in Indiana. This State continues to be only one of two refusing to take part in the Federal fund-matching program for expanded library service.

A map published in late 1958 by the Indiana State Library showed that 507 of 1,009 townships in the State had no local library service in the form of bookmobiles or town or village libraries. The State library now reports there has been no change in the map since it was published. By the library's estimate there are more than 800,000 Hoosiers, 20 percent of the population, with no library facilities.

During the past 3 years the Governor and his administration have refused more than $500,000 in Federal matching funds, earmarked for starting new library service or improving existing facilities. This year the refusal totaled $173,000. After next year the program runs out and Indiana will have pushed aside approximately $700,000 altogether.

Because the Governor declares he is acting "because there is a principle involved," the principle of opposition to Federal aid, Indiana finds itself in a curious position. It never shrinks from Federal aid for highways, or for school lunches, or welfare purposes. Apparently these do not involve "principle." But it does decline Federal funds for training practical nurses, or for participation in the White House Conference on Aging next January. We have the dubious distinction of being the only State declining funds for the Conference on Aging, and we are only one of four not sharing in Federal funds for aiding the permanently and totally disabled.

Rejection of Uncle Sam's funds, to which we all contribute in taxes, is very selective as practiced by the Governor. Some he favors without hesitation; others he declines because of opposition to the principle.

Purposes for which the Federal Government offer these funds, to be matched by State funds, are humanitarian and educational. It makes no sense to continue to accept the Federal distribution of its tax money for vast public improvements such as highways or flood control, matters which apparently carry the magic of vote catching, and to refuse small Federal aid designed primarily to stimulate the lifting and enriching of human life.

This State, like the others, should be ready to participate in programs which help make life better, whether instigated wholly or in part from Washington or from Indianapolis; it matters not. And after all we are paying Federal taxes—in these cases for the inhabitants of other States of the Union to use.

PUBLIC LIBRARIAN IN HANDLEY'S HOME TOWN SAYS HE'S WRONG

Mr. Speaker, not only does Governor Handley's hometown newspaper oppose his position on this issue. The librarian of the public library of La Porte, Ind., has expressed the same view in the following letter to me:

LA PORTE PUBLIC LIBRARY,
La Porte, Ind., March 7, 1960.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
1329 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I was glad to get the copy of your March 3 news release, and your testimony on Indiana participating in the Library Services Act of 1956. It is nice to know that some Representative of Indiana is aware of the educational importance of libraries.

Governor Handley (even if he is from La Porte) has done Indiana no favor in refusing these funds. His statement that he knows of no prime need for additional library service in Indiana violates much testimony that has been presented to him. Certainly one of the elements that could improve Indiana education would be the establishment of adequate libraries for the many students who want to go to college. Thank you again for your efforts.

Very truly yours,
LA PORTE PUBLIC LIBRARY,
GEORGE A. CURTIS, *Librarian.*

INDIANA LIBRARY LEADERS URGE HOOSIER PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM

I have received many other letters in support of the position that my colleagues and I have taken on the library program and I should like to include as an example the following letter to me from Mrs. Samuel Berg, president, Board of Public Libraries of Lake County, Ind., and past chairman, legislative committee, Indiana Library Association and Indiana Library Trustee Association:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES,
Chicago, Ill., March 28, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS,
The U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: It was certainly encouraging and heartening to read about the position you took with regard to Indiana's nonparticipation in the Library Services Act, as per the enclosed clipping.

It is true that there is a great deal of anti-Federal aid sentiment in our State, particularly among school and library people. It does not however, preclude our accepting Federal funds for highways, welfare, sanitary districts, school lunch programs, etc., as you well know.

Governor Handley did permit the State department of public instruction to accept funds under the National Defense Education Act and my own community is participating in this. A large addition of science equipment and an expansion of the language arts program have been the result. Other things are planned for the coming school year.

That libraries are prohibited from accepting Federal aid funds is a gross inconsistency and discrimination.

Both Representative DENTON and my own Congressman, RAY MADDEN, have made significant statements about this sad state of affairs in the Indiana library program in the past. It is a real pleasure to welcome you to the ranks of "friends of Indiana libraries in Congress."

Good luck and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Mrs. SAMUEL BERG,
President, Board of Public Libraries of Lake County, Past Chairman, Legislative Committee, Indiana Library Association and Indiana Library Trustees Association.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION LAUDS EFFORT

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to include in the RECORD the following letter to me from Miss Germaine Krettek, director of the Washington office of the American Library Association, concerning the support I was glad to be able to give to the participation of Indiana in the rural library program.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C. April 4, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: For the American Library Association, may I express our appreciation for your splendid assistance in support of an appropriation of $7,500,000 for the Library Services Act for fiscal year 1961. We were delighted that you appeared in person before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and urged that the full amount of $7,500,000 authorized under the Library Services Act be appropriated. Your testimony concerning the importance of the rural library program and the expectation of Indiana's participation next year was certainly effective and undoubtedly influenced the decision of the subcommittee to recommend an increase of $200,000 over the $7,300,000 recommended in the President's budget.

At the time of floor action in the House on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, we were also pleased that you spoke out in favor of the $7,500,000 figure for the Library Services Act and reiterated your firm belief that Indiana will come into the program in the near future. This conviction was appropriately backed up by your introduction of H.R. 11426, a bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations. The American Library Association will give you every possible assistance in achieving the prompt enactment of this legislation.

Thank you again for your fine support of the Library Services Act program which is doing so much to bring the educational and cultural benefits of public library service to millions of rural Americans.

Sincerely yours,

GERMAINE KRETTEK,
Director, ALA, Washington Office.

Broadcasting in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 my distinguished colleague the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER said in some remarks in the RECORD that nine New York City broadcasting stations last year programed a total of 220,000 minutes of community service broadcasts.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time a telegram I received from Mr. John Metts, vice president of the Connecticut-New York Broadcasters, Inc., describing the public service programing of station WICC in Bridgeport. Mr. Mett's telegram:

Noted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks by New York Representative EMANUEL CELLER that nine New York broadcasting stations last year programed a total of 220,000 minutes of community service.

Would like to bring to your attention the fact that during the past year radio WICC's public service programing exceeded 92,500 minutes, or 17 percent of the station's total air time. This figure does not include religious or special programs in the public interest. From its Bridgeport transmitters station WICC serves Fairfield and New Haven Counties in Connecticut.

WICC applauds Congressman CELLER's position that unless the achievements of broadcasters, as well as their failures, are taken into account, there can be no effective solution to current problems that would be in the public interest.

Urge your support of moves to bring to light significant day-to-day contributions of broadcasters in Connecticut and elsewhere.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to get this telegram from Mr. Metts, and I certainly agree that the public should be told of broadcasting's achievements as well as the industry's failures and shortcomings.

Representative Emanuel Celler and the Washington Home Rule Committee Strongly Support Both National Suffrage and Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post and Times Herald points out this morning something which is vital, I think, and this has to do with misleading the public by inaccurate headlines. The Washington Post editorial says:

Persons who were misled by a report yesterday afternoon into thinking that Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee had advised District residents to "skip" home rule may be interested in what Mr. CELLER actually said.

The Washington Post editorial then goes on to report what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who heads the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, actually said on the subject of national suffrage and home rule for the voteless citizens of the District of Columbia.

I think the position taken by Representative CELLER is sound and basic to the matter of giving the franchise to the nearly 1 million disenfranchised citizens of the Nation's Capital.

I note, too, that the Washington Home Rule Committee takes a similar position and is working for both national suffrage and home rule.

The basic interests of the citizens of the Nation's Capital would be best advanced if all the individuals and groups who love and revere the Nation's Capital with patriotic zeal and fervor as the greatest Capital City in the world would take a similarly broad-based view of the best way to achieve the franchise for its citizens.

I include the editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Post of April 7, 1960, and the text of the testimony of Philip B. Brown, chairman of the executive committee, Washington Home Rule Committee, before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, as follows:

NO "EITHER-OR"

Persons who were misled by a report yesterday afternoon into thinking that Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee had advised District residents to "skip" home rule may be interested in what Mr. CELLER actually said. In commenting upon his resolution for a constitutional amendment to grant national suffrage to Washington (which this newspaper strongly supports along with home rule), Mr. CELLER observed:

"I wish to emphasize that my resolution does not conflict with or have any bearing upon the question of home rule for the District of Columbia. This is not an "either-or" proposition. My amendment provides for a vote in Federal elections and representation in the House. While I have always favored home rule and I will continue to work for home rule, and I've signed the discharge petition for home rule, this bill is not a home rule bill nor is it a substitute for home rule."

That seems to us a clear statement of Mr. CELLER'S purpose, and not by the farthest stretch of the imagination an argument for dropping home rule.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP B. BROWN, CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON HOME RULE COMMITTEE, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 529, APRIL 7, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Philip B. Brown. I am a member of the Board of Directors, and chairman of the executive committee, of the Washington home rule committee.

I appear here today to express the home rule committee's support of the efforts of the chairman and of this committee to extend to the people of the District of Columbia, in highly significant measure, voting rights which the words of the Constitution presently grant only to the people of the several States.

Today, the people in the District are denied the right to vote for candidates for any public office at any level of government.

The home rule committee is dedicated to obtaining the right to vote at both the national and the local level for the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, we are grateful for your strong and clear support of measures to grant us voting rights at both the national and the District of Columbia levels of government. We applaud the Chairman's view that this is not an either/or proposition, and that House Joint Resolution 529 is neither a home rule bill nor a substitute for a home rule bill.

The voting rights proposed in House Joint Resolution 529 are fundamental to American citizenship: The District deserves the right to vote for President and Vice President and to have its rightful share of voting representa-

tion in Congress. Naturally, people disagree as to what that share should be; but they do agree that our present situation of no suffrage is the least desirable alternative of all. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, while the home rule committee would prefer that the District, without being made into a State, be given national voting representation in both the House and Senate, we acknowledge your experienced wisdom in determining what is, and what is not, politically feasible.

We must observe, however, that the resolution, if adopted in its present form as an amendment to the Constitution, in good faith calls for subsequent legislation giving voting powers to the District delegates. Otherwise, the resolution should be so amended before passage.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express our deeply-felt convictions that your resolution and the Home Rule bill, while separate in form, are related parts of the same substantive goal of full suffrage for the people of the District and that all true friends of democracy throughout the United States will happily give their support to both measures.

Henry B. Roberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to report to the Senate the death of Henry Buchtel Roberts, a journalist well known and respected by every Member of the Senate.

Henry Roberts was a rare figure in journalism. He was an acknowledged scientist of considerable merit in the fields of anthropology and archeology. His contributions to our fund of knowledge in these fields will serve for many year to help other scientists. He used his great reportorial ability and his acute sense of news values to write many penetrating and helpful stories on the activities of this body, and, indeed, on the whole area of government.

Henry Roberts will be sorely missed on Capitol Hill, Mr. President. He will be sorely missed in many other places.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that an obituary on Henry Buchtel Roberts, published in the Washington Post of Monday, April 4, 1960, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. B. ROBERTS, WAS EDITOR AND SCIENTIST

Henry Buchtel Roberts, 58, archeologist, anthropologist and senior editorial consultant to Prentice-Hall, Inc., publishers, died of cancer yesterday at Trafalgar Hospital in New York City. He lived at 1 Browns Ct. SE.

Mr. Roberts, who joined Prentice-Hall as a staff editor in 1948, was its chief Washington correspondent before becoming en editorial consultant. He was a resident of the District for 25 years.

Born in Arizona, he graduated from Harvard's School of Archeology and served on the university's faculty as a fellow in anthropology. In the mid-1930's, he headed several archeological expeditions to Mexico under sponsorship of Harvard's Peabody Museum and the Carnegie Foundation.

In recent years he contributed frequently to many scientific journals. He was a veteran of World War II service with the Army in the Sicilian and Italian campaigns.

Mr. Roberts was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was a member of Pi Gamma Mu, national science honor society, the Harvard Travellers Club and Phi Sigma Biological Society. He was active in the Washington chapter of the Harvard Alumni Association.

He is survived by a brother, Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr., director of the Bureau of American Ethnology at the Smithsonian Institution, of 3511 Leland Street, Chevy Chase.

The family requests that in lieu of flowers contributions be made to the American Cancer Society.

Affairs of Germany in Good Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the reassurances by Secretary of State Christian Herter in his speech before the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago on April 4, 1960, against the possibility that the United States will capitulate before the menacing Soviet propaganda with respect to Germany, came at a timely moment for all of us.

Less than 1 month ago, the Federal German Chancellor accompanied by his Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, visited President Eisenhower to ask his support for a firm stand on the Berlin issue, especially in the forthcoming summit talks in Paris.

At a luncheon given in honor of the foreign minister by two of my distinguished colleagues, Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York, Dr. Von Brentano declared that the German people are counting on America for leadership and strength in this showdown struggle against Soviet aggressive imperialism. He indicated that any sign of American weakness in these delicate negotiations with Khrushchev, would give aid and encouragement to the Communists. Under Secretary of State Dillon bespoke the important, nay, vital contribution made by Germany to the Western alliance, and also stated our position as being unyielding on Berlin.

I have great faith and confidence in Dr. Adenauer and Dr. Von Brentano. They have done wonderfully well in their management of German affairs in cooperation with Economic Minister Erhard and other members of the Adenauer Cabinet. Furthermore, the people of our Nation are fully behind the statement delivered by the representatives of our Department of State.

I regret that I was unavoidably absent from the luncheon that was tendered to Dr. Von Brentano by Members of the Senate. I would have congratulated him in person on the fine work that he is doing.

New England Council Testimony Relative to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement on H.R. 9999 and H.R. 10022 by Francis E. Robinson, manager, Natural Resources Department, New England Council, Boston, Mass., before House Committee on Public Works on March 30, 1960:

My name is Francis E. Robinson, manager of the Natural Resources Department of the New England Council, 1032 Statler Office Building, Boston, Mass.

I appear here today to record the support of the members of my organization for passage of H.R. 9999 and H.R. 10022 which would grant approval of the Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

The New England Council is a 35-year-old regional development organization. Among its 3,000 members are representatives from all of the six New England States and from all economic groups within those States.

The New England Council traditionally has favored interstate compacts as a means of meeting problems and accomplishing desirable projects which often involve several States in our region where the States are relatively small.

New England Council officers and staff members have been identified with many of the developments over the past several years which have led to adoption of this proposed compact by the four New England States which now seek your approval for its implementation.

We are familiar with the New England-New York Interagency Committee and with its development into a joint Federal-State committee, with the publication of its extensive report, and with creation of the Northeastern Resources Committee.

The New England Council cooperated with the Northeastern Resources Committee in the holding of a series of State conferences on natural resources at which several thousand New Englanders took the opportunity to hear about the region's resource problems and to express themselves regarding them.

We are aware, therefore, that the proposal you have before you is one which has been developed through wide public discussion and careful committee attention over a period of several years. We are confident that a substantial proportion of those New Englanders with an informed interest in natural resources favor the creation by interstate compact of a Northeastern Resources Commission.

The New England Council's position on the subject is contained in a resolution of approval proposed by the council's natural resources committee and adopted by the

NEC executive committee. The resolution is as follows:

"The New England Council reaffirms its traditional approval of Interstate compacts as a means of handling regional water-resource problems. The New England Council recognizes further that increasingly intense use of all natural resources requires coordinated regional planning as a means of effective resource management in the orderly growth of New England.

"Therefore, the New England Council favors establishment of a regional commission by interstate compact for coordination, planning, research, and education relative to natural resources development."

Bataan Day, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago the Philippines fell to the invading forces of Japan.

On April 9 we commemorate the fall of Bataan, in order to recall the gallantry of the Filipino and American troops during those early dark days of the war in the Pacific.

When the main Japanese invasion of the Philippines began on December 22, 1941, our defending forces were forced to withdraw to the mountainous Bataan Peninsula, across Manila Bay from the capital city. The retreat maneuver was executed with consummate skill but at a heavy cost in lives and an unavoidable loss of vital supplies.

By January 7, 1942, American and Filipino troops held well prepared positions on Bataan Peninsula, settling down—along with the forces on the nearby island bastion of Corregidor—to a long seige. This courageous act denied the enemy the use of Manila Bay for the duration of the battle. Japanese attacks on the embattled defenders were so thoroughly repulsed in January and early February that they ceased altogether until April.

Completely cut off from outside aid, the Bataan forces grew weak from hunger and poor diet. Thousands succumbed to diseases which shortages of medical supplies made impossible to control. Desperate efforts to send food, medicine, and ammunition to the beleagured men were thwarted by the Japanese.

In April the Japanese initiated a devastating attack upon the thin lines of the defenders. The lines crumbled and disintegrated in the face of overwhelming force. On April 9, 1942, the few surviving troops on Bataan surrendered. A month later Corregidor fell.

These events are still vivid memories for many Americans and Filipinos who grieve the loss of their loved ones and for the few survivors of those horrible days who are still with us. Today we memorialize the valor of the defenders of Bataan and Corregidor as a symbol of the fight for freedom and the defense of liberty which is never ending.

All Aboard the Gravy Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, we do not hear private enterprise or individual initiative attacked on the floor of this House. On the contrary, we are accustomed here to stirring defense of these ideas. Repeatedly and earnestly, we pay tribute to their parts in the economic development of the United States and the greater well-being of its citizens.

On sober reflection, however, we cannot but admit in our hearts that these principles of personal freedom are receiving today more of a pro forma devotion than true observance. There seems to be an increasing emphasis on the receipt of maximum benefits, rights, and protection at minimum individual expenditure of effort, and with the least possible acceptance of individual responsibility.

More and more, the individual appears willing to pass his personal problems, be they economic or sociological, to an agency of government. The local community seems more willing to confess inadequacy in the face of local problems and to look to Washington for aid.

The inevitable result of a spread and intensification of what is essentially a defeatist philosophy is the welfare state.

It may be that our national character is in need of jacking-up, as Louis Spilman, editor and publisher of the Waynesboro (Va.) News-Virginian, suggests in the following perceptive editorial, which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

MAYBE IT IS LATER THAN WE THINK; HAS STATISM ALREADY ERODED FREEDOM?

(By Louis Spilman)

As the years move swiftly into oblivion the matters of personal freedom, individual initiative, private enterprise, thrift, personal dignity, and individual sovereignty are being submerged in a wild dash for security, statism, and welfare-itis. No one could possibly be more concerned with the rights, privileges, and welfare of the individual than I. But I also regard these rights, privileges, and welfare as obligations and responsibilities. The years have emphasized that we must produce to create wealth and that without wealth we cannot have all the wonderful things our Socialist-minded friends envision.

As it appears now the United States is headed toward an existence, in the not too distant future, as a welfare state. Private enterprise is being milked unmercifully of its resources in the form of taxes and some of these taxes are being employed to provide tax-free, governmental competition for the very industries providing the funds. Business cannot survive a sustained attack by those who would apply confiscatory tax rates on the one hand whilst on the other subsidizing tax-free competition.

Too many of our elected representatives are becoming more and more fearful of their political lives. They are being jockeyed into supporting schemes and programs that will eventually take care of everyone from cradle to the grave. We have become so accustomed to giveaway tax programs and deficit financing that few, if any of us, even take the trouble to protest any more. More likely than not we are striving strenuously to get our own share before the pipelines go dry.

Money is being spent by governments on all levels at such an accelerated pace that not even the men who presumably fashion our governmental budgets understand them any more. Instead of encouraging business and industry (source of most public funds) to expand through research and additional operating facilities, we jeopardize business initiative and frighten private enterprise into a shell. Business must realize a profit if it is to succeed. It must have funds for replacement, expansion, research, and growth. Profit, performance, and progress are inseparable.

Lives, fortunes, and honor were sacrificed on the common altar in the quest for freedom, liberty, and individual dignity that marked our cleavage from England in the late 18th century. Selfishness and security were secondary in the hearts of those noble patriots who spawned, with their own resources and blood, these United States of which we are so inordinately proud. Must we now see all that we've learned to hold dear die a slow death at the hands of statism or through fear of independence? We need to steel our souls against surrender to the "easy life"; we need to rededicate ourselves to personal freedom and sovereignty * * * to independence and the right to expand and grow. Without hatred or malice we must face with courage the responsibility of preserving a free world.

Vote as Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily Calumet on March 31, carried a most interesting and enlightening editorial, which I am including in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House and Senate:

VOTE AS AMERICANS

Since the first immigrants stepped off a ship and onto Plymouth Rock, shrewd politicians have been trying to capitalize on the "foreign" vote in this country. In the generations of the Nation's greatest growth, thousands of newcomers flocked to this great land of opportunity.

Since these people were not only in a strange land but had to learn a new language, new customs, and a new way of life, they banded together for protection. While these settlements by national origin provided them with companionship among those with mutual backgrounds and mutual interests and afforded them protection, they also provided a fertile field for politicians.

Now, there is little doubt that these early settlers gained much through their political influence. In fact, many would still be held down today if they hadn't turned to politics to improve their lot.

And it would be erroneous to say that all politicians exploited the foreign born. The vast majority were doubtless sincere in their desire to help the new Americans and accomplished much.

However, there grew a minority who found in nationalistic politics an easy stepping-stone to well-paying political jobs. These callous individuals played national likes and hates for all they were worth and often created dissension if there were none available to suit their purposes.

Unfortunately, many of this type have filtered down to this day. By pretending to be

friends of a certain national group, they seek to make political capital.

In every political campaign you see examples. Many will vote for a candidate knowing nothing about him other than that fact that his name has the same national background as theirs.

In recent years, however, as many of the problems which national groups banded together to fight have disappeared and the foreign born have become Americanized, the influence of this type of politician has dwindled.

Today there are few groups—national and otherwise—that can be completely dominated by one party. And this is as it should be for there's both good and bad in both parties. All Americans, native and foreign born, are beginning to realize that what is good for one national group is good for another as we all live in harmony in this great melting pot that is America.

Our voting ballot knows no nationality other than American.

Too Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Amsterdam News, of New York dated April 2, 1960:

TOO SMART

If there is anything which the white politician fears more than Negro unity it is Negro-Puerto Rican unity.

And now that these same politicians have unified the Negro in New York by persecuting their leaders on legal technicalities, they have suddenly become horrified that the newly united Negro will now join hands with the Puerto Rican.

And in their desperate effort to prevent this, these same politicians might do just what they did in the case of the Negro—they might hasten to bring about that unity.

That's exactly what they did in the case of the Negro. They persecuted Negro leadership in an effort to destroy it and they inadvertently did for Negroes what Negroes had not been able to do for themselves—they united them.

The unity was brought about mainly becaues of the dirty, low unfair tactics which these politicians were using in their attempt to kill off Negro leaders.

There is not a single Negro adult in New York who does not remember well the outrageous attempts to brand Ralph Bunche a Commie; to brand Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune and former Judge Hugh Delaney the same way; the attempts to destroy James Johnson and Monroe Dowling of the Internal Revenue on legal technicalities; the sneaky way Commissioner Bob Mangum was rendered almost ineffective; the low blows at Judge Stoute; the unanswered questions in the Clem Ransom case.

The Negro people, who, incidentally are a very sophisticated people, sat by and watched all this underhanded dirty work in silence.

But suddenly they grew tired—and what is more important—they now have let the politicians know they are tired and displeased and that they are backing their leaders like other groups back theirs.

And now in their desperation the politicians are seeking, through racism, to set the Negro and Puerto Ricans in New York at each other's throat.

They are doing it in their club rooms, in the press and in the radio. Probably the most guilty are the daily newspapers and particularly those dailes which have a large circulation in Harlem.

These newspapers often claim in their editorial columns that they despise bigotry and that they do not want to see race set against race in New York City. As a matter of fact they have accused POWELL and his followers of racism.

But today we can't pick up a daily paper without reading some story which is slanted toward making Negroes and Puerto Ricans jump at each other's political throat.

This is a shame. It is a disgrace to the profession of journalism. And it plainly shows just what kind of daily papers we have in New York.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes on April 7, 1960:

LEST WE FORGET

"God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

So wrote Rudyard Kipling some threescore years ago. Undoubtedly he had in mind his own country and its forgetfulness toward those who had secured the "dominion over palm and pine" of which his empire boasted.

Looking back some 43 years in our country's history we might conclude that the British poet, knowing the forgetfulness of a nation and its people for past service by its young men of all eras, might have been foretelling the fate that would befall the young men of the United States who marched proudly off to battle when our country declared war against the Central Powers on April 6, 1917.

We wonder how many of the young leaders of the American Legion who have attained high office in that organization remember April 6, 1917.

We wonder—as a matter of fact we do not really wonder—how many of the leaders of AMVETS, the group representing the veterans of World War II and the Korean war remember that particular day. Very few in both groups we would venture to say.

On the other hand we do know of certain individuals who recall the day quite well, something less than 2 million of them today, but though their numbers decrease rapidly from day to day, those who are left cannot help but remember when their country called them to battle.

Yes, of those who are still alive after their service in the First World War we are inclined to think that, mulling over the verse quoted here from Kipling's Recessional they might shake their heads sadly, realizing that a country and its people do not forget with the passage of time.

We recall it quite vividly, that day of April 6, 1917. It was a Sunday in Washington, D.C., a quiet Sunday for at that time the Nation's Capital was a quiet city. We were attending a movie picturing Hun atrocities. The particular picture had not been flashed on the screen fortuitously. It had been scheduled some weeks ahead.

After the movie ended we went out on the streets only to find crowds of people milling about, grabbing up the extras which the newsboys were selling as fast as possible—extras which announced our entrance into World War I. We learned later that this scene was repeated all over the country.

War of any kind was far from the minds of the youth of the Nation on that fateful Sunday. In our own way, we of the day were living out our lives peacefully and happily—an old-fashioned way as compared with present-day standards, even the standards of 1941 when we found ourselves engaged in a Second World War.

The young generation of 1917 had managed to survive a panic in 1907 and had grown to manhood convinced that all was well with the world. But when war was declared in 1917 they had little hesitation in answering their country's call, many of them not waiting for the draft.

Those who volunteered and those who responded to the draft acquitted themselves nobly in battle and received the country's acclaim for their heroic deeds.

There were many who reached France early in the summer of 1917. Their knowledge of what was going on at home was derived from letters and an occasional hometown paper.

What impressed those early arrivals and those who followed them into battle was the enthusiasm with which the young servicemen were greeted as they passed from town to town en route to training camp.

From what could be learned, they had the backing of the entire Nation and were assured that nothing would be too good for them on their return. Prayers were offered in the churches and the synagogues for their safekeeping and return and the man overseas felt that the battle was worth fighting if only because of the support they were receiving at home.

In the minds of those abroad and at home in uniform it must be recalled that there was no thought of future reward for service. They felt they were but doing their duty and that was satisfaction enough.

One benefit was granted them—Government life insurance—and most of them took advantage of it. True, most of them allowed their Government insurance to lapse on their return. That was but natural.

Those who still remained overseas after the Armistice on November 11, 1918, were reading glowing accounts in the home papers and in the Stars and Stripes of the AEF, of the reception accorded the returning heroes. They swelled with pride knowing that their country had not forgotten them.

We recall a group which returned to the United States in the middle of May 1919. Their voyage home was uneventful. They disembarked somewhere in Brooklyn and were transferred to ferryboats which were to take them to a rail center from which they would be shipped to various camps for discharge.

Naturally, they looked about for that heroes' welcome they had read about. True, there was a handful of Red Corss workers who distributed hot chocolate and a couple of chocolate bars for the train ride to camp.

These returning veterans were a bit disappointed but they took it in their stride and went about the business of making a living. However, recalling their own experience after their return they saw to it that the young men who followed them into another war in 1941 and later in 1950, were taken care of by beneficial legislation which has worked not

only for the benefit of these younger groups but for the Nation itself.

Those men of 1917–18 did not forget what war meant but it is said to relate that the further from World War I the country moves just the more does it forget the debt of gratitude it owes to the men of World War I who now may be seeking aid, when the advancing years press upon them, from the country they had served.

It might be well for all the people of the United States from the highest to the lowest to ponder over the words of the Recessional and realize perhaps that they too, have forgotten those who fought for them in World War I and with this realization see to it now that their debt of gratitude is properly paid without more delay.

Sir Oliver Franks, the Treasury, and Our Gold Reserve Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted, I am including hereunder my letter of February 23, 1960, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the reply on his behalf from Alfred H. von Klemperer, Assistant to the Secretary.

FEBRUARY 23, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is an insertion I made in the RECORD recently of certain portions of a report written by Sir Oliver Franks for Lloyds of London. I call your attention to his remarks as set forth on page A1247 with particular reference to his suggestion that the $12 billion of gold which is at present "locked up as backing for Federal Reserve notes and deposits" be set free for effective use. I'd very much appreciate having your comments on his suggestion and on his reasons for our going ahead along these lines.

It does seem to me incongruous to have gold backing our Federal Reserve notes in any proportion at all since the holder of such note is not at all entitled to gold under any circumstances, whereas we have no gold reserve in connection with our foreign obligations but we do have to pay them in gold. I should be interested in your comments on this situation and upon any plans you might have for changing it.

With every good wish.
Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 10, 1960.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: The U.S. gold reserve position and our balance of international payments situation, discussed by Sir Oliver Franks in his annual report of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., which you forwarded for our examination on February 23, 1960, are of continuing interest to this Department, and we are glad to have an opportunity to present our views to you.

Sir Oliver proposes that the $12 billion gold at present serving as backing for Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities should be set free for "effective use." What he seems to be suggesting is that the United States does not have gold stocks, in excess of statutory gold reserve requirements, adequate for international settlements. As we have indicated in previous correspondence, foreign holders do not undertake to exchange all of their dollar balances into gold since a large portion is essential for ordinary working balances and other purposes. Moreover, as Secretary Anderson indicated on January 20, 1960, to the House Committee on Appropriations, no run on our gold stocks need be feared so long as the rest of the world retains confidence in the United States. We have such confidence and we can maintain that confidence, he pointed out, if the U.S. economy, both Government and private, pursues budgetary, fiscal and cost-wage policies that are reasonable, policies which will demonstrate that we are going to maintain the purchasing power of our currency. The Secretary also expressed the hope that we will always remain on the international gold standard, the present world system of payments and reserves, and no change is contemplated.

It is also important that our balance of payments position show a satisfactory trend in order to justify confidence. Among the measures which the United States has taken in connection with our present balance-of-payments position and its impact on gold movements are the following: It is urging other governments to eliminate quotas which discriminate against U.S. exports. With regard to direct loan funds appropriated for foreign economic development projects, it is placing primary emphasis on the financing of goods and services of U.S. origin. It is also encouraging other industrialized countries to emprove and increase their financing of development in the less developed areas of the world. In this connection, you may be interested in the enclosed copy of my recent address, "The U.S. Balance of Payments in a Changing World Economy."

Let me point out that at the January 20, 1960, hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, the Secretary also discussed in some detail the subject of gold and our balance-of-payments position. References appear on page II of the index, following page 135.

The increased resources of the International Monetary Fund will undoubtedly provide the additional equity to finance international trade, which Sir Oliver intimates should be provided by the United States through the mechanism of eliminating our monetary gold reserve requirement. You will recall that last June the Congress amended the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to permit an increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, and, under the terms of the resolutions of the Board of Governors of the Fund, this increase in our quota, as well as the quotas of other countries, became effective in September. In the Treasury's view, the increase in the Fund's resources provided for expanding world trade in the foreseeable future, and will enable the Fund to deal with the problems of temporary imbalance in international accounts which are likely to arise. Moreover, the exchange reserves of other industrial countries have increased considerably, and the adoption of nonresident convertibility by these countries will make the Fund's holdings of their currencies more available for use of operations.

It is always a pleasure to have an opportunity to be of assistance to you. Please do not hesitate to call on me should you wish to explore other aspects of these important subjects.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED H. VON KLEMPERER,
Assistant to the Secretary.

A Hot Issue: Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News, published in my congressional district, which deals with a subject now before the country:

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Apr. 6, 1960]

A HOT ISSUE: MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

An idea whose time has come is sitting on the doorstep of the American Medical Association and the Eisenhower administration.

That idea is governmental health insurance for the aged. It may be repugnant to the AMA whose members see it as an entering wedge for socialized medicine. It may strike President Eisenhower, a man who has never had to pay his own medical bills, as too much governmental control.

But the idea remains on the doorstep. And for good reasons:

Item: A major insurance company's statistics show that in a recent year 500,000 families in the United States had medical bills larger than their total incomes for that year.

Item: Old people spend nearly twice as much on medical care as the general population; during a 5-year period health expenses in general increased 42 percent while those of the aged went up 74 percent.

Item: In 15 years the over-65 age group will increase from the current 16 million to 22 million; currently, one out of every three persons between the ages of 60 and 64 has a parent or close relative in his eighties or older; their medical care is a serious drain on income.

These are straws in the wind. They explain why Congressmen are being "snowed under" by mail supporting the Forand bill, which calls for free medical care for persons covered by social security.

The Forand bill is pie-in-the-sky legislation. It would cost the Government up to $2 billion during its first year of operation (with financing provided by an increase in social security payments). There would immediately be a shortage of hospitals, doctors, and nurses to take care of millions of aged who would take advantage of the new insurance. The AMA argues that the Government would eventually set the rates of compensation for hospitals, nursing homes, dentists, and physicians.

But all these arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, support for the Forand bill, or something like it, grows. The need is urgent. Millions of old people are unable to take care of their medical needs; their number grows as medicine increases the lifespan.

If the American Medical Association opposes the Forand bill, it had best, like RICHARD NIXON, scurry around for something less stringent as a substitute. Mr. NIXON cooperated with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming on a plan combining Federal and State aid to assist private insurance programs. But President Eisenhower opposed that.

Now health insurance is picking up steam as an election year issue. It will not go away, because millions of aged are unable to pay for their medical care.

Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, some progress has been made in the all-out clashing struggle against the nationwide peddlers of filth, but the battle is far from over. Lewd material is still being sent into millions of American homes despite all that local law enforcement agencies, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Justice have been able to do. This business of trafficking lewd material is estimated as being in excess of a half billion dollars annually.

Today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11590, which deals specifically with section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code. That section provides a criminal penalty for use of the mails to sell and distribute obscene literature and medicines and devices designed to prevent conception or produce abortion. So far as it goes, the present statute is entirely commendable. However, the paragraph pertaining to obscene literature has proved to be entirely inadequate. Accordingly, while my bill would retain and preserve the other paragraphs of section 1461, it would drastically amend and greatly strengthen the obscene literature paragraph. In so doing, it treats the problem in four separate parts:

First. The first part concerns the mailing of obscene literature to school children and other children under the age of 19 years.

Second. The second part concerns all persons other than such children.

Third. The third part concerns those who use the mails for transporting obscene literature to middlemen or retailers for further circulation or disposition.

Fourth. The fourth part applies to those who receive the literature from the mails for such future circulation or distribution.

While my bill effectively covers every link in the filthy chain of depraved smut merchants who employ the U.S. mails as the vehicle for their despicable trade, it also maintains the "continuing offense" concept whereby violators can be prosecuted either, first, in the judicial district in which the obscene literature was deposited in the mails, second, in any judicial district through which the mails passed, or, third, in the judicial district where the literature was delivered. This is the concept which Congress originally wrote into section 3237 of title 18, but which the 1958 Supreme Court decision, in the case of United States against Ross, repealed. The concept was revived and refortified in the last Congress, with the enactment of legislation similar to my bill, H.R. 11185, which became Public Law 85–796.

One of the most important features of my bill is its more comprehensive and more specific definition of obscene matter. It includes not only literature, but any article, matter, thing, device, or substance of any kind which would suggest, induce, arouse, incite, or cause, directly or indirectly, first, lewd, libidinous, lustful, indecent, obscene, immoral, or depraved thoughts, desires, or acts; second, the use of such things for any illegal purposes or in any illegal manner, or third, cause a corruptive, depraved, or immoral effect.

The argument might be espoused that this definition is too broad and overly restrictive and might outlaw the use of the mails for the transportation of certain legitimate medicines and devices. However, my bill contains a saving clause which exempts such mailing for bona fide medical, educational, and research purposes.

There is also the argument that there is no statutory test to apply to the interpretation of the definition of obscenity. However, my bill does contain such a test, one which grew up with the formulation of common law and case law, viz, the so-called "reasonable man" test. There can be no conviction and no penalty under this bill unless the literature or device in question is obscene "in the opinion of the normal, reasonable and prudent individual."

There are those who would contend that this legislation would make the Government an arbitrary censor and would violate the freedom of the press and speech clause of the Constitution. Such an argument is entirely without foundation. With respect to censorship, the Supreme Court has frequently interpreted the first amendment, and Mr. Justice Murphy in 1942 said, Chaplinsky against New Hampshire:

> There are certain well-defined * * * classes of speech, the prevention and punishment of which have never been thought to raise any constitutional problem. These include the lewd and obscene * * * which by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace.

This, of course, applies with equal force to the publication of obscene ideas and speech or pictures.

My bill provides a penalty of $5,000 or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for the first offense and $10,000 or 5 years, or both, for each subsequent offense under this new subsection. The records of the Post Office Department disclose repeated convictions of the same violators operating under assumed names, aliases or different trade names. These indecent people follow the practice of incorporating their "businesses" under the laws of their State of domicile. As soon as the corporation is convicted, they simply dissolve the corporation and form a new one. The penalty provisions of my bill would constitute a substantial deterrent and a just punishment.

I have praise only for the postal authorities and the enforcement officers of the Justice Department—they have done a good job with the tools they have. However, they need more tools and better tools. I sincerely believe those tools have been forged in my bill—possibly they need more polishing and sharpening, but it is up to the Congress to finish the task, and, I urgently feel, should proceed to do so immediately. We have here something of paramount national interest. Every year, a horde of criminals, using the mails as a vehicle of extortion, fleece thousands of our people of millions of dollars with a variety of fraudulent schemes which defy the ingenuity of the honest man. We cannot afford it, and as a moral matter we cannot tolerate it. We must stop the flow of obscenity.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Woman's Auxiliary of the Michigan State Medical Society at its midyear board meeting. This resolution is being inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of Mrs. Walter Hammond, State chairman of legislation of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Michigan State Medical Society.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas social security cash benefits now go to 13.7 million;

Whereas private pension plans, increasing savings, and liquid assets are all combining to improve the economic resources and the purchasing power of the group over 65 years of age;

Whereas many positive-action programs, including improved nursing homes, home-care services, and homemaker services are being advanced;

Whereas the boards of the American Medical Association and the American Hosptial Association recently adopted a resolution dedicating their full resources to accelerate the development of adequately financed health care programs for needy persons, especially the aged needy;

Whereas any plan which benefits a selected group, social security beneficiaries, to the exclusion of other equally or more needy citizens, at the expense of the taxpayer is discriminatory;

Whereas medical care programs for indigent citizens, especially those over 65 years, are improving;

Whereas proof of need dose not require Federal action, nor does Federal action promise to resolve the problem;

Whereas need cannot be proven until the findings of the White House Conference on Aging in 1951 are known and studied; and

Whereas adoption of a plan for Federal control and payment of medical care for our citizens would hinder the progress of medical science, kill voluntary health insurance, and force our really ill citizens to compete for hospital space against malingerers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Woman's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society on this 10th day of March 1960, That the Forand bill must be labeled (1) unwise, (2) discriminatory, (3) burdensome, and (4) failing its stated purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Woman's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society is unalterably opposed to any legislation which makes a governmental body responsible for the medical needs or expenses of U.S. citizens or any subdivision of its citizens.

Planning for the Future of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening that more Americans now recognize the need to permit individuals regardless of age, to make their own choice about work and leisure. Many of us have long since observed that it would be a far different Congress if Congressmen were forced to retire at age 65. Erwin D. Canham, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and editor of the Christian Science Monitor, has written very perceptively about this problem. He recognizes the need for preretirement training and for part-time employment for those who wish it. Above all, he challenges the Congress not to deprive the elderly of freedom of choice. I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will report legislation that will encourage the part-time employment of older persons and permit gradual retirement in a way which the present arbitrary work test does not do.

Mr. Canham notes that this is a challenge to the individual and to employers as well as to the community and the Congress. This is the eighth in a series written for Ray Henry which appeared in more than a hundred papers throughout the country. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE OF THE AGED

(By Erwin D. Canham, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, editor, Christian Science Monitor)

Few persons probably realize how much our aged population will increase in the next 10 years. By 1970 there will be 20 million persons aged 65 or over in this country, as compared with 16 million in 1960.

Of these 20 million, about 13 million are today aged 55 to 64. The vast majority of these 13 million are now working or are the wives of working men.

With so many approaching retirement, the decade ahead is one of both challenge and opportunity.

There is a challenge to each individual to exercise initiative, ingenuity and imagination in continuing on the job, if he needs to or prefers to do so.

Similarly, there is a challenge to employers to lend their support to the fullest extent possible in providing satisfactory placement of older persons in suitable self-sustaining employment.

And, there is good reason for believing that a very substantial number of these persons will continue working beyond the age of 65.

There is a challenge to workers and business to explore and develop sound, constructive preretirement training and planning, so that individuals can better adjust and reap the rewards of a more satisfying life of retirement.

Businessmen are giving more attention to the adjustment process in preparing for a life less strenuous, less exacting, but with opportunity for individual satisfaction. Part-time jobs may provide a suitable transition for many.

The individual business concern has responsibilities to its owners, to its consumers, and to its employees.

Extension of fringe benefit programs will be undertaken in the light of these responsibilities and of what is most likely to promote the continued success and well-being of that business enterprise. No one could safely predict what and how much business as a whole will do in the fringe benefit area in the next decade.

Of profound concern, especially to older people and to those retiring in the 1960's, is the threat of inflation.

Nothing can be so discouraging—destructive of human dignity, well-being and happiness of our older people—defenseless against the erosive effect of inflation on their relatively fixed incomes and lifetime savings. A sound curbing of those forces which would result in rising prices is a challenge to all.

There is a challenge to every community to supply adequate public facilities for health, recreation and education for their older people, as it now does for the younger segments of the population.

We must recognize that each community has a responsibility for providing such services for older people, as well as for younger groups of its citizens.

The Federal Government has a responsibility for maintaining the social security program primarily for older people as a floor of protection against want.

But there is a challenge to Congress not to allow its various studies of the status of the aged to develop into programs which will deprive the individual in his later years—or at any time in life—of his freedom of choice. We must now halt those forces now on the march which would destroy man's capacity to make decisions for himself.

The decade of the 1960's will challenge all of us not to succumb to the blandishments of social planners, and thereby deprive the individual of his will to do for himself, of his human rights and freedoms which, we believe, are God given.

Freedom To Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting an editorial from the Indianapolis Star on freedom to travel. I recommend it to the attention of the Members of this Congress. Eighteen Members voted against the passport bill last year, and I was one of them. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to vote for legislation that will tend to make our country a police state.

LEAVE THE FENCE DOWN

Critics of the right of free travel report that 1,150 individuals, whose passports normally would have been held up because of Communist affiliations, have received passports since the Supreme Court decision upsetting the State Department's power to deny passports arbitrarily. Many of these doubtless have gone out to spread anti-American propaganda abroad.

But which is worse—to have a thousand malcontents shooting off their mouths abroad or to have them sitting at home and writing to friends abroad that America is keeping them behind their own iron curtain for fear of their criticism?

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1960, the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronics Industries Association in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducted its 13th Annual Voice of Democracy Contest. Fifty-one young spokesmen for democracy from 50 States and the District of Columbia took part in this contest. An awards luncheon was given in honor of these winners at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Mike Armstrong from Pittsburgh, Kans., was the Kansas representative on this occasion. His speech is entitled "I Speak for Democracy." It is included herewith. I think Members of Congress and others who read the RECORD will find it interesting as well as inspiring.

The fourth-of-July orator, the civic club speaker, and the political campaigner all speak for democracy. They paint with glowing words a rosy picture of today's great American democracy. They speak of the wise Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin; the martyr Patrick Henry; and the patriotic Sons of Liberty. The people swell with pride when they once again hear of the grassroots resourcefulness and courage which built this America, the greatest Nation in all history.

I, too, speak for democracy. I do not speak to uphold or defend, for democracy needs no defense. I speak instead as a spokesman for democracy saying what it should have, but has not, said to the world and to itself, including not only the various media of communicating ideas but that which speaks lounder than words—action.

Years ago a symbol of freedom was erected in New York harbor. The inscription on this statue reads in part:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free."

With this statement American democracy voiced once again its long existant invitation to the poor and oppressed people of the world to come and share in our fortune. America needed these people and they needed America. The golden door was open wide for the mutual benefit of all.

Today this door is still open, but only a crack. America no longer needs the added numbers these masses can provide. But, democracy, these people still need our support and we need theirs. Shall we now not only slam the door but refuse to look out the window. The American people think and talk on this question but neither we or the people of the world can afford the luxury of time spent in such a manner.

Democracy, you should say, "Listen people of the world. I offer you a higher standard of living, escape from the shackles of tradition which have held you for ages, a stable political foundation, and an economic system where none now exists.

"I can give you the money to build roads, dams to produce electricity, the machinery for which this power may be used, equipment to mine wealth from the earth, equipment for the irrigation of farmland and the claiming of new land, and the many and varied improvements offered by modern America. I can also give you the knowledge

to continue these projects and eventually to improve yourselves.

"But it was only by sweat and toil that American democracy advanced itself to its present position in the world and by the same token I can provide the ways and means but only you can provide the will to better yourself."

Although democracy can provide others with the things they need, we must beware. For as we are not alone on the plateau of political power, neither may we sit complacent on our mountain of money. Where we once sat unchallenged, we now must play a game of economic king on the mountain. Instead of pushing us off our mountain, other forces have set about to build a higher mountain all their own over the horizon where we cannot see. Meanwhile, in the United States there is only talk of recession, depression, strike, unemployment, and the shorter work week. The Dow-Jones average makes the bull market of the twenties look meager in comparison, but inflation is still higher. But the American people still ask for higher wages, increased Government benefits, but with lower taxes. And away we go on another loop of the spiraling cost of living. Our standard of living is higher than ever, but so is our price standard. It's high enough now that many of the customers of the world can barely peer over the counter to look while other markets are selling from the floor. Karl Marx predicted our downfall when we got so rich, and our prices so high, that no one was left to buy our products. This leads us once again to the barefoot balance of world power.

America is the showplace of democracy and we must be the showmen. P. T. Barnum said that there is a sucker born every minute, but today's world birth rate produces them much faster than that. For these people we must first put on a show, the greatest show on earth. We must show them what we already know, that we are the most advanced people on earth. Next we must give them the things I have offered in our name. It is only in this way that we can keep the peoples of the world from being subjected to lies and false promises and bring them into the world of democracy.

It would seem that we are the suckers, but such is not the case. These gifts would actually be a capitalistic investment in the future of the world. These people have much to offer in repayment. In the underdeveloped countries of the world lies the future market for our goods.

These words I speak are in the finest of the American democratic tradition. What I offer is not a bribe or a gift in sympathy, but an investment for our mutual benefit.

These words I speak for democracy.

Fair Trade Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal—New York City—of March 28, 1960, entitled "Fair Trade Fight":

FAIR TRADE FIGHT—RECENT COURT DECISIONS AGAIN THREATEN PRICE-FIX STRUCTURE, U.S. LAWYERS SAY

(By Lyle W. Denniston)

WASHINGTON.—The fair trade fortress, where retail price fixing lives legally immune to Federal trustbusting, seems to be crumbling under new court attacks—even as its defenders try to rebuild the ramparts.

This is one of the great sieges of U.S. legal history, already extending for more than 2 decades, and not even a Philadelphia lawyer would dare to predict with certainty the ultimate victor. But it is plain to the eye that warriors whose battle dress is the black judicial robe are opening new cracks in the fortress walls.

An opinion handed down from a State or Federal bench is not, of course, so blunt an instrument as a battering ram—its impact may not be completely visible at first glance.

A few days ago, for instance, New Jersey's supreme court held that Eli Lilly & Co., the pharmaceutical manufacturer, must register with State officials if it wishes to rely on State courts to help it police retail prices of its products. Superficially this is not too important a matter; it simply requires fair trade manufacturers to shuffle a few papers to New Jersey's secretary of state.

But here's the twist, according to lawyers who have watched this case at close range: Once a company has registered, it has accepted business citizenship in the State—and State taxes may hit it hard. The conclusion: Many a company may be unwilling to pay this price for the privilege of enforcing fair trade in New Jersey.

Like many attacks in the State courts, this opens only a chink in the fortress walls. But highly placed Government attorneys here say they spy a gapping hole, opened by a verdict of the U.S. Supreme Court about a month ago.

The damage inflicted to fair trade by this case, rather similarly, was not immediately and unmistakably apparent. On its face, it had nothing whatever to do with fair trade, because it involved the price-policing activities of another drug maker, Parke Davis & Co., solely in Virginia and the District of Columbia—neither of which had fair trade laws when the case got started in 1956. (Since then Virginia has passed one.)

LAWYERS' MORAL

But the Federal legal men are convinced that the kind of activity which Parke Davis was accused is equally illicit in any fair-trade State. What the drug maker engaged in, according to the court record, was arranging for wholesalers to cut off sales of products to price-cutting retailers, and visiting the chief price-cutters to warn them their supplies would be cut off if they persisted in undercutting suggested retail prices. This sort of thing, said the justices, creates an illegal combine.

The moral that Government lawyers draw for manufacturers operating in fair-trade States is this: It's still quite legal for a factory sales chief to write price floors into agreements with retailers. And it's still legal for him to refuse to sell directly to a retailer who violates them. But the refusal must be an absolutely unilateral act. If he organizes action by wholesalers, or even so much as goes around to have a chat with a retailer about the consequences of price cutting, he has very likely stepped beyond the law. If that is the case, it's questionable what a sales cut-off could accomplish beyond the loss of an outlet for the producer's ware.

In practical effect, then, the reasoning goes, fair traders are left with but one perfectly legal enforcement tactic. That's a lawsuit by the manufacturer seeking a court order to force a merchant to abide by price minimums. But plugging price-cutting holes in this way can be a tedious and expensive business, experience has shown. General Electric, which gave up on fair trading 2 years ago, had hired 45 law firms to take 3,050 cases to court in 33 States.

And the courts, in the opinion of fair traders, are frequently found to be hostile. An official of Sunbeam Corp., for example, on one occasion complained that State judges allow price-cutting merchants to raise all manner of "pettifogging" procedural barriers to such suits.

Most importantly, many State courts insist that a manufacturer show proof that he has tried diligently to gain price compliance before coming to court. And under the Parke Davis doctrine, any company which sets about building a pattern of price enforcement effort sufficient to impress the State judge may be running the hazard of violating Federal antitrust law.

Government lawyers have no doubt all this adds up to a major breach in fair trade defenses. They expect that many a fair trading manufacturer will quietly and gradually give up real attempts to enforce retail price fixing and perhaps be happy to have a good excuse for doing so. According to this theory, it is the retail pressure groups, not the manufacturers, who are the true believers in price fixing.

Fair trade apostles, naturally, do not altogether agree with this strategic estimate of the situation. The National Association of Retail Druggists, for instance, stoutly insists that the Parke-Davis case "is completely unrelated to either State or Federal fair trade legislation." But other lobbyists for legalized price fixing are making the grudging admission the ruling may have at least a psychological impact on fair traders. And experts within at least one pressure group concede that any manufacturer would now be well-advised to observe the literal limits of State fair trade laws to avoid wandering into the range of Federal trustbusters.

STORMY HISTORY

It may take years, and no doubt further court tests, to determine beyond question the impact of the Supreme Court's Parke-Davis ruling. This is simply the latest important chapter in fair trade's prolonged history of frustration in the courts.

The U.S. Supreme Court dealt what looked like a knockout blow in 1951, when it held that price-fixing contracts were binding only upon retailers who signed them, not upon nonsigners. Congress reacted a year later by saying, in the McGuire Act, that they are indeed binding upon all.

Since then, however, State courts have scuttled in whole or in their most vital part 16 of the 45 States' fair trade laws. These laws were found totally invalid in two States. Tribunals in 14 others all but crippled their acts by throwing out the nonsigner clauses.

A damaging court ruling came in a U.S. Court of Appeals in 1957—a decision the U.S. Supreme Court refused to disturb. It gave a discount house permission to ship its goods from a non-fair trade State into a fair trade State and sell them there at less than suggested prices.

The string of legal reserves, triggering decisions by such companies as General Electric, Sunbeam, and W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co. to quit fair trading, convinced price maintainers that only Congress could help them rebuild their legal fortress.

So far, they have been able to persuade the House Commerce Committee that fair trade should be made a national policy. But until they persuade the House Rules Com-

mittee, too, their bill can't get to the House floor for debate. The Rules Committee doesn't seem ready to oblige as yet.

The bill would make it a Federal crime for a merchant to sell below a minimum fixed by a manufacturer on his products.

NO PROSPECT OF TRUCE

One of the more persistent bands of lobbyists, frankly conceding fair trade's tarnished image, doesn't want Congress to vote it back into respectability under that name. But they have hardly given up the cause. They want a quality stabilization bill which would lead somewhat circuitously, but its backers hope more agreeably, to the same object: Resale price maintenance.

Here's how it would work: Congress would specify that the owner of a brand name or trademark continues to own that symbol even after the item bearing it is sold. With the ownership right would go the right to set a price; this would be a specific price, not just a minimum as in the usual fair trade case. Any seller who strayed from the price—up or down—could be cut off. The same fate would befall a merchant who used the brand name product only as bait to get customers into his store.

Whatever the form, if Congress should approve resale price maintenance as a Federal policy, legalized price fixers would have new mortar to patch up their crumbling bastion. But even then, the repairs might not be lasting. Justice Department lawyers regard a national fair trade bill as one of doubtful constitutionality.

Thus, fair trade's fortress seems ill-prepared to withstand further assault, and there's no prospect of a truce.

Where Are the Republicans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I comment to the attention of our colleagues the following articles on the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia.

The first is an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of March 7, 1960:

WHERE ARE THE REPUBLICANS?

However one looks at it, a large majority of the Republicans in the House of Representatives have fallen on their faces, so far as carrying out their party's pledge of suffrage for the District of Columbia is concerned. In line with that pledge, the President sent to Congress a bill that has widespread bipartisan support. Likewise it has the endorsement of Vice President NIXON and former President Hoover. But a majority of the Republicans in the House seems to be in league with the reactionary Democratic leaders of the House District Committee who are trying to sabotage the bill.

By contrast, the Democrats of the northern and western States have lined up in large majorities for the petition designed to discharge the District Committee from further consideration of the bill. Here is an interesting spectacle. Traditionally the Republicans claim to be the party of civil rights. They assert a profound interest in the right to vote. Yet in this matter of restoring suffrage to the disfranchised citizens of the Nation's Capital most of the GOP members of the House are letting the Democrats claim all the credit for supporting the President's bill.

If anyone thinks this is a harsh conclusion, let him call the roll of home-rule petition signers. Of the Representatives from the New England States, 15 out of 19 Democrats have signed, but only 4 out of 9 Republicans. Of the Middle Atlantic Congressmen, all but 1 of the 40 Democrats have signed, but only 15 out of 47 Republicans. Other records are even worse. The East North Central States have 32 out of 43 Democratic Congressmen behind the petition, but only 6 of 44 Republicans; the South Atlantic States, 11 of 55 Democrats, but none of 5 Republicans; the Mountain States, 6 out of 11 Democrats, but only 1 out of 5 Republicans; the Pacific States, 19 out of 22 Democrats, but only 5 out of 21 Republicans.

Except for 10 Southern States that are not represented at all on the petition, the Democratic legislators have done very well. They have provided 140 of the 174 signatures noted in the most recent count. If the Republicans had done as well, the home-rule bill would soon be moving to a vote in the House.

It is true, of course, that many Republicans and some Democrats have followed a general practice of not signing discharge petitions. But this is one case in which such a petition is necessary to prevent a little reactionary clique from making a mockery of the legislative process. For more than a decade the House has been denied an opportunity to vote on this and similar bills, while the Senate has approved home rule for the District five times. Surely 10 years of obstruction ought to be enough to arouse the hackles of any legislator who has any regard for the basic right of self-government.

Every Member of the House whose name is not on the home-rule petition ought to be asking himself how his suport of the anti-suffrage, and antihome-rule clique will look back home. Can the Republicans who are holding aloof defend their failure to lift a finger in support of the President's effort to restore the ballot to 870,000 voteless citizens? This complete denial of suffrage to all the residents of the District is even more flagrant than denial of minority voting rights in the States, because in this instance Congress itself bears the whole responsibility.

There is still time to remedy this deficiency, but the time is growing short. If the Republican Members of the House are not themselves alert to the embarrassment they may face in November, Minority Leader HALLECK and Vice President NIXON could render a useful service by reminding them that the American people have a high regard for the right to vote.

The second article appeared in the New York Times of April 3, 1960:

NEW DRIVE SEEKS CAPITAL SUFFRAGE—HOME RULE BILL IS STALLED IN HOUSE—VOTING MAY BE A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—This Capital is throbbing once again with a new drive to let its nearly 1 million residents vote, and the issue is moving into the national campaigns.

In recent years the fight has been confused by the fact that the population of Washington has become about 53 percent Negro. This factor is not brought up in official argument, but it seems to play an important role in the back of many minds.

Also in the background is the argument that citizens of the Nation's Capital have not been allowed to vote simply because of an omission in the drafting of the Constitution. It is argued that the Founding Fathers distinctly did not want to make Washingtonians voteless citizens.

NEW DRIVE UNDERWAY

The status of the new drive is as follows:

The Senate has approved a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment that would give suffrage to citizens of the National Capital.

Hearings on this proposal will be held next week by the House Judiciary Committee. The legislation would remedy the constitutional omission that provides that elections for Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Members of Congress be handled by the States. The District of Columbia is not a State or a part of one.

The constitutional amendment must be approved by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress, and then be ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years.

Pending also is a home-rule bill that would give Washingtonians the right to vote for a Delegate to the House of Representatives, as Puerto Rico has, and for a city council.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES

The city managers now are presidential appointees. Congress is the city council, and when city matters go to the floors there appears to be a lack of congressional interest in them.

The home rule bill has been bottled up by the House District Committee. The southern element of this panel, opposing the legislation, has prevailed.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, is trying to force the proposal to the floor by bypassing the committee. This is being done by a discharge petition, which must be signed by a majority of the House, or 219 Members.

The petition had 186 signers today, 33 short of the required number. This has led to charges by Representative MULTER and others that the Republicans, despite their platform pledges for Washington home rule, are slackers.

ANALYSIS BY COMMITTEE

The Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., analyzed the petition signing, as of today, as follows:

While 147 Democrats seek a showdown, only 40 Republicans have signed the petition. The committee asserted that only a heavy pressure from the White House and the congressional leadership was lacking, perhaps unintentionally, to bar a real test.

The committee also noted that, excluding the southern and border State membership, about 80 percent of the Democrats were supporting the move to take the issue to the floor.

It said that Republicans joining this movement represented only about 26 percent of the GOP House membership.

The home rule committee estimated that, if the issue went to the House floor, at least 275 Members, 56 more than a majority, would approve the bill.

The committee added that the only thing that could break the logjam would be insistence by the White House, or by Vice President NIXON, or by the House Republican leadership, that a test be made.

The third article appeared in the Washington Post of March 30, 1960:

HOME RULE DRIVE NEEDS GOP HELP, LEADER SAYS

(By Morton Mintz)

The drive for District self-government appears almost certain to fail unless President Eisenhower, Vice President Richard M. Nixon or House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana, exerts "leadership pressure" on Republican Congressmen.

That is the gist of a report made to the Washington Home Rule Committee yesterday by its legislative counsel, Walter Pozen.

Without "leadership pressure," there are "serious doubts" that the administration home-rule bill will be forced to the House floor where, Pozen asserted, it would be approved by at least 275 Members.

The bill is locked up in the southern-dominated House District Committee. A bi-

partisan group seeks to discharge the District Committee from further consideration of the measure.

To succeed, the group needs the signatures on a discharge petition of at least 219 of the 437 Members of the House. It now has 185. The belief is that fewer than two dozen GOP signatures would do the job—but that these will be forthcoming only under "leadership pressure."

The Democrats have supplied 145 signatures. Eighty percent of the Democrats from outside the South and the border States have enrolled: Only a handful of potentials remains.

The Republicans have supplied 40 signatures, 26 percent of their House membership of 152. Their theoretical reserve is thus 112. They contributed only 7 of the last 45 signatures.

Both the President and Vice President have long supported home rule, but neither has taken a public stand on the discharge petition. Former President Truman said recently that he would sign it if he were a Member of the House.

The 14 Republicans from NIXON's home State of California include only three signers.

HALLECK declined again yesterday to state his position on home rule. He has said that he personally would not sign any discharge petition but does not object to other Republicans signing.

One hundred percent enrollment has been achieved in Republican delegations from two States, compared with Democratic delegations from 19 States, Pozen's analysis shows. In addition, seven other Democratoc delegations have produced signatures from all but one member.

The administration home-rule bill provides for a 15-member elected legislative assembly with a presidentially appointed Governor.

Last year the Senate passed a bill providing for an elected mayor and a nine-member city council. Home-rule strategists hope the Senate would accept the administration's territorial bill, should the House pass it.

Alive at 65—Most Debated Topic Regarding Aged Is Forand Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 31 edition of the La Grange Citizen, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on a subject of great concern to us all:

ALIVE AT 65—MOST DEBATED TOPIC REGARDING AGED IS FORAND TAX LEGISLATION

The most debated and most pertinent topic on older people is the Forand legislation which already has created considerable trouble for Congress, and which will be a hot subject for legislators to handle this election year.

In this column there have been presentations during recent weeks of both sides of this question which involves the basic consideration "Should old-age medication and hospitalization be tied in with social security?"

At this point there is doubt whether the Forand bill will be reported out of the House committee in its present form. There also is evidence that both the Senate and the House will have some form of old-age medication care legislation up for voting.

Vice President NIXON has been caught in a squeeze between President Eisenhower's statements opposing social security taxation for old-age medical care, and between the pressures being exerted by groups desiring to see the Forand bill adopted.

The forces behind the legislation that would increase social security taxes to provide for medical care and hospitalization of older persons are centered in the political action unit of the AFL–CIO. That group has been censured for alleged misrepresentations and distortions of the American Medical Association's stand against the Forand bill, or any similar legislation.

"The AMA will continue to oppose the Forand bill because it is a costly, irreversible program tailored to avoid the real program" is the official statement of Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the AMA.

Another bit of legislation before Congress should be of interest to persons who have accepted the responsibility to finance the medical care of older dependents.

A Senate amendment to H.R. 9660 would allow the maximum $2,500 medical expense deduction for medical care of a taxpayer's dependent parent, without regard to the 3 percent limitation presently in force.

As many a taxpayer who is supporting a hospitalized parent will admit, present day costs of hospitalization can create a financial burden too great to carry without extreme sacrifice.

An allowable $2,500 deduction would do much toward easing the burden, and also would serve to encourage others to accept the obligation of caring for their parent.

Many major corporations are reviewing their stand on arbitrary retirement at 65 or similar age the "Industrial Relations News" reports that a survey of some 30 corporation personnel policies shows that over half of them have adopted changes in former rigid policies regarding retirement.

The survey reveals that about one-fourth of them now have flexible policies regarding ages for retirement, and that another fourth make exceptions to their age 65 retirement when such exceptions are advisable.

The Governor of Mississippi has assured the aged of his State:

"With the help of our medical, hospital and local government team, we shall care for our own. The aged who have no means with which to secure health care services will find a skilled helping hand extended to them." Decrying Federal "socialized medicine" he said.

"The scheme would be a beginning without an end of more federalism, more centralized control, less initiative by States and less exercise of local judgment."

Address at Byelorussian Independence Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 of this year the people of Byelorussian origin observed the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. That Republic was proclaimed in 1918, but about 3 years later the Communist rulers of Russia extended their domination over Byelorussia and its people have been suffering under the yoke of communism ever since.

The Byelorussian-American Association had a public celebration dedicated to the anniversary on Sunday, March 27, 1960, at the Biltmore Hotel in New York. The association's national headquarters are located in Brooklyn, N.Y., and its national president is Constant Mierlak. The Hoonrable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City, sent his personal representative, Mr. John B. Byrne, to deliver a message on his behalf at the celebration.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Byrne:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my official assignment this afternoon is to present on behalf of Mayor Robert F. Wagner his proclamation proclaiming Byelorussian Independence Day.

With your kind indulgence if I may be permitted to momentarily digress I would like to point out the fact that we in America are aware of the rich and expansive resources that nature has bestowed upon us. We are favored to enjoy the contributions of labor, art, literature, and culture that have been brought to us by the peoples who have come from every land on earth to find a sanctuary in the United States, and to make it their home. It is the springtime of the year now and soon it will be especially beautiful. The leaves will be green on the bough, the birds will sing with a clearer note, the days will be warmer, and nature's artistry will be born to bloom. But above all, far surpassing all, we are a free people.

Being a free people, we must also realize that every human eye that is brightened by a thing of beauty must just as assuredly grow dim with sorrow and weep for the enslaved and the oppressed, wherever they may be.

The history of Byelorussia teaches us that this land too, has been gifted by nature with many of the resources that are essential to the health and happiness and good life of mankind. A great portion of these resources make up the economy of the U.S.S.R. Byelorussia, a fair and fertile land. Its people have a literal and cultural heritage that reaches far back into the centuries. But it is not a free land.

Forty-two years ago, following valiant and relentless struggle for freedom, the Byelorussian people established a democratic Republic which was based on the principles of liberty and justice. They wrote a constitution which was for the common good, intended to insure the fundamental rights of all the citizens within the limits of order and morality. That constitution was abolished and destroyed. It was destroyed by coercion and treachery. By godless forces of faction and violence, and the people of Byelorussia today are deprived of their rights and made slaves.

The principle, then, underlying this movement, this afternoon, is a very simple one. It is the soul-searching cry of an enslaved people asking to tell their own story, in their own way. But the story of Byelorussia is not new. It is the spirit of test and endurance that has varied little down through many dark and bloody centuries. Time and again, the people fought and fell in appalling slaughter. Yes, they went down in defeat, but defeat never meant despair. Every new generation has renewed that fight for freedom. Today, more than ever, they are compelled to witness in agony, the tyranny and oppression of a Red imperialism. But as I said defeat never meant despair and every new generation has renewed the fight for

freedom. You of Byelorussian extraction are the inheritors of a gay bravery and a proud heritage.

May we not hope and pray this afternoon that this memorable anniversary shall be a most significant one. That the song of liberty that you sing shall re-echo around the world and that noble people of your courageous race in the homeland may have a good reason to feel confident and hopeful that the dawn of a new freedom is nigh. That they shall break the chains of slavery and that the cruel yoke of oppression may be lifted from their bowed and beaten backs. That they will be once more given their sacred privileges of right and justice to hold up their heads and walk in the light of liberty. To know that they not only command but get a full measure of respect for the dignity of man in a free and happy land that can take its rightful place in the parliament of the world.

Political Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of April 7, 1960, entitled "Political Medicine":

POLITICAL MEDICINE

Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN offered more epithets than ideas regarding medical care of the aged. He was vehement in denouncing labor leaders Walter Reuther and James Carey for their criticism of the administration and their support of the Forand bill; but he had nothing constructive to suggest instead. And Secretary Flemming was full of promises but barren of programs when he appeared on Wednesday before the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging; the administration, he said, is working on a plan which will have nothing to do with social security taxation but will function, instead, through the States and private health insurance systems. It is very difficult to see how private health insurance systems can possibly meet the whole need.

By 1980, according to estimates prepared by the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, 26 million Americans will be over 65 years of age. Eighty-five percent of them will have incomes under $2,000 a year. What private insurance companies are going to insure them adequately at rates they can afford to pay? It is doubtful that any private company can pay for all the surgical and nursing and hospital care these elderly persons are indisputably going to need.

There are, of course, a great many companies in the United States selling health insurance of protective value, and some make a special point of catering to elderly folk; but no more than about one-third of the persons over 65 have hospital insurance, most of it with inadequate benefit coverage. Private insurance companies provide splendid protection for wage earners. But the cost of insurance inevitably goes up as the likelihood of illness increases with age, and sometimes is prohibitive for those who have retired.

The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program; and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as "socialistic" without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire. They might just about as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was "to promote the general welfare."

Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree Conferred Upon Senator Kenneth B. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Long Island University, one of the most outstanding institutions of higher education in the United States, conferred an honorary doctor of laws degree upon Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, on March 22 at its annual scholarship fund dinner at the Hotel Astor in New York City. Prof. Dennis Brown in reading the citation stated:

Mr. President, here is a public servant of the highest order; sagacious, judicious, courageous in his convictions; a legislator dedicated to the common weal; an articulate spokesman for his party, his State, his Nation. Native of Lima, in this Empire State, he received the A.B. degree from the University of Rochester at the age of 19, and taught high school Latin before entering Harvard to prepare for the profession of law. Possessed of the forensic gifts of a Cicero, his ability as a trial lawyer drew wide attention, and indeed his practice became a lucrative one. Yet, with characteristic conscientiousness, he relinquished an active participation in his law firm when the citizens of the 38th Congressional District first elected him their representative in 1946, and he devoted himself to his Washington duties with full vigor. He served consecutively in the House for six terms, and in 1959, invested with the purple-bordered toga of an eminence gained by diligence and skill, he took his place in the Senate of the United States. He has distinguished himself in public service as an ardent internationalist and a firm supporter of the United Nations, an advocate of liberalized immigration laws, and a militant defender of civil rights. In two World Wars he served with brilliance and valor, earning decorations from this Nation and from Great Britain as well, and now holds the rank of brigadier general. Mr. President, here is a gentleman, scholar, patriot; an American of genuine distinction who symoblizes the highest ideals of public service. He is commended to you most heartily for the degree of doctor of laws.

I congratulate the junior Senator from New York on his receipt of this well-merited honor, and join with numerous individuals and newspapers in commending the Senator for his excellent address at that time.

The text of the address by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING is as follows:

It can well be said that each of us is born with a fortune. The silver spoon of past learning is in the mouth of every infant. Millions of ancient and modern scholars and scientists are the fairy godfathers, and, let us be historically accurate, the fairy godmothers of every child who is born into the civilized society that we know. Poets have spoken of time as a thief—but, time is first of all a giver—it lumps the riches of the past before each of us and we literally come into the world with an inheritance of learning awaiting us—a treasure that is ours for the taking.

That inheritance is so often overlooked—or misconceived—because it is left lying around in books, or because it is so readily available from teachers who are the custodians of what is known and what is imperishable.

The flowering tree of American culture has its roots in faraway places, has been fed by faraway springs of thought and energy. Athens, Rome, Western Europe—yes, the East and Africa—civilizations some vanished, some flourishing—yet all form the seed of our culture, and the soil, the sun, and air that give it life.

Culture is the business of the university—its reason for being—and today I should like to speak with you about the true role of culture as opposed to a latter-day perversion of that role in certain areas of the world.

Traditionally, culture has been dedicated to the embellishment and ennobling of man's life on earth. It is a hunger satisfied, a thirst quenched, a wealth acquired. It has been self-fulfilling, as sufficient unto itself as a flower in bloom. It has been devoid of ulterior motives.

Today, a new and disturbing concept of the role of culture breaks sharply with the past. I refer to the first beginnings of a Soviet program that recognizes culture as a cold war weapon—an ideological missile if you will, that has the thrust of rubles and energies to get it aloft, and whose predetermined targets are the minds of men.

Many of you, no doubt, are aware of the project to which I refer. It is the planned establishment in Moscow of a special university for the training of African, Asian, and Latin American students. This university is scheduled to open its doors next month with an initial enrollment of 500 students. In the following years it is anticipated that that figure will rise to 4,000 students. Because the Russian language barrier will exist for these students, the new university provides a preparatory course of 1 to 3 years before students can start their 4 or 5 years of graduate studies.

According to Russian-source figures, the training of each individual student will cost the Government $10,000 a year. This amount includes transportation, tuition, and all incidental expenses. Thus, when the university is operating at expected capacity, it will involve an outlay of $40 million a year by the Soviet Government.

Now the genesis of this unique seat of learning—learning Communist style—is interesting. The project has not sprung full blown from Khrushchev's brow. Actually, its establishment is based upon what might be termed a pilot experiment. This experiment has been going on since 1947 in Czechoslovakia where the Communist Party has been conducting a school in Prague for young

African intellectuals. Apparently, the success of this school has been a determining factor in the Soviet decision to embark on a full-scale cultural campaign to educate those who will be among the leaders of tomorrow in Africa, Asia, and South America.

To put it into bold, realistic terms, the Communist Party is now engaged in a campaign to make culture a weapon. Figuratively, it is beating the pen into the sword. It is perverting the great historical role of text and teacher to create a culture responding to the Kremlin pattern of conquest rather than to the intellectual growth of the individual and his society.

The basic objective is clear. It is a bold aggressive move to win over the future technical intelligensia of countries now underdeveloped but on the verge of bursting into a tremendous and exciting and meaningful future. In its way, this is actually the rolling out onto the launching site of an ICBM whose guidance system aims at the world-to-be not the world-that-is—whose target is that often so vulnerable area—the area of the free world.

The Soviets display the ultrarefinement of their psychological warfare methods in so prosaic a field as transportation. According to an East German report, two of the new passenger ships built in Rostock for the U.S.S.R. have the assigned mission of carrying students back and forth between Africa and Indian Ocean countries and the Soviet Union. These trim, white one-class Soviet vessels are complete with libraries, educational movies and personnel versed in the languages of the foreign students.

Thus does communism build cradles for its ideologically newborn. Thus does it feed and clothe and educate those who will never be allowed to forget the name of their alma mater, nor their loyalty to it.

I spoke of the new perversion of culture. Perhaps my meaning is now clearer. Culture was meant to conquer ignorance—not territory. It was meant to ennoble man, not to enslave him.

There is a spirit of militancy in the Communist cold war approach which makes our own approach suffer seriously by comparison. Indeed, one is tempted to say that we of the West work at the extension and preservation of freedom on a 9-to-5 basis, while the Kremlin long ago instituted round-the-clock shifts.

The truth as we conceive it, as we expound it, and seek to extend it, is not, by its essence, militant. It does not have the arsenal of lies at its command. It cannot dress up in duplicity's many changes of wardrobe. But it cannot, it must not, stand idly by. It must learn a militancy of its own for self-protection. It must be taught to stand on its own two feet and counterpunch—or else it will continue to yield ground in this silent war for the minds and loyalties of men.

I do not underestimate the value of the manifold official and private programs intended to project a favorable image of America to the world. Today, as never before, we are extending the hand of friendship to foreign peoples—through our information programs, our cultural exchanges, and people-to-people effort.

It is my conviction, however, that a fresh, bolder, more imaginative restudy of this entire approach to the so-called sell America program is urgently needed. And parenthetically, I should begin by burying the slogan "Sell America." The values we stand for, the ideals that Americans have fought and died for, are not a commodity for sale. They are a spirit to share—an experience to communicate—a freedom to make known.

I spoke of the urgency of a new appraisal of our role as the leading nation in the battle for the dignity of man. And it is a battle, no matter how still the guns, how unfurled the flags. Time bombs are being set in men's minds. One day their detonations may affect the course of history. Conquest by culture is only one of the myriad manifestations of the Kremlin's night-and-day program—across the world—to woo and to win loyalties, to trickle its red coloring into new areas of the global map. When freedom is being shot at continually—without effective counterattack—freedom ends up by being killed.

There is irony in the fact that America was—how shall I say it?—a misunderstood and suspected stranger—to the peoples of Asia until President Eisenhower—by his one appearance there—revealed, almost startlingly, the true image of this Nation. Some Americans have innocently believed that we buy friendship by our foreign aid—that it is a form of international exchange—a gift for a friend, a friend for a gift. The truth of course, is that you don't buy friends in this world. You make friends. You make them by personal contacts, by a sympathy with needs and aspirations, by an identification with their problems and by the helping hand that aids them in solving those problems. And the fact that such contacts, such assistance are developed with the cold calculation of a battle plan, as in the case of the Kremlin, does not detract from the essential result. A nation's influence is felt when it consciously makes itself felt, be the result for good or evil.

There is no more pressing necessity in the America of today than for a national awareness of the tremendous import and urgency of the need to act dynamically and positively in resisting the cultural, social, and economic erosions of communism as they operate to reduce and stifle the areas of freedom in this world.

We cannot continue to maintain a frozen or semifrozen posture of defense in this field. We must meet the fire of dedication with some fire of our own. It is not enough to pay lip service to the cause of peace, nor to think of taxes as our first line of defense. American imagination, and energy, and inventiveness must be galvanized and brought into play. Individuals and groups must be challenged to commit themselves to the problem, to explore new techniques, create new ideas, to identify themselves personally with a cause that touches them personally. We have long since come out of the isolation booth of disinterest in the rest of the world. What we have failed to do is to realize the full implications of living in a world that is only as safe as we make it, only as free as we are vigilant to keep it free.

It is not enough to bury dead slogans like "Sell America." We must bring to life a new concept—a concept that is responsive to the imperative needs of the times. Let us change "Sell America" to "Project America." Project America and what it stands for in the basic human values that are the difference between man's dignity and man's degradation.

We are in a battle, not a salesman's competition. What we are defending is the truth that makes men free and keeps them free. That truth has been a punching bag for the protagonists of government by tyranny.

Our counter-blows—let us face it—have been feeble and ineffective. If the truth is to fight back, let us at least put boxing gloves on it. Let us plan its attack—let us train it to sharpness for the struggle—let us give it the strength to challenge and to prevail.

The hammers of history are beating out a new universe of man. We can—each of us—help guide those hammers, or we can stand by and see the globe shaped by other alien energies and philosophies—shaped into a world no free man could call home.

May I close with this thought. It has meaning, I feel in the light of what has been said. History has recorded for us the many ways in which human freedom has perished—gloriously, cravenly, forlornly—but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom dies in its sleep.

Calls It Craziest Tax Law in the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from a valued constituent, Fred E. Etten, residing at 7921 Ingleside Avenue, in the city of Chicago, I have received a clipping from the Chicago Daily News with an article by Columnist Inez Robb and a copy of Mr. Etten's letter of commendation to Miss Robb. I recommend them to the careful reading of my distinguished colleagues. They pinpoint a weakness in our tax structure that urgently requires our attention. The article by the widely read columnist, Inez Robb, follows:

CRAZIEST TAX LAW IN THE LAND

(By Inez Robb)

If a qualified jury were asked to choose the silliest law in the whole, jerry-built Federal tax structure, it would be hard put to select the really ultimate lulu.

However, I have a nomination: The majestic statute that now forbids anyone, between the ages of 65 and 72 and receiving social security, to earn in excess of $1,200 annually. Any senior citizen with the get-up-and-go to earn in excess of $1,200 is penalized by cuts in or loss of his social-security benefits.

Now Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, from New Mexico, former Secretary of Agriculture, has introduced a bill that would permit willing and able elders to earn $2,000 annually before the penalties set in. Well, I respect the Senator for trying to up the ante, but I wish he had tried for a goal instead of a place kick.

It is not only silly, but cruel to restrict the earning power of any free American citizen who is willing to roll up his sleeves and pitch in.

It is a crazy infringement on the guaranteed liberties of the citizen to tell him what he can or can't earn, or how much he can work. Or to restrict him to a bare livelihood on the subsistence level that social security provides.

Social security is not a gift or a free-will offering of the Federal Government. Those who receive social security have, by law, contributed regularly to the fund, as have their employers. It represents part of the savings of the worker against old age and should be free of strings.

It is not only asinine but a waste of the Nation's skilled and experienced manpower to insist that the worker at age 65, who accepts social security, must for the next 7 years twiddle his thumbs. The Government graciously allows the oldster, after he reaches 72, to garner all the money he is capable of earning.

Such restrictions on an American's right to earn not only play ducks-and-drakes with his freedom, but there is a vicious inequity in the law. The Government is only interested in the earned income of oldsters between 65 and 72. The penalty is all on earned income; there is none on unearned income.

The basic law of our land provides for a redress of civilian grievances. This imbecilic penalty on grit and gumption bedded in the social security laws screams for redress.

Here is the letter written by my constituent to the columnist after he had read her article:

INEZ ROBB,
Chicago Daily News.

DEAR MISS ROBB: I am a regular reader of your column and generally enjoy your articles. Your recent one, however, "Craziest Tax Law in the Land" was a masterpiece. If I were vain and boasted the ability, I would say you took the words out of my mouth.

You may have had plenty of cases in mind to help form your opinion but may I add a case to further convince you how right you are.

My wife, at 66 years, a registered nurse for 43 years and in perfect physical condition, is compelled to curtail her work to 2 half days a week in order to receive her little social security award. With hospitals here crying for nurses, two merciful, willing and able hands are tied because of the crazy law which you have pointed out.

She does staff duty in one of Chicago's largest hospitals whose nursing school is her alma mater. She could just as well be working 3 full days a week but why when the Government virtually confiscates her wages?

Gratefully yours,

FRED E. ETTEN.

One Round Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 31 edition of Chicago's American, in my opinion, is an interesting and enlightening commentary on a subject of great interest to the Members of Congress. For this reason, I am including it in the RECORD for the Members' consideration:

ONE ROUND WON

For this session, at least, the effort to destroy the Connally reservations to the World Court treaty has been abandoned in the Senate, thus preserving this country's right to keep the International Court at The Hague from meddling in the domestic affairs of the United States.

This is a victory for the realistic commonsense of ordinary Americans over the strange idea of the internationalists that winning the approval of foreign countries is more important than preserving American sovereignty.

The public, alerted by the newspapers, deluged the Senate with letters protesting against opening the way for the International Court to take jurisdiction over disputes involving the internal affairs of the United States.

And it is the public's opposition, as expressed in those letters, that has persuaded Senate leaders to abandon the effort to repeal the Connally reservations this year.

The Connally amendment limits the World Court's jurisdiction by reserving to this country the right to decide when a dispute involves its domestic affairs and therefore is not subject to adjudication by the International Court.

Internationalists of both parties had proposed that the Senate, at this session, repeal the Connally amendment.

The repeal plan was favored by President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, sponsor of the repeal resolution, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and others, including many leaders in the American Bar Association.

The internationalists argued that the World Court could not take complete control over international disputes as long as the United States and other nations following this country's example, could prevent it from interfering in their domestic concerns.

But after the public's letters had been pouring in for some weeks, the worried backers of the repeal resolution conducted an informal poll of Senators, and this revealed that the move to cancel the Connally reservation could not come anywhere near getting 67 votes—the two-thirds majority needed to amend a treaty. So the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, reluctantly decided to postpone consideration of the repeal resolution indefinitely.

Nevertheless, people who oppose letting the World Court decide for itself how far it shall thrust itself into the business of the State, National, and local governments of the United States, will have to keep on fighting. The next effort to knock down the Connally reservation probably will be made at the national conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties. The internationalists probably will urge that the two parties write recommendations for the repeal of the Connally amendment into their platforms.

So, Americans who don't want to see the U.S. Constitution undermined by decisions of a World Court, which has only one American judge as against two Communist judges and some Socialists, should go on writing letters demanding that the Connally reservation be kept in force. This time they should write to the chairman and members of the party national committees and to candidates for office.

Address by Irving Maness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Irving Maness, counsel to Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Small Business Committee, before the 25th annual convention of the Movers' and Warehousemen's Association of America in Miami, Fla., on March 5, 1960:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS, COUNSEL, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, officials of Movers' and Warehousemen's Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am extremely grateful to your chairman this morning for his most considerate introduction. I am particularly happy with his pronunciation of my name. Unfortunately, my name has been pronounced and mispronounced many times but I am very thankful to your chairman for his correct pronunciation. I do not hesitate to state, however, that had I been addressing another type of movers' meeting sponsored by another group that my name would have been mispronounced and I would have been introduced as the "Mr. Menace."

As has been indicated, I was not scheduled to address this meeting—I am, in effect, a substitute. I would like to tell you a story to illustrate my interest in the independent, small businessman:

A man walked into the spring training camp of a major league ball team leading a horse. "I want you to give my horse a tryout," he said to the manager. The manager was about to have him thrown out of the park, but the man's insistence that his horse could play baseball finally persuaded the manager to give him a chance.

He sent the horse to the outfield and began hitting flies to him. The horse caught all of them in his mouth and snapped the ball back with a whip of his neck. "Can he hit?" asked the manager. "Try him," said the horse's owner. A bat was placed in the horse's mouth and he stepped to the plate. He hit every ball that was pitched to him. The manager was ecstatic. "He's great," he said, "we'll use him in the opening game."

The bases were loaded when the horse came to bat in the opening game. He smashed the first pitch to left centerfield but he did not move toward first base. "Run," cried the manager. "Run, you fool." "Why doesn't he run?" he shouted to the horse's owner. "That's his trouble," the owner replied. "He can't run. If he could run, he'd be at Hialeah."

I want to say right here that I will do better than the horse. You may rest assured that I will not only hit the ball for the independent small businessman but most assuredly I will run with it, too.

I would like to clarify something for you folks, something which confuses not only laymen but also Congressmen. There is a Small Business Administration, which was established by Congress, in the executive branch of the Government to aid and assist small business. There are in the legislative branch, Small Business Committees in both the Senate and the House of Representatives whose purpose it is to study and investigate the problems of small business and also to aid and assist whenever they can.

I am now celebrating my fifth anniversary as Counsel to the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives and have devoted the major portion of these 5 years to Government procurement. I might state that during this 5-year period, I have had many, many small business people come to my office seeking information on how to become big business. Interestingly enough, I have also had big business coming to my desk and inquiring how it can get the benefits of small business provided by law.

Some day, I hope and pray, the Congress of the United States will establish a Big Business Committee and that I will be employed as counsel. I assure you that it will be a cinch of a job—then there will be no problems and I can take life easy. The converse of this, unfortunately, is not true. The job at times is frustratingly difficult but, let me assure you, we are doing everything we possibly can to aid and assist small business.

This morning I do not intend to address you nor lecture to you. It is not proper to speak to you or at you. I do, however, want to speak with you. Particularly to discuss your problems as they pertain to Government procurement. Your problem is a problem in Government procurement.

Your president, in opening the convention, stated that the organization was confronted with three basic problems: tariff, the treasury, and equitable distribution. I will not discuss tariff. I will not discuss your treasury. I am well aware of budgets, appropriations, and money difficulties in running organizations such as yours. However, I will speak with you about your procurement problem—equitable distribution.

Six months ago, I first learned about your fight. I have lived with it ever since. At this point, I wish to state that no one person can take the credit for whatever little success we have had to date but let us bear in mind that the success we have had is only temporary, is only one of the battles in an overall war. But I want to state here categorically that without the aid of your officials, you members of the Movers' and Warehousemen's Association, and the particularly wonderful assistance from your executive secretary, Carroll Genovese, the little temporary success we have attained could not and would not have been accomplished. This fight has just started.

This brings to mind a story told around political circles about an important Senator:

"An important Senator took the unpopular side on a bill pending before the Senate and made an eloquent, impassioned speech against it. The next day when the vote was taken, he voted for the bill. "What happened, Henry?" asked a surprised colleague. "Did you see the light?" The Senator smiled. "It was not that I saw the light," he said, "I felt the heat."

This story illustrates, I think, the most important job you have before you—you must keep on the job every minute to be sure that those responsible for new directives and regulations in your industry feel the "heat" of justice and truth.

One thing I want to make very clear at this point: Small business does not ask for special favors. You folks don't ask for special favors. The Small Business Committee does not ask for special favors for small business. All we ask for, all we wish to gain, is a fair and equitable opportunity to compete for Government procurement.

I must admit that I am a neophyte in your industry but I am not a neophyte in the battle for procurement, nor am I a neophyte in battles for equality of treatment. Let me assure you our opponents will know our organization and that we are in this fight and we will guarantee equality to big and to small business. We will guarantee an equal opportunity to compete.

Quite a bit has been said at this convention and at numerous meetings that I have attended heretofore in connection with your industry's problems. General Morris, in his address, spoke about the number of suspensions given by the Department of Defense in connection with quality of service. He gave the figures of 492 suspensions and 54 letters of warning. Unfortunately there was no breakdown of these figures so that we do not know which suspensions were for small business and which were for large business. Let me assure you that big business is in this group.

In closing, let me say that I congratulate the officials of your organization, and particularly your executive secretary, Carroll Genovese, for your aid and assistance in fighting this battle for small business.

Let me assure you that the members of the House Small Business Committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and particularly the Subcommittee on Government Procurement under the chairmanship of the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of Brooklyn, N.Y., are always ready and willing to aid and assist small business in their just cause and fight for equitable opportunity to participate in Government procurement.

Thank you again.

Sixty Years Under the Sea: Electric Boat's Role in the History of the Submarine Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement that the administration has finally agreed to speed up our Polaris submarine program is good news indeed, especially to those of us who have been urging such a speedup for so long.

Sixty years ago next Monday, on April 11, 1900, the U.S. Navy purchased the world's first practical submarine, the *Holland*.

Last December, the *George Washington*, the first Polaris submarine, was commissioned. Both of these historic craft were built by the world's pioneer builder of submarine craft, the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., of Groton, Conn.

Appropriately, the latest issue of Navy magazine carries an excellent and informative article which traces the history of the U.S. Navy's Submarine Service, in which Electric Boat has played such a major role.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call the article, "Sixty Years Under the Sea," to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

SIXTY YEARS UNDER THE SEA—U.S. NAVY'S SUBMARINE SERVICE

(No one knows exactly how many leagues under the sea the Navy has logged since the inception of its submarine service 60 years ago. But through tragedy and conquest it pales the legends of any Jules Verne and the submarine service gives promise of accomplishing epochal feats undreamed of by its pioneer developers. In fact, the nuclear-powered "electric boat" and its combination with the Polaris missile suggest it may well be the balance of power in future warfare.)

On April 11, 1900, the U.S. Navy purchased a 54-foot "steel submarine torpedo boat" for $150,000 to establish a submarine force.

Since then, the submarine has been an integral part of the fleet and today, propelled by nuclear power and armed with ballistic missiles that can be fired from submerged positions, the submarine has become one of the Nation's prime deterrent forces.

Both the Holland and the George Washington were built by General Dynamics Corporation's Electric Boat Division, the Nation's pioneer submarine shipyard.

(Historically, another name of a submarine pioneer was invading the scene. It was that of Simon Lake who subsequently sold the Navy his craft.)

The story of U.S. submarines began in the village of Liscannor, County Clare, Ireland, where a young schoolteacher named John Philip Holland spent most of his spare time sketching plans for a submersible vessel.

In 1872, Holland emmigrated to the United States and began teaching in Paterson, N.J. He also began building submarines, financing them through savings from his salary and personally testing them in the Passaic River.

Between 1872 and 1895, Holland built a variety of submarines with varying degrees of success. One of his major problems was underwater propulsion, since he was forced to use an air-consuming, highly dangerous gasoline engine.

In 1895, he began work on a craft named the *Holland* in which he solved the propulsion problem by employing electric storage batteries for submerged operation. The *Holland* was 54 feet long, displaced 75 tons and was armed with one torpedo tube and a pnuematic dynamite gun.

After a series of exhaustive tests which lasted more than 2 years, the Navy purchased the *Holland* and ordered six more like it.

At the time the United States entered World War I the Navy had a fleet of 59 submarines, most of them representing improved designs. In 1912 it had acquired the USS *Skipjack*, first of the "E" class submarines and first to use diesel engines for surface propulsion.

The diesel, inherently safer than the gasoline engine, gave the submarine greater cruising range and the *Skipjack* became the first U.S. submarine to cross the Atlantic.

An accelerated building program during World War I brought forth the "O" and "S" class submarines which were slated to be the workhorses of the undersea fleet for nearly a quarter of a century. Their durability was attested by the fact that during World War II 10 "S" boats sank a total of 14 Japanese naval and merchant vessels.

In the years following World War I, the United States, adhering to the Naval Limitation Treaty, restricted its submarine building program and new vessels were largely of the "S" class. However, durable though they be, technological advances were making them obsolete.

On November 21, 1933, an entirely new type submarine was launched by Electric Boat at Groton, Conn. Named *Cuttlefish*, it was the forerunner of the fleet type of World War II fame. Larger than the "S" class, it had two distinctly new features—a partial double hull and was partially welded (rather than completely riveted)—both of which enabled the submarine to dive deeper than its predecessors. A deck gun and 10 torpedo tubes made *Cuttlefish* at formidable fighting ship.

Following the *Cuttlefish* came *Shark*, the first all-welded submersible and the development of the fleet-type submarine had begun.

By World War II all vessels were fairly standard, averaging 310 feet in length and displacing about 1,500 tons. They were armed with either one or two 3-inch deck guns and had 10 torpedo tubes, 6 in the bow and 4 in the stern.

In the early days after Pearl Harbor the submarine became the Nation's primary sea weapon. The undersea Navy began offensive operations against the Japanese immediately after war was declared and by V–J Day had sunk more enemy shipping than the combined efforts of the surface fleet and the Air Force. Comprising 1.6 percent of the Navy's wartime personnel, submariners accounted for 55 percent of all enemy shipping destroyed.

Following the war, extensive modifications were made in submarines. In an effort to increase underwater speed, superstructures and conning towers had been streamlined; deck guns and other protuberances which created underwater drag had been eliminated; the snorkel had been introduced; and high alloy steels allowed the vessels to operate at greater depths.

Yet, dispite technological advances and design improvements of a half century, the submarine was basically the same craft developed by John P. Holland—a surface ship that could operate underwater for a limited period of time. For example: at a speed of between 1 and 2 knots, an absolute minimum, a sub could remain submerged for a maximum of about 48 hours. At its top

underwater speed of about 8 knots, a submarine could operate submerged for no more than 1 hour.

Power limitations had long concerned submarine designers. In fact, John P. Holland had written in 1900: "Larger (more than 200 feet long) boats will never be feasible, unless we discover some better system of storing electricity than exists today—a contingency which is exceedingly doubtful."

Nuclear power was the long-awaited propulsion source for the submarine. It was to turn the submersible surface ship into a true submarine, capable of almost indefinite operation and no longer bound to the earth's atmosphere.

The first nuclear-powered submarine, *Nautilus* far exceeded the hopes of her most optimistic supporters. During her first 2 years of operation, *Nautilus* steamed over 62,000 miles without refueling and established new speed and endurance records. On a second core *Nautilus* went even further, pointing the way toward the Navy and Atomic Energy Commission goal of a nuclear core which would last at least the same duration as World War II.

Nautilus vividly demonstrated the new versatility of submarines in August 1958, when the submarine traveled from the Pacific to the Atlantic via the North Pole during a 4-day, 1,830-mile voyage.

Other nuclear submarines—*Seawolf*, *Skate* and *Sargo*—pioneered new areas of submarine operation. *Seawolf* remained submerged for 60 days completely independent of the earth's atmosphere, proving that extended submerged patrols are feasible from both mechanical and human standpoints.

Skate made two trips under the arctic ice, one during the northern summer and the second during its winter. On the first trip *Skate* surfaced nine times in lake-like openings in the ice. On the second it surfaced by pushing its way through the ice and on March 17, 1959, surfaced at the geographic North Pole.

More recently, the *Sargo* spent 31 days under the arctic ice on an exploratory mission, and duplicated the *Skate's* feat of surfacing at the Pole.

These achievements proved that the Arctic Ocean is not only accessible to nuclear submarines but is actually an operational area, open to nuclear submarines regardless of the season.

Nuclear power enabled a second revolutionary development to take place, this one in the field of design. Naval architects had long known that a shark-shaped hull was ideally suited for subsurface operations. Holland, in fact, had designed his submarines along this line. However, power limitations made the surface craft design (sharp bow, superstructure deck and conning tower) the most practical for the prenuclear era.

With the new power source at their disposal, designers developed a radically new type of submarine, the first of which was the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, built by General Dynamics and commissioned April 15, 1959. A shark-shaped hull, completely free of protruberances, a sail with diving planes mounted on it, and a single screw propeller made *Skipjack* the world's fastest and most maneuverable submarine. It's speed is highly classified with the Navy admitting only to "in excess of 20 knots," but *Skipjack* and others of the same class are altering previous concepts in underseas warfare.

A third advancement came with the Fleet Ballistic Missile submarine, a nuclear-powered submarine armed with the Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile. These submarines can launch missiles with nuclear warheads from beneath the surface, and because of their mobility are virtually immune from retaliation.

The first Polaris-firing nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington*, was launched June 9, 1959, by General Dynamics and commissioned the following December 30, marking an unprecedented building record for the atomic era.

A second such vessel, the *Patrick Henry*, recently completed initial builder's sea trials and is being readied for commissioning. Seven other Polaris submarines are under construction, including four of an entirely new design.

Our Irrevocable Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include, in part, an article by Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former president of the Security Council of the United Nations, and an intelligent, loyal friend of the United States of America.

The article by this distinguished statesman and diplomat was recently brought to my attention by my distinguished friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., associate editor of World Affairs and famed specialist on inter-American history and culture.

It is Dr. Thorning's belief, based upon exhaustive research, that Soviet China is more intimately involved in the Cuban regime than is the Kremlin itself.

The Red Chinese pattern of domination, he points out, is prominent in the so-called agrarian reform and in the gradual enslavement of the Cuban press.

At any rate, the facts about the Castro regime should be brought to the attention of the public. Moreover, the State Department has a responsibility to take effective action to uphold freedom and decency and to protect the legitimate rights and interests of this Nation in Cuba and elsewhere.

It can be generally agreed, I earnestly submit, that if, as believed and asserted by many responsible leaders and observers, the present Cuban Government is sympathetic with the general aims of the World Marxist Communist movement, that fact must be viewed with utmost concern and gravity by the Government of the United States.

Can we and our Latin-American friends remain unconcerned while such a government, not only gains a foothold but actively pursues Communist objectives in Latin America?

The American people want an affirmative policy and decisive action on this question. We can no longer afford to defer action, and the first step would be the convening of the American States. Such a convocation could well point the way, by cooperative measures, to find adequate solutions to safeguard freedom and democracy in this hemisphere.

Economic measures of swift and compelling effectiveness are also available to us and we should have long since already determined how and when to employ them.

The solution of this question can no longer be deferred without serious consequences to our Nation and this continent.

The article follows:

OUR IRREVOCABLE POSITION

With apologies for trying the patience of our readers, we must persist in depicting the picture of Cuban tragedy to the world, especially to the countries of the Americas, and the United States in particular.

The island is a powder keg capable of producing a conflagration of startling proportions unless drastic and energetic action is taken immediately.

We have explained our personal position in previous editions of this newsletter. We cannot be accused of a single violent crime. Not even the most fanatical partisan of Castro can accuse us of having enriched ourselves at the expense of the National Treasury. And we do not oppose the Castro regime because we have been victims of confiscation representing significant losses.

We oppose Castro because we consider it our duty to Cuba and to our people who deserve a better fate. We shall never accept the unfortunate island's conversion into the branch office of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

We are convinced that you have a situation in Cuba in which the Cubans themselves, acting alone without outside help will never be able to liberate themselves. History does not reveal a single case showing that this is possible. Only the contrary is in evidence.

We appeal for support from all men of good will who stand against international communism. We shall continue to do so since such is our duty, and we shall not slacken our efforts as long as we are physically able—opinions to the contrary do not matter. Whenever moral support has been offered in bad faith and does not tend to liberate Cuba from international communism, we shall consider ourselves free of any compromise. Above all, it is the fate of Cuba that concerns us.

We have said that what is dealt with here is the most important problem of all America, especially the United States, the spearhead of democracy and the anti-Communist movement of Latin America and the rest of the world as well.

We have never advocated a return to the past for Cuba, not only because of its impossibility, but because Cuba will not benefit from such a move.

We are aware that a social revolution has been going on in Cuba, which the Communists have directed for their own evil purposes, but which nevertheless, as sometime occurs in such cases, has produced certain reforms that previous governments should have proclaimed years ago.

We are firmly convinced that a movement against Castro is destined to fail if it does not count on the great masses of people within its ranks. The popular forces in Cuba are not and never have been Communists. The people live under a regime of terror and are subjected to a terrible onslaught of propaganda directed by Red specialists, all of which stands in the way of a calm analysis of the serious Cuban problem.

We are surprised at opinions expressed by Cubans to the effect that nothing has happened in our country during the last year. To think that a movement can be set up for the benefit of only one class seems to us to be an error. Much less can we accept the thesis that a class can direct national destinies which in the past has demonstrated that because of its nearsightedness

and selfishness it was unable to prevent certain happenings.

We maintain that the Cuban problem consists of the fact that a total Communist regime has been established in the island, a regime that stands unconditionally at the service of Moscow and Peiping.

A totalitarian police state does not respect any of the fundamental human rights; this occurs in all Communist countries.

A Communist regime in Cuba constitutes a threat to the security of the other American countries, mainly the United States. Everyone must take action against this dangerous situation and if they do not, they will have to answer to their respective peoples.

The Cubans will have to practice democracy sincerely, pursuant to the century in which we live. The people must be the true sovereign, and national majorities and also foreign elements should have the opportunity of profiting from our natural resources by the sweat of their brow, as is the custom in all civilized countries.

The American Coal Industry Through the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Urges Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton To Resist the Growing Demands of Importers of Foreign Residual Oil for an Increase in Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, in the role as spokesman for American coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-carrying railroads, and allied industries dependent upon coal, revealed grave concern over the efforts being made to cripple the President's petroleum import control program by increasing quotas on foreign residual oil being imported to the United States. Mr. Moody urged Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton in a letter dated April 5 to resist the clamor for an increase in the flood of foreign residual oil which has proved to be economic poison to the coal, railroad, and allied industries.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks the following news release giving the highlights of Mr. Moody's letter to Secretary Seaton together with a copy of the letter urging firm action in rejecting requests that foreign residual oil imports be increased:

DOMESTIC COAL INDUSTRY DEMANDS RESIDUAL IMPORT QUOTA BE REDUCED—ASSAILS FOREIGN OIL COMPANIES' ATTEMPTS TO WRECK PRESIDENT'S CONTROL PROGRAM, CREATING ARTIFICIAL SHORTAGE BY PRICE-CUT MARKETING METHODS

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The American domestic coal industry today called on Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton to hold firm against the growing demands of foreign oil importers to increase quotas of imported residual, and urged, instead, that allocations for the third quarter of this year be sharply reduced.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, the spokesman for U.S. coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, leading coal-carrying railroads and industries closely associated with coal, said in a statement that current pressure against the President's petroleum import control program is a serious threat to all domestic fuels industries and thus to the national security, which it was created to safeguard.

"We have just learned that a powerful contingent of lawyers and other representatives of major international oil companies met today with officials of the Department of Interior and demanded in the strongest terms that present quotas for residual oil be ignored and new allocations granted for the remainder of the first two quarters of this year," Mr. Moody declared. "These demands are being made despite the fact that the heavy burn season is now ending, and that any spot shortages of residual that may exist have been artificially created by frantic marketing activities to dispose of residual to new users, in many cases at prices well below the posted prices and established at levels to undercut coal. Besides, all information we have is that east coast and gulf stocks of residual are at safe levels to meet any demands that may develop in the foreseeable future."

"As Mr. Elmer Bennett, Under Secretary of the Interior Department, pointed out in a recent letter to the president of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the major importing companies have a responsibility equal to that of the Government in connection with the import control program, as with other national security programs. He noted that most importers have fully met this responsibility.

"We cannot believe," Mr. Moody asserted, "that the millions of American citizens dependent on the domestic coal and other domestic fuels industries for their livelihood are to be penalized by letting those few major foreign oil importers who may not have met those responsibilities destroy the President's import allocation program."

Earlier today Mr. Moody had written Secretary Seaton urging that third-quarter quotas for residual imports be reduced to the 1957 level, the base year originally contemplated in the President's proclamation.

"Since the heavy burn season is now ending for this year, demand will be considerably less for the next several months, even despite the new consumption recently stimulated by the price-cutting marketing activities of certain importers," the coal spokesman's letter declared. "Therefore, we urge that the next quotas be set for a 3-month period beginning July 1, and be based on a 1957 level (daily), seasonally adjusted to allow for the normally low consumption during the summer."

He pointed out that such a stand by the Department of the Interior would "serve to convince these few large international oil companies that they must meet their responsibilities to the Nation and to national security.

"It would likewise be of tremendous encouragement to the millions of American citizens dependent on the domestic fuels industries and to those seriously concerned with a self-sufficiency of dependable fuel within our borders to meet any demands of national emergency," he asserted.

Mr. Moody's letter to Secretary Seaton follows:

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We continue to hear disturbing rumors, perhaps inspired by international oil importing interests, that there may be an increase in residual oil import quotas for the remainder of the present 6-month quota period. We want again to call your attention to the serious effect such action would have on the 2 million American people in this country who are dependent on the domestic coal industry.

We find it hard to believe that our Government could seriously consider an increase in quotas, which are already 26 percent higher than the level of 1957 established in the President's proclamation of mandatory controls last year, merely to meet a situation brought about by the frantic sales efforts of three or four giant international oil companies seeking to extend their markets.

It is obvious that a few large international companies, who have imprudently exhausted much of their half year's quotas while creating an artificial demand through sales well below listed prices, are using this rigged situation to claim that shortages will soon deprive many users of essential fuels, and are thus putting tremendous pressure on your department further to increase allocations between now and June 30.

We do not refer to the many companies who, as Mr. Bennett pointed out in his recent letter to the president of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) have "fully met" a "responsibility equal to that of the Government in connection with this [program], as with other national security programs." Instead, the present situation has been created by a few companies which have expended a large percentage of their quotas in the first 3 months, and are now exerting pressures for an allotment increase which would virtually wreck the import-control program and would be disastrous to the domestic coal and domestic oil industries.

We trust that imperative considerations of the welfare of millions of Americans, as well as of national security, will prevail and that these attacks on the President's mandatory control program will be unsuccessful.

Indeed, we believe the facts prove that, instead of increasing import quotas, the amount of residual oil now being permitted to be imported into this country should be materially reduced.

When the President was forced to impose mandatory quotas on petroleum and petroleum products in March of 1959, following unsuccessful attempts to limit imports voluntarily, his proclamation provided that the imports of residual fuel oil should not exceed the level of imports of that product into districts I–IV during the calendar year 1957 (or 343,445 barrels per day). The mandatory program was extended to residual oil because of a finding by the President that unrestricted imports posed a threat to the national security.

Twice since then the Department of Interior, by administrative decision as permitted in a revision of the President's proclamation, has increased quotas above the 1957 level so that present quotas permit the import of 425,000 barrels daily. On an annual basis, this is the equivalent of 38 million tons of coal, compared to 30 million tons lost to imported residual oil in 1957.

The loss of this tonnage is a severe economic blow to the domestic coal industry. Recent press stories have pointed to the pitiful plight of thousands of unemployed coal miners in this country, and any further inroads on coal's markets by cheap imported residual could only add to their suffering. Also, it should be realized that the effect of this unemployment spreads widely throughout the communities and areas in which it exists—to merchants, school and tax districts, transportation agencies, service establishments and all who depend secondarily on a healthy coal industry for their prosperity.

Mr. George H. Love, chairman of the National Coal Policy Conference and chairman of the board of Consolidation Coal Co.,

Pittsburgh, recently told the annual dinner of the conference that residual imported at a level higher than that for 1957 would "tend to put the coal industry and railroads on a standby basis, and on such a basis there is no way to maintain either of them."

"Certainly the threat of war prevents us from letting our country become dependent on these importations, but even without war, governments and circumstances can change and foreign oil sources be cut off," he pointed out.

In view of all these facts, we think that the Oil Import Administration and the Department of the Interior should give serious consideration to an immediate reduction on quotas to no more than the 1957 levels originally contemplated in the President's proclamation.

Since the heavy burn season is now ending for this year, demand will be considerably less for the next several months, even despite the new consumption recently stimulated by the price-cutting marketing activities of certain importers. Therefore, we urge that the next quotas be set for a 3-month period beginning July 1, and be based on a 1957 level (daily) seasonally adjusted downward to allow for the normally low consumption during the summer. If this resulted in any legitimate shortage of stocks by fall, ample time would remain to rebuild them for heavy winter demand beginning in October.

Meantime, however, such a firm stand by the Department of Interior would serve to convince these few large international oil companies that they must meet their responsibilities to the Nation and to national security.

It would likewise be of tremendous encouragement to the millions of American citizens dependent on the domestic fuels industries and to all those seriously concerned with a self-sufficiency of dependable fuel within our borders to meet any demands of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

Copco Code of Business Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the president of the California-Oregon Power Co. established a code of ethics, applicable to business dealings and personal relationships among the members of the Copco organization, in 1941.

It has been my experience that the Copco people, both executives and employees, take this code seriously. It has significance for citizens throughout any community.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including the text of this "Code of Business Ethics":

CODE OF BUSINESS ETHICS

Deal honestly, fairly, and lawfully with all concerned. Make your business and personal conduct above reproach.

Your business will be most profitable if you charge the lowest possible rates and develop the largest volume of service.

Try to set a high standard. Keep the cards on the table. We want no secret deals, no favoritism, no corruption. Sooner or later the people will understand. This course may cause you harder work for a time, but eventually it will make it easier.

Never forget that your company is a public servant that wants no dollar it does not fairly earn.

Take the people into your confidence. Give them the facts.

Treat your customers as human beings, realizing that mutual good faith and tolerance form the basis of successful commerce between man and man.

Participate in the public and semi-public welfare activities of your city.

Maintain the old-fashioned virtues. They will always win in the long run. We are back of you to the last dollar as long as you do your honest best, but we will not forgive any act that is not clean and honorable.

Governor Ribicoff's Plea for Action on the Stalled Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished Governor of Connecticut, the Honorable Abraham A. Ribicoff, is well known to many of my colleagues by virtue of his service here as the Representative of the First Congressional District of Connecticut in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

One of Abe Ribicoff's outstanding contributions as Governor has been the dramatic and forceful way in which he has reduced the accident record on Connecticut's highways. As chairman of the Committee on Roads and Highway Safety of the National Governors' Conference, Governor Ribicoff recently delivered a memorable address at the Highway Day observance luncheon in Wilmington, Delaware. I call to the earnest attention of my colleagues the Governor's sober and thoughtful presentation of the dilemma of the States in the current debate over the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway program. Governor Ribicoff's address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF AT THE HIGHWAY DAY OBSERVANCE LUNCHEON, WILMINGTON, DEL., APRIL 4, 1960

It may seem strange to some that a Democratic Governor should be speaking to you today at the invitation of a Republican Governor.

There is a simple explanation for it.

Any Governor who is at all sensitive to his public responsibilities, and this goes also for officeholders on all levels of government, is continuously aware of the fact that there are many issues and problems affecting his State and its people which transcend politics.

To bring to such problems a narrow partisan view is to court a great harm. It delays or makes impossible solutions required by the public interest.

One such problem is the uncertainty which has arisen over the future of the Federal interstate and defense highway program authorized by Congress in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Both Governor Boggs and I have become deeply involved in this question, he as chairman of the National Governors' Conference and I as chairman of the Governors' Conference Committee on Roads and Highway Safety, an appointment I owe to him.

Creation of the committee last August at the annual meeting of the Governors' Conference reflected the mounting concern among all of us, regardless of party and geography, over a grave threat to the interstate highway program which had developed.

The Governors voiced their collective concern by listing the problem of financing the program as one for which "an effective solution must be found."

It is one to which all of us must address our best effort cooperatively and responsibly if we are to avoid serious consequences to our national economy, severe setbacks in the highway building and financing programs of our States, and impairment of Federal-State relations.

The specific problem can be simply stated.

Congress, recognizing the necessity and wisdom of developing a nationwide network of highways, took a long step toward financing such a program by providing in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 for the creation of a highway trust fund into which would be deposited certain highway user taxes to pay for these roads.

It has developed, however, that tax money being paid into the highway trust fund will fall far short of the $37 billion now estimated will be needed in Federal funds to build by 1972, the present target date, the 41,000 miles of interstate highways authorized by Congress.

This gap poses an extremely difficult and complicated problem. It has created fiscal differences between the President and Congress which have served to slow down the highway program.

The Governors' conference committee on roads and highway safety feels strongly that construction of the entire 41,000 miles of interstate highways must be pushed to completion on schedule. It agrees with the Governors' conference that differences over financing the program "must be resolved to prevent the stifling of commerce, to promote highway safety and to protect the national security."

How do matters stand today? What specifically are the difficulties facing our States? What must we do responsibly and constructively to remove these difficulties and to wipe out the uncertainty over the future of the highway program?

Relying on the Highway Act of 1956 as well as the Highway Act of 1958 which fixed the current annual rates of authorized appropriations, States throughout the Nation mobilized their fiscal, engineering, planning, and construction resources to tackle this big and important program and push it to completion.

State highway departments expanded their staffs and stepped up their planning, engineering, and land acquisition activities. Construction forces were recruited. Commitments were made for equipment and materials. States adjusted their fiscal operations.

In short, the States accepted in good faith the program and the commitments and obligations that went with it, fully expecting at the same time an equal show of good faith from the Federal Government.

The many years of planning and study which gave birth to the concept of an integrated nationwide highway construction program, first written into legislation by Congress in 1944; the increase in the Federal Government's share of building these roads from the original 50 percent to the present 90 percent; the creation of the highway trust fund—all these can be accepted not only as evidence that the program was conceived in good faith but as evidence also of how vital the Federal Government considers the program.

But as it frequently happens with undertakings of such magnitude and importance, unforeseen complications requiring adjustments have developed in the program from time to time.

Currently, as I have already indicated, the complication which imperils the interstate highway program is rooted in the question of money. Long-range studies of this question are now being made. From them are expected to come among other things, a revised and detailed estimate of the cost of completing the 41,000 miles of interstate highways; a fuller understanding of the many direct and indirect benefits which such a program will bring to everyone, users as well as nonusers of highways; and an evaluation of the present method of sharing the cost of the program.

The Governors recognize the desirability and wisdom of such a study. We can understand the necessity for careful examination of problems as they arise and for adjustments which may be required. We are confident of the ultimate success of the program.

But they consider unfortunate any action—or lack of action—which serves to slow down the program.

Reports on the studies to which I have just referred are not due until 1961. There is an immediate problem confronting the States, however, which cannot wait on 1961 for ultimate long range answers. It is the problem of keeping the program moving reasonably on schedule during the fiscal years of 1961 and 1962. To do so, it is imperative that the present Congress enact legislation providing sufficient funds to equal the rate of spending authorized in the 1958 Federal Aid Highway Act.

This act authorized $2.5 billions for fiscal 1961 and $2.2 billions for fiscal 1962, a total of $4.7 billions. Cutbacks made by Congress and by the executive branch have reduced the 1961 figure to $1.8 billions. Of the $2.2 billions authorized for 1962, an estimated $2 billions will be apportioned.

The effect of these cutbacks totaling $900 million has been to shake the confidence of the Governors in the whole concept of Federal-State relations; raise questions as to how far the States dare go in the future in making long-range plans and commitments when pegged to Federal legislation which says one thing today and another thing tomorrow; and create doubts as to the time when we can fully enjoy the maximum benefits from these highways.

In all, the situation which has developed from these cutbacks and other restrictive acts which I shall not recite today is truly an unhappy one. It is particularly so because of the impasse which has developed between the executive and the legislative branches as to how the Highway Trust Fund should be replenished, so that we may put an end to cutbacks, contract controls, and other devices and get these urgently needed highways built as planned and on time.

Briefly, the White House has taken the position that if more money is to be made available for the program, it must come from higher taxes—a-half-cent-a-gallon increase in the gasoline tax on top of the 1-cent increase made last summer.

Congress has made it quite plain that it will not accept a further tax increase. It thus becomes apparent that the highest statesmanship will be needed to bring them together in good will and mutual respect for an earnest effort to work out a practical and effective solution.

The Governor's conference committee on roads and highway safety is convinced that such a solution, consistent with sound budgetary policies and fair tax policies, is not only possible but that the interest of the Nation and the States demands it.

Spurred by this conviction and recognizing that the Governors, both as responsible citizens and as spokesmen for their States, are duty bound to help in every way possible, the committee has engaged in a series of conferences with White House spokesmen, congressional leaders and others in an effort to establish the basis for a reasonable reconciliation of the differences between the President and Congress.

We have been cordially received in Washington. We have been given courteous and respectful hearings. We have made specific proposals for raising the money needed to restore the 1961 and 1962 apportionments to the levels authorized by Congress in 1958.

All of this, let me stress again, the Governors have done without regards to politics or geography because there are no Republican, no Democratic highways whether they cut through dense urban areas to save them from traffic strangulation, open up wide rural areas to speed farm produce to our markets, or link our States into a tighter union for purposes of national security and defense.

Yet, as of this very moment, we have been unable to thaw the frozen position of either the White House or Congress.

What, specifically, have the Governors suggested as a possible solution? Generally, we have proposed this plan to both White House representatives and congressional leaders:

1. The Federal Government plans to deposit into the highway trust fund beginning with the 1962 fiscal year 50 percent of the automobile and parts excise tax, all of which now goes into the general fund. We propose that this 50 percent amounting to $815 million be deposited in the highway trust fund starting with the 1961 fiscal year instead. It should be pointed out that the cutbacks were made with the explanation that the fiscal situation dictated a policy of retrenchment. With a $4 billion dollar surplus now a possibility for the 1961 budget, it would seem only fair that since the highway program suffered when the fiscal picture looked bleak, it should share in the benefits of a brighter fiscal picture.

2. That return of $359 million which was advanced by the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund be deferred. The administration has set June 30 of this year as the due date. We propose repayment in two installments—part in fiscal 1961 and the balance in fiscal 1962.

3. That the present extra 1-cent a gallon gasoline tax be continued through the 1932 fiscal year rather than expire on June 30, 1961.

The net revenue from these combined proposals would total roughly $1 billion for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962. We see it as a practical and constructive way of solving the immediate problem—a solution which would honor the Federal Government's commitment to the States and which, at the same time, permit the States to proceed expeditiously and in an orderly fashion with the program as contemplated under the Federal Aid Highways Acts.

The Governors have offered this program not in a spirit of finality. It is offered rather in the earnest hope that it will serve as a basis for joint White House-Congress discussions leading to a reasonable compromise.

I have discussed the Interstate Highways in some detail because none of us, as good citizens, can in good conscience allow this program to be crippled by indifference, inaction, or stalemate either in Washington, in our States, in our cities and towns or among our citizens.

The reasons for this are many. Most of them you know, so that they need not be listed here. I feel, however, that because of my chairmanship of a Governors conference committee which is concerned not only with highways but with highway safety as well, I should underscore one benefit equally offered to all of us, whatever our politics, wherever we live—the opportunity to save lives.

The 41,000 miles of highways have been designed to connect more than 90 percent of all our cities with populations of more than 50,000. It is estimated that these highways will handle more than 20 percent of the Nation's traffic.

The importance of all this when translated into terms of highway safety stands out in bold relief when we look at the estimated number of lives that these highways are expected to save.

The figure is more than 3,500 annually—nearly 10 percent of the traffic death rate for 1959.

I can make no stronger plea that the program be stripped of its uncertainties, its delays, its cutbacks, its contract controls than to recite this one figure.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Wisconsin Babysitter To Receive Young American Bravery Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the White House Conference on Children and Youth had just completed its meetings here in Washington.

During the Conference, constructive efforts were made to resolve a wide variety of problems involved in improving opportunity for individual growth, as well as strengthening the fiber of the youth of America.

Currently, too, there are a number of proposals pending before Congress which would deal with the negative side of the question—that is, how to cope with the ever-growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

All too often, unfortunately, the so-called delinquent children—out of step with society in conduct—get the headlines for their antics and misdeeds.

By contrast, the activities of the majority of aspiring, dedicated, talented, creative youth—as they constructively strive to prepare themselves for a responsible adult life—go by with little or no notice, to say nothing of fanfare.

For this reason, I always welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to outstanding individuals who, by their acts, as responsible young people in the community, demonstrate the best qualities of youth.

By meritorious deeds, they often demonstrate a great source of responsibility and duty, concern for their fellow men—accompanied by the willingness to give of themselves, sometimes to sacrifice themselves—in circumstances of stress and crisis.

Today I refer specifically to Miss Sharon Lois Boero, of Independence, Wis., who was recently selected to receive the Young American Bravery Award.

As we recall, Congress established the Young American Medals for Bravery and Young American Medal for Service to provide recognition of boys and girls who performed outstanding acts of bravery or service.

Recently Sharon Boero, acting as a babysitter for a family in Independence, Wis., risked her life to rescue children from a fire-engulfed apartment.

In recognition of this outstanding act of bravery, former Governor Thomson, recommended Sharon for the Young American Medals Awards.

Recently, Attorney General Rogers paid just recognition of her act of heroism by selecting her for the award to be presented at some later date.

Reflecting upon the greatness innate in our youth—needing encouragement to come to the surface not only in times of stress, but in regular daily life—I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Wisconsin State Journal, as well as excerpts of a statement from the Department of Justice on the award program, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 4, 1960]

WISCONSIN BABYSITTER TO RECEIVE YOUNG AMERICAN BRAVERY AWARD

WASHINGTON.—A Wisconsin babysitter and a Connecticut lifeguard have been chosen to receive the Young American Medals for Bravery for 1958.

Attorney General William P. Rogers announced Sunday that Sharon Lois Boero, 18, of Independence, Wis., and Neil Lorenson, Jr., 15, of Waterbury, Conn., will receive the medals awarded annually since 1950.

RESCUES GIRL

Sharon was selected "because of her bravery and the disregard of her own safety in rescuing three children from a burning building and assisting in the rescue of a fourth," the Justice Department announcement said.

Lorenson won his medal for the rescue of a girl who had been swept out to sea by a riptide in high surf off fog-enshrouded Fenway Beach at Weekapaug, R.I., August 14, 1958.

The youngsters, chosen by a committee which included FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, get an all expenses paid trip to Washington to receive their medals from President Eisenhower. A date for the ceremony has not yet been set.

Congress established the Young American Medal for Bravery and Young American Medal for Service to provide recognition for boys and girls who perform outstanding acts of bravery or service each year. There were no recommendations for the service award for 1959.

Sharon is the daughter of Louis and Margaret Scott Boero. Her father was killed while serving with the Navy in the Pacific during World War II. She was recommended for the bravery medal by former Wisconsin Gov. Vernon W. Thomson for her rescue of the four children of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Everson the night of February 8, 1958.

While sleeping on a davenport ,she was awakened by smoke and found the area of the apartment where the children were sleeping engulfed in flames. Calmly, she took Ellen, 3, in her arms and Peggy, 8, by the hand and led them out of the building. She reentered the blazing building, suffering burns on both her hands and face, to rescue the other two children.

KEEPS HER AFLOAT

Neil was assisting the regular lifeguard at Fenway Beach when he performed his spectacular rescue.

Neil kept Catherine Buchanan, 10, of Ontario, Canada, afloat in the heavy seas for nearly 30 minutes while tides pushed them away from shore before lifeguards could tow them to safety.

Attorney General William P. Rogers announced today that Young American Medals for Bravery for 1958 would be awarded to Sharon Lois Boero, a Wisconsin high school girl, and Neil Walter Lorenson, Jr., a young lifeguard whose home is in Connecticut but whose act of heroism was performed at a beach in Rhode Island.

Miss Boero was selected for an award because of her bravery and disregard of her own safety in rescuing three children from a burning building and assisting in the rescue of a fourth. She was the children's babysitter.

Attorney General Rogers said that he had approved the awards upon the recommendation of the Young American Medals Committee of the Department of Justice. The members of this committee are J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin, and Luther A. Huston, Director of Public Information.

Congress established the Young American Medal for Bravery and Young American Medal for Service in 1950 to provide recognition for boys and girls who, prior to their 19th birthday, perform outstanding acts of bravery or service during each calendar year. The law permits but does not require the bestowing of two medals annually in each category. Nominations for the awards are submitted by the Governors of the States and territorities and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Including the 1958 awards, 12 medals for bravery and 4 for service have been bestowed since the program was set up.

The Young American Medals Committee did not recommend a service medal award for 1958.

Sharon Boero was babysitting with the four children of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Everson, a storekeeper of Independence, Wis., on the night of February 8, 1958. Sharon's young half sister was also in her care. Mr. and Mrs. Everson were away. The Eversons lived in an apartment behind the store.

Sharon, sleeping on a davenport, was awakened by smoke and found that the area of the apartment where the children were sleeping was engulfed in flames. She seized the telephone to call for help but the wires had been destroyed by the fire. Calmly, she awakened the children and was successful in removing them to a hall while she searched for blankets to protect them from subzero weather outside.

Sharon took 3-year-old Ellen Everson in her arms and 8-year-old Peggy by the hand. She told 5-year-old Virginia and 7-year-old Ronald Everson, and 9-year-old Marie Arneson, her half sister, to follow her down the blazing stairs. On reaching the outside with Ellen and Peggy, Sharon found that the other three had not followed her instructions. Without a thought for her own safety she reentered the blazing building, found Virginia and carried her to safety. Again she tried to return to the building but the door had slammed shut and she was unable to open it. She was burned on her hands and face while trying. Ronald, whose father said he was a heavy sleeper, had gone back to bed instead of following Sharon but she obtained help from a neighbor who brought a ladder, climbed up and rescued the boy through a bedroom window. Marie, instead of following Sharon down the steps, broke a window in the smoke-filled room, climbed out on the

roof of a porch and slid to safety down a drainpipe.

Sharon Boero was born May 29, 1942, at Kenosha, Wis., the daughter of Louis and Margaret Scott Boero. Her father was killed in the Pacific theater of operations while sarving in the U.S. Navy in World War II. Sharon lived with her mother and grandmother at Chippewa Falls, Wis., for a time and at the time of her act of heroism was living on a farm near Independence with her mother and stepfather Ernest Jacobson. She is attending high school at Independence and her teachers say that her act of saving these children was an example of outstanding characteristics she has exhibited in other fields of activity.

Sharon's nomination for the Bravery Medal was submitted by Vernon W. Thompson, then Governor of Wisconsin.

Address of Former Governor McKeldin at Purdue University Mock Political Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of the State of Maryland, at the Purdue University Mock Political Convention, held in Lafayette, Ind., on Thursday, March 24, 1960.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with Governor McKeldin's speech a list of those advisers and officials who played a part in this very interesting and successful convention.

There being no objection, the address and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, 1951–59, PURDUE UNIVERSITY MOCK POLITICAL CONVENTION, WEST LAFAYETTE, IND., MARCH 24, 1960

The Purduvian Party, which I represent today, enjoys a distinct advantage over all other parties in that it has no historical entanglements, no prior commitments to restrict its course of action. It is, as lawyers might say, protected by the Statute of Mortmain—no "dead hand" lies upon it to hold it back from adopting any policy that is clearly to the interest of the United States, even though it may offend some minor interest, or some regional, or sectarian, or racial prejudice.

The program that I offer, then, should be taken as adapted strictly to the Purduvian Party. Most of it, as I believe, would be a good program for any other party, but I am not prepared to urge it upon any other because it takes no account of the political expediencies by which other parties are hampered and harassed. We here proceed uncommited, not entangled; which is a privilege not enjoyed by the others.

Nevertheless, even we are restricted to some extent by the very fact that we are an American party, operating under the American political system. Our program, therefore, must take account of the basic factors governing all political activity in this Republic. Most of these are spelled out for us in the Constitution of the United States, and I need spend no time on them; but there are some that are not written in any law, constitutional or statute, and these are not always understood. Yet because they are embedded in public opinion they are enforced more rigidly than any article of the Constitution or any statute enacted by Congress. If you are unscrupulous and ingenious enough you can evade or avoid almost any written law; but whatever is supported by a powerful public opinion you cannot escape. Respect for public opinion is a condition of survival.

An American political party may make a mistake in policy and, though defeated, yet survive.

A party may make a mistake in a man and, though punished for supporting a crook or a fool, yet survive.

But if a party makes a mistake in its judgment of the time it is on the road to destruction and, unless it corrects the error quickly, soon the place that knew it shall know it no more forever.

What I mean is this: If you merely shift the zero on the calendar and instead of reading today's date as 1960, you read it as 1906, you are politically ruined.

But that, you may say, is arrant nonsense. Nobody makes a mistake like that, and it is silly to consider it.

Are you sure? Maybe nobody does make the mistake in dating letters and writing checks, but you may take my word for it that there are thousands of men who do exactly that when it is a matter of adjusting their political ideas. Perhaps few go back as far as 1906, but some go back to 1926, many to 1936, and so many are still living in 1946 that they constitute the most serious threat to intelligent government today.

When a political party is dominated by men whose minds are as much as 14 years behind the times, that party is on the way to join the Federalists, the Whigs, the Know-Nothings, the Anti-Masons, the Constitutional Unionists, and all the other parties buried in the cemetery of dead ideas.

The Purduvian Party, therefore, must first of all realize that this is 1960 and its program must deal with the problems of this year. It cannot gain the respect of the voters by proclaiming eternal opposition to Mussolini and Hitler, much less Kaiser Wilhelm and Jess Davis and King Geore III. It cannot arouse enthusiasm by favoring digging the Panama Canal, or votes for women, or the Payne-Aldrich tariff. It must talk of those things that interest the people here and now, or they will simply; become bored; and there is nothing deader than a political party that becomes a bore.

Unquestionably, the central political problem of today, the central question around which all others are in orbit, so to speak, is the question of national survival. This is more than curious, it is wholly unfamiliar for not since Cornwallis surrendered in 1781 have the American people cherished serious doubts of their survival. But they are worried about it in 1960.

There are two ways of looking at this question, depending on how you understand the word "survival." Literally, surviving means simply living through a crisis, but it seems to me that every American worthy of the name ought to have a broader conception than that. National survival means not only that the people shall continue to live, but that the Nation shall continue to exist, much as it has existed in the past.

The difference is important, because some measures that might enable the people to continue to live would mean the extinction of the Nation. For instance, we could easily remove all danger of the butchery of our people by surrendering to the Communists and submitting to their tyranny. But who wants to live on such terms?

We can achieve a pretty fair chance of survival by arming to the teeth, shutting off nearly all outside contacts, and becoming a garrison state, something like ancient Sparta. But that would not be the United States as we have known it. It would be an entirely different country, and while the people might continue to live, the Nation would not survive.

But if we discard both these ideas as too monstrous to be considered, all that is left is a very complicated policy about which nobody can be certain. It means taking a calculated risk, and relying on expedients that have not been tried before, and therefore may or may not work. Of course, men whose ideas all go back to 1906 or 1946 are against doing anything of the kind. If a policy was not tested and accepted by grandfather, they are against it. Yet it must be done, if the Nation 20 years hence is to be anything like our country as we know it now.

For imperial communism is not a figment of the imagination, it is a fact. In the beginning most Americans, including some of the wisest, believed it was a sort of mental aberration that would soon disappear; but 43 years have passed and it is still with us. Apparently we are going to have to live with the thing for a long time to come; and we can't live with it in the same way that we lived with the old German, and Austrian and Turkish empires, for it is not the same kind of thing.

A party that doesn't recognize this is a party that simply is not living in 1960. It is like the horse in the famous old story. It was a handsome horse, fine head, glossy coat, long flowing mane and tail—in fact, perfect in every feature. The only trouble with it was that the horse was dead.

I submit that a political party that has no idea of how to get along in the world today except the way that we got along before the Communist power appeared is like that horse. It may be handsome in every respect, but it is dead, even if it won'e lie down. Let that never be said of the Purduvian Party.

Obviously, we must look to our military defenses; and if we are attacked, we must be ready and able to defeat the attacker. Obviously, adequate defense will require a great many men and a great deal of money. But the idea of being prepared to repel an attack was old when Hammurabi raised the great walls of Babylon more than 4,000 years ago.

The Purduvian Party realizes the need of strong national defense and it favors the expenditure of whatever sums may be needed to provide that defense. Nor are we disposed to haggle over details. When we are asked, How much can we afford to spend on defense? Our answer is, as much as is necessary.

But we propose to go further. There are two methods of national defense. One is to build up our military power. The other is to reduce the threat. Our policy is to build up the power, but without relaxing for a single minute the effort to find ways of reducing the threat. To that end, we will explore any avenue, we will listen to anybody, we will consider any proposal. We will reject nothing simply because it is new or simply because it is suggested by someone whom we dislike. We will not be scared off by names, nor trapped by catchwords. Whatever is reasonable and right shall have a place in our program, regardless of its novelty or its origin.

We are aware, too, that our point of view is not necessarily the only valid one. We propose to avoid carefully the intellectual arrogance that assumes that our way is always the best way, not only for ourselves but for all other men. We are not going to brand as a traitor every man who suggests that there are some things that we might do better. The Declaration of Independence

acknowledges that in 1776 we held "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." We are going to maintain that respect.

With this in view we favor constant examination of any domestic policies that incur criticism at home or abroad. The mere fact that they are criticized does not prove that they are wrong; but it does indicate that we should examine them carefully and in a reasonable spirit, not defend them blindly simply because they are ours and may have served well in the past.

In such matters as race prejudice, freedom of speech, economic opportunity, and fair dealing in politics, in commerce, and in society, we realize that it is necessary to avoid, as the Apostle said, even the appearance of evil. To do that, we favor reasonable alterations even of our domestic institutions.

In short, we oppose every form of aggressive imperialism, even in the intellectual realm. Indeed, we oppose it most of all in the intellectual realm, for we have no fear that the American people will tolerate imperialism in the political and geographical worlds. But there are those among us who, professing to abhor military aggression, yet consider it patriotic to exhibit a ruthless and domineering spirit in our relations with the outside world. This the Purduvian Party opposes and deplores.

And yet, in summoning all Americans to join in the work of solving modern problems by modern methods, discarding the obsolete however valuable it may have been in the past, and not shrinking from the new because it is untried, we are in fact adhering to an idea that is as old as the Republic. It was George Washington who said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair." To raise such a standard is the purpose of our party; and under it we intend to heed the admonition of Lincoln, "to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY PURDUVIAN PARTY MOCK POLITICAL CONVENTION, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IND., MARCH 24, 25, 26, 1960

Fredrick L. Hovde, president of the university; Donald R. Mallett, executive dean; Dr. Ken Kofmehl, adviser; John R. Kleber, national chairman; David S. Brandt, national treasurer; Julie Post, national secretary; Roi E. Baugher II, permanent chairman; Harry Sharp, parliamentarian; Kathryn Elder, credentials committee; Adam Fisher, public relations committee; Jane Anne Chapman, public relations committee; Timothy Wittlinger, actual convention committee; Syd Steele, rallies and parades committee; Carol Lynn Mrva, State delegation committee; Charles Riepe, platform committee; Caroline Sumerford, platform committee; David Ransburg, keynote speaker committee; Margo Pautler, historian; Sally Runk, reading clerk; Bill Leber, tally clerk; Judy von Rosen, exponent coverage.

Announcement of Rollcall Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, if I had been present and voting on House rollcall votes 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 18, and 38, during the months of February and March 1960, I would have voted "yea" in each instance.

Senator Dirksen Legislative Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in yesterday's Evening Star an excellent column by the eminent writer, William S. White. This editorial, recognizing the leadership of Senator DIRKSEN, is a fitting tribute to the excellent record the Illinois Senator has made as Republican leader.

It is my privilege to represent the 18th Congressional District of Illinois which Senator DIRKSEN served so well from 1933 to 1949 when he retired from the House and subsequently defeated, in the Senate race, Scott Lucas, who was then the Democrat majority leader. I am sure I can speak for the people of the Senator's home district and wish him continued success in executing so effectively the heavy burdens and responsibilities of his present office.

Mr. Speaker, I want to include at this point Mr. White's article which points out so well that Senator DIRKSEN has met the test and is, even now, considered a better floor leader than was Taft or Knowland.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1960]

A RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DIRKSEN—REPUBLICANS' "LEGISLATIVE MAN OF YEAR" LAUDED FOR RECORD AS MINORITY LEADER

(By William S. White)

If there were any real justice in politics—as, of course, there isn't—the Republicans would now be designating Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and their Legislative Man of the Year.

He has now entered the last lap of his first session as the GOP Senate leader. Simple fairness compels this report, from a correspondent who once had no difficulty in restraining his admiration. This Senator is doing a good job, a responsible job, for his party and even for his country.

Senator DIRKSEN is actually a better floor leader than was either of his far more famous immediate predecessors, Senators Robert A. Taft and William F. Knowland.

Old cliches die hard, perhaps because a cliche usually becomes one only because it is based on truth. Senator DIRKSEN was long seen by most Washington observers as a man of few fixed convictions and many thousands of purplish words—an overripe Shakespearean actor tossing his graying locks and skipping nimbly about among the issues.

As a Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, he had been an isolationist and then an internationalist and then an isolationist again through eight terms in Congress. When, in 1951, he came to the Senate this was the blunt but wide estimate: His promotion could be described as the Senate's loss and the House's gain.

Even in a body, the Senate, which relishes a good deal of what is called corn, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was considered to be quite too abundantly blessed with that commodity. On nearly any insider's list of those new Senators who were not going far, the name of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois would surely have led most, if not all, the rest.

Thus when last January the Senate Republicans set out to make Senator DIRKSEN their new leader there was much shaking of heads. Both Senators Taft and Knowland, whatever might have been said about them otherwise, had been leaders of extraordinary strength of character. It was suggested, not too delicately, that this quality—strength of character—was notably absent in Senator DIRKSEN.

But what has since happened? The DIRKSEN who had so long been thought so weak began repeatedly to show undeniable strength, both in his convictions and his work. Soon the Senate, at least, was aware that the new GOP spokesman was an able tactician than either Senator Taft or Senator Knowland. Moreover, once he had given his word, he stood with it as bravely as either of them ever did.

The plain truth today may seem surprising. Senator DIRKSEN has behaved with efficiency, with courage, with honor, with faithfulness to his partisan obligations but with a higher faithfulness to the interests of the United States of America.

The latest of many instances was in the Senate's civil rights fight. The Senator stood for a reasonable bill. Stoically he resisted all pressure from other Republicans for a punitive measure for which the South, of course, would have blamed the Democrats. He was unwilling to play that kind of politics with that kind of an issue—an issue involving the unity of the United States in a world of peril.

Were his detractors ever right in the past? Having been one of them, this columnist cannot with good taste attempt an answer.

But one thing is sure. Either they were wrong all along; or EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is another living illustration of one of the saving things about the American political system. This is that men thrown into positions of high responsibilities have a remarkably capacity to grow up to those responsibilities and ably to discharge them in the showdown.

Such a man is EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. And while the Republican Party may hardly pause this year to salute him, he has this anyhow: The awareness of the earned respect of one of the most acute judges of men in this world—the collective membership of the U.S. Senate.

New York State Cancer Education Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Department of Health has just inaugurated a vigorous campaign to educate the people of my State on the major symptoms of cancer and on the treatment of this deadly and dreaded disease. Governor Rockefeller has appropriately designated April as "Cancer Education Month."

The New York State Department of Health is presently circulating pamphlets designed to educate the people of my State on this very vital and important subject of significance to all persons of all ages.

I commend Governor Rockefeller and the department of health for this very excellent and worthwhile project, which I hope will be imitated by other States.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release outlining the aims and purposes

of New York's "Cancer Education Month" and in which the several danger signals of cancer are described, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, April 7.—"Cancer can be cured if found and treated in its early stages," Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, State health commissioner, said today.

Dr. Hilleboe, in expressing appreciation of Governor Rockefeller's designation of April as "Cancer Education Month," said that of all the scientifically proved facts about cancer, probably the most important is that the disease can be cured if treated early enough. He added, however, that salves, ointments, lotions, or patent medicines cannot cure cancer. "Only a physician can cure cancer by surgery, radiation, or chemotherapy," he said.

The State health commissioner said there are three important steps persons can take in controlling cancer. The first is to learn the early danger signals. The second is to see a physician immediately if you notice any of the danger signals, and the third is to have periodic physical examinations.

The danger signals are: Unusual bleeding or discharge; a lump or thickening in the breast or elsewhere; a sore that does not heal; change in bowel or bladder habits; hoarseness or cough; indigestion or difficulty in swallowing; change in a wart or mole.

"These three steps are of major importance in cancer control because they are ways of detecting cancer in its early stages when it can be cured," Dr. Hilleboe added.

Several pamphlets dealing with cancer are available from the State health department. Included are "Yes, Children Get Cancer, Too," "The Truth About Cancer," which describes the various types of cancer; and "A Monthly Check," which stresses the importance of breast self-examination for women and shows the correct procedure for breast self-examination.

Not the Grandest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Not the Grandest Hour," which appeared in the Richmond News-Leader of March 5, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT THE GRANDEST HOUR

"Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Chair inquire of the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama if he will yield to the Senator from North Carolina so that the Senator from North Carolina may propound to him another interrogatory?

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

"Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama is delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for a question.

"Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama if he agrees with the Senator from North Carolina that this is not the Senate's grandest hour?

"Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama has been in the Senate approximately 22 years. The Senator from Alabama thinks he has some knowledge of the long history of the Senate. The Senator from Alabama would certainly agree that this hour is far, far from being the Senate's grandest hour."

The elaborate filigrees of SAM ERVIN's inquiry were intended only to provide a touch of humor during the tedium of Wednesday's all-night session, but there was a sad truth in this 4 o'clock in the morning conversation. This is not the Senate's grandest hour. On the contrary, these round-the-clock sessions exhibit to the world a lunatic unreality. Here is the free world's greatest deliberative body, with a third of its Members sprawled on cots in the cloakrooms, some of its most able spokesmen droning on methodically to an almost empty Chamber, and the legislative process reduced to the level of a 7-day bicycle race or a marathon dance.

What accounts for this madness? The answer lies in politics, and in politics alone. The necessity for the pending legislation counts for nothing at all. If the embattled southerners have accomplished one thing in a week of debate, they have accomplished this: They have shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that abundant laws are on the Federal statute books now to protect every citizen's right to vote and to punish those who would deprive him of it. In the process, they have exposed the liberals' hypocritical demands as no more than the shabby oratory of a presidential year.

Abolitionist editors in the North, so choked with emotion they have lost their usual sense of balance, owe it to themselves to examine these laws. If they will descend from their pulpits, they will find awaiting their inspection, for example, title 18, section 242. It provides a fine of $1,000 and a year in prison for any person who under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom willfully deprives another of any right secured by the Constitution by reason of his race or color.

Title 18, section 594 goes directly to voting rights; it provides the same punishment for any person who intimidates, threatens, or coerces another for the purpose of interfering with the right of such other person to vote.

There also are civil remedies: title 42, section 1983, provides for damage suits in U.S. district court against any person who deprives another of his constitutional rights.

These laws exist now. They have existed for the past 90 years. They were supplemented in 1957 by still another law dealing with the same subjects. What possible public good could be served by piling on still more laws, extreme in their provisions, punitive in their spirit?

No public good can be served by the hundred-odd civil rights amendments now heaped on the clerk's desk. Only public harm can result from them, in further inflaming racial and sectional problems that need most desperately to be left alone for a while to heal.

Hon. Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because I was called home on March 30 I was unable to be present when my good friend, Hon. PAUL BROWN, was the recipient of many deserved eulogies on his birthday. I now want to add my small tribute of affection and esteem. PAUL BROWN has served on the Banking and Currency Committee with me for 25 years and for the last 15 years has sat next to me as the senior Democratic member. During that time I have been deeply impressed with his fine character, his genial friendly nature, and his devotion to duty. The committee has always been anxious for his counsel and advice because of his good judgment and sincerity. I know the Members join with me in expressing the wish that PAUL BROWN may have many years of service to his district, his State, and the Nation. His constituents have always held him in deep affection and I am sure they wish him to represent them as long as he desires.

I hope he may have health and happiness and a just reward for all his faithful service.

Mistaken Internationalism of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown entitled "Mistaken Internationalism of United States," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Saturday, April 2, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTAKEN INTERNATIONALISM OF UNITED STATES—EUROPEANS VIEW POLICY AS ANEMIC AND PLAYING INTO HANDS OF SOVIET

(By Constantine Brown)

PARIS.—"Since the death of Mr. Dulles your foreign policy makers require large quantities of liver and vitamin pills; to say the least, your foreign policy is anemic." These were the words of a distinguished French authority on diplomatic subjects who has an important post in the French Parliament.

This man is not a policymaker, since in France there is only one policymaker—General de Gaulle. But he is close to the general, and his point of view is frequently found in most West European newspapers with the exception of England. While our allies never liked John Foster Dulles, they respected his rigidity in dealing with the Kremlin.

In commenting on this phase of the late Secretary's character, my French friend pointed out that despite what we often described as brinkmanship, there has never been, to the knowledge of the continental European allies, a real risk of the Soviet Union or Red China retaliating because of those policies. Quite the contrary, according to reports from Moscow to Paris, the Russians were actually worried whenever Mr. Dulles spoke bluntly.

Since last spring our policy has changed radically and just at the time when our European allies have reached their peak in economic recovery and military posture. Germany has overcome the internal difficul-

ties which had caused her to be slow in creating her army of 50,000 for the NATO alliance; Italy has completed her quota of 12 ground divisions and has greatly improved her air and naval strength component, and France, while still heavily engaged in Algeria, is now working with nuclear power and missiles. All are taking no chance of Soviet attack.

But our allies, whom we built up at a terrific expense, have gained the well-founded impression that the United States has suddenly become anxious to meet more than halfway the Soviet demands for coexistence. A few years ago this Washington move would have been welcomed in continental Europe. But the Europeans have had a change of heart and our new policy is being received with amazement and has produced visible frustrations. And it would seem from the actions of our policymakers in Washington that they have not recognized this change in our allies' attitude.

In the last 2 years Western Europe has become nationalistic, while Washington, in the last 10 months or so, has veered toward internationalism or one worldism more than ever before.

I shall try to give a résumé of the frank thoughts expressed on that subject by my French friend and others I have contacted in other countries. It is doubtful if the State Department or CIA representatives have been given as clear a picture of the sentiments which prevail among our allies in Europe. Here is the résumé.

"Nationalism and internationalism do not go together. In the past we deplored your nationalism represented by isolationism because it permitted the totalitarian aggressors to launch two costly wars. But today we are equally concerned over your moving to extreme internationalism as represented by the idea of 'one world,' united and equal. It is a splendid idea which might come to fruition some time in the 22d or 23d century, or even later. But it is absolutely unrealistic in this century.

"You are once more an isolated island. While your statesmen and newspapers decry nationalism and see in internationalism the one and only cure for present world ailments, every other country in the world is becoming increasingly nationalistic. This does not only apply to the free world but also to that representing international communism. There is no fiercer national pride than in the Soviet Union and Communist China, where the foreigner is actually despised.

"In the free countries, nationalism has existed from time immemorial and has often been the cause of conflicts. There is no possibility of eradicating this deeply embedded feeling by a fiat from Washington. Your policymakers have been accustomed since the end of the war to giving orders to Europe. You imagine now that you can tell us to be internationalistic and we will do it instantly. This is no longer the case. Thanks to your assistance, we have completely recovered, economically and spiritually. It may be that spiritually we are even several jumps ahead of you.

"We don't want war any more than you do. But neither do we relish the idea of surrendering to the Soviet Union because you have figured out that you have no chance against them. We know the Russians, their qualities and their failings. And we are no longer scared or worried. Neither do they want a nuclear war, but so long as your political men and publicity media show themselves terrified over the possibility of such a tragedy, the Russians will have the advantage of it and push you into a corner. No American who comes to Europe will detect any kind of fear or concern over the military menace of the Soviet Union.

"In fact, your internationalism plays into the Soviet hands in a manner undreamed of by the Kremlin. For instance, you are pushing for the complete independence of the Black Belt in Africa in the expectation that in this manner you will keep those young nations out of Communist domination. How mistaken can you be? These totally backward countries, completely unprepared for independence, are falling into the Communist lap like rotten fruit. You are the most vociferous, though unwitting, advocates of handing over the whole of the African Continent to your most deadly enemy. But you don't realize it.

"Your fantastically rapid growth from a colony to the most powerful state the world has known since the days of Roman empires has made you impatient. You have embraced internationlism with the same fervor you once embraced isolationism. But this time you are likely to cause yourself and your frends even more injury than before."

Canada: Our Unknown Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Mr. Carl Rowan, the well-known feature writer of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, has written a series of articles called "Canada: Our Unknown Neighbor." Mr. Rowan reports widespread discontent with the United States-Canadian military relationship. The Canadian resentment is not so much with the technical decisions as the manner in which the decisions are reached. This has resulted, he reports, in many Canadians believing that their nation is being treated as a satellite instead of a free and independent ally. I ask unanimous consent to have two of Mr. Rowan's articles—Minneapolis Morning Tribune, April 1 and 2, 1960—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 1, 1960]

CANADA: OUR UNKNOWN NEIGHBOR—BATTLE OVER BOMARC HIGHLIGHTS "U.S. SATELLITE" THEME

(By Carl T. Rowan)

At 11 a.m. last Friday George Pearkes, Canada's Minister of Defense, stepped before the House of Commons to face what many in the galleries must have considered "the same old weary questions":

How long will Canada rely on a flop, the Bomarc missile, for the nation's defense?

How long will Canada be a U.S. satellite in the cold war?

Last Friday, however, the opposition was armed with a rumor that in a closed session the day before the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives had decided to reduce to "funeral expenses" funds for the Bomarc.

Just as he had for months during Canada's agonizing debate over military policy, George Pearkes stuck by the Bomarc. He brushed aside rumors the United States was about to ditch the missile with an assertion he had been "continually consulted" by Pentagon officials and that he was "fully informed."

Seven hours later George Pearkes called a press conference to announce that U.S. Congressmen had cut next year's appropriations for the Bomarc from $421 million to $50 million.

The United States now was going to spend a mere 40 percent of what Canada was shelling out for two Bomarc bases.

Pearkes insisted, nevertheless, that Canada would rely on the Bomarc as the keystone of the nation's defense.

In Commons, the Liberals and Socialists hammered hard at Pearkes, accusing the Government of "fabulous waste" on the Bomarc and of being "in the hip pocket of the United States."

"We are called a partner, but we are not a partner," said Hazen Argue, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Socialist). "We are not a partner in policy. We are not a partner in basic discussions; we are merely the errand boy for the United States in this defense program."

In the press and across the Nation, the angry rumblings of disenchantment over the United States-Canadian military partnership roared toward another crescendo.

Editorial writers breathed fire as they asserted that the United States had given Canada another slap in the face.

The Toronto Globe and Mail drew two conclusions from Pearkes' performance: that Canada's Defense Minister "was kept in ignorance until the last possible moment" and that "the United States still intends to deliver to Canada a weapon which it regards as too inefficient to be used in its own defense."

"UNITED STATES CONSULT US?" HUMBUG

The Winnipeg Free Press said the Pentagon had dealt "a cruel blow to Mr. Pearkes and to the Diefenbaker government."

As for Pearkes' claim he has been "continually consulted," the Free Press cracked there was "about as much consultation as there is between a tail and a dog."

The ironic coincidence is that the day of the Bomarc announcement, Canada's big weekend newspapers carried huge spreads on a book which urges Canada to discontinue all military alliances with the United States and the West and issue a "declaration of neutralism."

In "Peacemaker or Powder-Monkey," author James M. Minifie argues that the United States has lost world leadership because McCarthyism alienated too many people and because the Russians beat (the late Secretary of State) John Foster Dulles at his game of "massive retaliation."

"Minifie firmly believes that Canada must not continue to be the 'powder monkey' of a powerful country in which the dominating political forces are mercantilism, militarism, and nationalism, and where these noxious forces are the more difficult to control because of a traditional inclination toward violent solutions," said reviewer John Gellner in the Toronto Telegram.

The startling thing is not that Minifie (a former Canadian by way of England who now lives in Washington, where he is a political commentator for the Canadian Broadcasting Corp.) was suggesting neutrality, but that thousands of Canadians were of a mood to listen.

"Mr. Minifie shows the Canadian-American alliance at its worst," wrote B. T. Richardson, editor of the Telegram. "But no one can doubt that Canadian public opinion is much readier for his criticism of that alliance than it was 5 years ago.

"Ten years ago, the idea of neutrality was unthinkable in Canada. Today, the Canadian position in the world is undergoing intensive rethinking. Mr. Minifie has furnished a new focus of controversy that will greatly stimulate the process."

CANADA DEFENSE REVIEW AGONIZING

This is a painful process for Canada, caught geographically between the United States and Russia.

Ideologically committed to the United States, Canada, nevertheless, is filled with

much intellectual doubt as to the wisdom of U.S. policies.

It already has spent so many precious dollars for defense that it is like a poker player who has lost heavily and feels he must go on playing "catchup." So dependent on, so tied to, the United States economically and militarily is Canada that it is not sure it can "break away" even if it wanted to.

A further disturbing aspect of the whole business, as many Canadians see it, is that most Americans are totally unaware this "agonizing reappraisal" is taking place.

Should Americans be?

The answer depends to a great degree on how important Americans think Canada is to the defense of the continent of the United States.

Are those radar warning lines on Canadian soil (the DEW line, the Pinetree line and the mid-Canada line), for which we spent close to $3 billion and Canada more than $300 million, important to our security?

Or, as many Canadians now believe, has Russia's intercontinental ballistic missile rendered them obsolete?

SERIOUS DIFFERENCES BEGAN 2 YEARS AGO

Is it or is it not indispensable to our survival to have bases and bomber squadrons at the northern frontier of Canada; to have Canada in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to have Canada as a partner in North American air defense (NORAD)?

If these things are still crucial to defense, there is a disturbing sense of urgency about recent developments in the Canadian attitude.

Even if our missiles strength is such that we could forget Canada as a military ally, Americans would still wonder by what sequence of events our age-old ally could now view the Pentagon with such harshness, could entertain thoughts of neutrality.

The one feeling that seems to have permeated every level of Canadian society is that, largely because of what Canadians call Washington bungling, Canada has spent millions it could not afford and still has nothing in the way of military security.

Serious differences with Washington began a couple of years ago when Prime Minister John Diefenbaker finally agreed to junk Canada's Avro Arrow jet, at a loss of $400 million to the national budget and an immeasurable amount to the national ego.

Fighter interceptors are obsolete, insisted the Pentagon; we'll stop the manned bombers with a surface-to-air missile called the Bomarc.

After seven launching attempts, the Bomarc was still landlocked when Pearkes faced Commons last week. Canadians reacted with befuddlement, fear, anger, sarcasm, and suggestions Canada wash her hands of the whole defense mess and let the big powers wrangle.

CANADA RESENTS SHABBY TREATMENT

After the Bomarc's sixth fizzle, the Toronto Star said: "Whether or not the Bomarc ever performs, it will never defend one Canadian household. In event of war, any or every Canadian city could be atomized by hydrogen bombs, against which there is no defense."

Now the fear of being caught defenseless seems far less painful to Canadians than the "hurt feelings" inflicted by Washington.

"The relationship between Canada and the United States is of great interest abroad," reasoned the Toronto Globe and Mail. "While Canada, a relatively weak country, remains a free and independent ally of her mighty neighbor, an ally treated with dignity and respect, Canada presents convincing evidence of U.S. integrity * * *

"But if the United States shows any inclination to treat Canada as a satellite, U.S. integrity will soon be doubted.

"There is no doubt that Canada has been treated shabbily in the matter of the Bomarc. This fact must be drawn to U.S. attention in no uncertain manner."

CANADA: OUR UNKNOWN NEIGHBOR—CANADA TOYS WITH NEUTRAL ROLE IT KNOWS IT WON'T ASSUME

(By Carl T. Rowan)

It would be easy for Americans to dismiss Canada's grumblings over defense policies as just so much "blowing off steam."

The assumption here, as in much of Canada, is that our neighbors have no choice but to follow our lead.

But complaints of "shabby treatment" by the Pentagon, the increasing suggestions that Canada become "neutral," point up at least three questions that Americans cannot very wisely ignore.

The first is whether the impossible could happen, leaving Canadian expenditures, manpower and real estate no longer available for a continental defense scheme.

The second is whether Washington officials are giving proper thought to a course of conduct that will permit less powerful nations to be our partners while maintaining their integrity and self-respect.

The third is whether awesome developments in weaponry have made the arms race seem so utterly futile that no little nation will be happy tied to the military policy of one of the great powers.

Could the impossible happen—could Canada go neutral?

The history of U.S.-Canadian relations suggests that mere discussion of neutrality in Canada is ridiculous.

When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, Canada declared war faster than the United States did.

Conversely, some 16,000 Yanks couldn't wait for the United States to enter the war against Germany, so they joined Canadian forces.

The concept of North America as one unit in any moment of international stress long has been taken for granted.

The United States and Canada probably would fight for each other tomorrow at the drop of a hostile firecracker, but influential, thoughtful Canadians warn that present rumblings of dissatisfaction ought not to be dismissed flippantly.

"A wave of pacifism is sweeping Canada," a Toronto editor told me.

There have been demonstrations with pacifistic overtones, but most Canadians deny that pacifism is a proper description of their attitude.

"We can't take a neutral stand. That would be idiotic from every military, political, and economic standpoint," says Ross Munro, publisher of the Winnipeg Tribune.

"Canadians have no sense of pacifism about defense. It is a sense of realism—perhaps fatalism."

This sense of fatalism seems to arise not only from the feeling that Canada is hopelessly tied to U.S. policies, but from a growing belief that there no longer is any real security for mankind in any military program.

CANADA MUST RELY ON UNITED STATES IN DEFENSE

"It is accepted that Canadian and U.S. defense must be integrated, if only because one cannot be endangered without the other being endangered," said the Toronto Globe and Mail.

"It is accepted that Canada, with a small population in a vast country, cannot possibly afford adequate defense for herself, and must rely heavily on the United States."

Thus the great bulk of Canadians agree that they cannot quarrel on technical grounds with U.S. decisions that Canada's Arrow jet or the United States ill-fated Bomarc missile have become obsolete.

Canadians do object to the fact that they are "treated as the kite's tail" when such decisions are made, and that Pentagon officials show little awareness of the fact that $400 million wasted on the Arrow is a big chunk out of Canada's economy, and not just a drop in the bucket as it would be in the States.

So part of the Canadians' disenchantment results from the feeling that they have been forced to spend far too much in reaction to the fear generated primarily by Russia and the United States, both Canada's next-door neighbors.

Canada has spent some $20 billion on defense since World War II, or about 16 times as much as the federal government has devoted to education.

Canada's intellectuals now argue that all they have for this money are some radar lines and electronic equipment that the guided missile has rendered obsolete, and a worldwide reputation as a flunky of the United States.

CANADIANS HOPE TO AID DISARMAMENT

This worry about Canada's international reputation is a powerful one, and a far more important factor in United States-Canadian relations than many Americans realize.

In negotiations over Korea and Indochina, and during United Nations efforts to resolve the Middle East and Hungarian crises, Canada achieved great prestige.

Canadians have expected to enhance that prestige by helping to show the big powers the way to disarmament.

That is why thousands of Canadians reacted with hostility to President Eisenhower's announcement a few weeks ago that the United States wanted to share nuclear arms with certain trusted allies.

Canadians felt that to take these arms would plunge their country into the nuclear race and diminish its role as a spokesman for disarmament.

Canadians also feared that nuclear weapons based on Canadian soil might be used without approval by Canada—just as the Bomarc cutback and other military decisions apparently were made without consultation with Canada.

In reviewing a new book suggesting that Canada break off all military alliances with the United States, J. B. McGeachy said in Toronto's powerful Financial Post that Canadians may not think of themselves as flunkies of the Pentagon, but "it is difficult or impossible for Latin Americans, East Europeans, and others to see Canada as anything but a satellite (with about as little independent judgment as, say, Bulgaria) when part of the Canadian forces is under direct U.S. command."

NEW NATIONS TRUST CANADA—SO FAR

This raises the question of whether the United States handicaps democracy in many parts of the world when it takes actions that make Canada look like the tail of the dog.

Canada, because of its size, is one of the few Western democracies that still maintains the trust and respect of diplomats and leaders in the emerging nations of Asia and Africa. But Canadians know that this trust and respect will quickly vanish if Canada comes to be regarded as a mere echo of the State Department or the Pentagon.

The strain between Canada and the United States is intensified by the feeling that Canada goes on spending 30 percent of her money for an obsolete military installation that would mean nothing in the event of all-out war only because she already is past the point of no return, and because the possibility of U.S. economic sanctions and other pressures force Canada to dance to the American tune.

Some Canadian intellectuals admit that part of the difficulty may result from the fact that Canadians today are bowing reverently to that old god, national sovereignty.

These intellectuals say Canada has devoted a huge chunk of its wealth to defense, not so much out of a fear of Russia as the fear of United States encroachment.

To kick U.S. military men off Canadian soil altogether is as of now unthinkable. To allow U.S. military installations in Canada without maintaining at least a pretense of Canadian control would be viewed by Canadians as a gross violation of Canada's sovereignty.

DEFENSE INTEGRATION STILL RAISES QUESTIONS

Canadians know that the man who pays the bills usually makes the decisions—so Canadians continue to pay for defense in the hope that the canceled checks will be accepted by the world as evidence of Canada's independence.

Nevertheless, says the Winnipeg Tribune, Canada really has "abdicated the main responsibility of defense of Canada to the United States."

However, perplexed and weary of debate Canadians get, in the past they always have wound up where Prime Minister Diefenbaker put them a year ago. Assuring the House of Commons that defense integration with the United States would strengthen, not weaken, Canadian sovereignty, he said:

"It will assure the freedom we inherited. It is the course of national survival, and any other suggestion is nonsense."

Diefenbaker may be absolutely correct. But the current mood of Canada suggests that there's going to be a lot more nonsense discussed in the months ahead.

The Good Country Editor on Federal Aid to Education; H. M. Baggarly Writes the Facts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us have seen many shocking examples of how certain selfish individuals and groups oppose expenditures for education.

And those who oppose fuller educational opportunities for our youth throw up emotional harrangues against Federal funds for education by darkly predicting "Federal control of schools." They assert that education should be spported only by funds raised at the local level. After they pressure defeat of Federal aid to education plans, they turn around and defeat or block moves at the county or State level to raise additional funds for education.

This is a matter which is seldom fully analyzed by the news media. For this reason, I was delighted to find that H. M. Baggarly, the "Country Editor" of the Tulia (Tex.) Herald, has devoted a recent column to this subject. By his incisive reporting and lucid writing in this column, Mr. Baggarly gives an excellent example of why his newspaper has gained national recognition and why he has won national awards for editorial writing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the column, "The Country Editor" from the Thursday, March 31, 1960, Tulia Herald of Tulia Tex.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY EDITOR

(By H. M. Baggarly)

Opponents of Federal aid to education have advanced many arguments as well as strawmen in recent years. One well-known argument is "Texans are able to take care of their school needs without any help from Washington."

We are not necessarily a proponent of Federal aid to education, but we are certainly an opponent of deceitful and hypocritical arguments. For instance, those making the most noise about the evils of Federal aid which, they say, means "Federal control" are the same ones who are just as opposed to local aid to education.

We have no quarrel with those who are satisfied for Texas public schools to remain 38th in quality among the 50 States. We have no quarrel with those who are satisfied for Texas not to have a single first-class university. Accrediting agencies say that Texas best universities are no better than second rate. This is due to their inability to pay enough to attract first-class professors. It's a person's prerogative if he wants to live in a mansion, drive a Cadillac, then send his children to a school system ranking 38th in the Nation and later to a second-rate university. But let him be honest enough to say that he thinks good schools cost too much money, that mediocre teachers are good enough. Let him refrain from chanting the hypocritical lie, "We are able to finance our schools without any help from Washington."

This is not to imply that Texas doesn't have some good teachers. She does, both in her public schools and colleges. There are dedicated people in every profession who are willing to do what they like even though the pay is small. But there aren't enough to staff all our schools and colleges. There are too many people with master degrees and years of experience mercenary enough to expect as much as some high school graduates are able to make 3 months following their high school graduation. We know a 1959 high school graduate working in a newspaper shop who is making $200 a year more than some Ph. D.'s now teaching at Texas Tech.

The ability of Tulia public schools to get and keep good teachers is declining every year. Even now, the school is unable to exercise much choice in the employment of teachers. The time is not far distant when high school students will be told, "Sorry, we aren't offering mathematics this year—we don't have anyone to teach it." People just aren't going to teach mathematics, or anything else, when industry will pay them a higher beginning salary than they can make teaching after 25 years' experience.

Of course, it is quite unpopular to cite the facts of life. It invites brickbats and unkind words from the nonthinkers and the ostriches who will term you a "spender," among other things. Then too, many like to evade the real issue by injecting side issues. The daily papers dodge the issue by telling the public that the schools are ineffective, that Johnny can't read, that he can't write, that children spend their days in school studying frill subjects.

What the dailies don't tell us, among other things, is that in 1906 approximately 16 percent as many students graduated from high school as there were children 17 years of age. In 1956, there were 60 percent as many students graduated from high school as there were children 17 years of age. To be fair, comparison of the graduate of 1906 should be made with the top 10 percent of 1956, and such a comparison places the graduate of today head and shoulders above his compeer of yesteryear.

What the dailies don't remind us is that in the main, most all our amazing scientific developments since World War II have come from comparatively young men—men who have been educated in what the dailies term "ineffective" schools of the past 2 or 3 decades.

If the public can be sold the proposition that public education is ineffective and a waste of money, then it will be much easier to keep Texas in 38th place and with no first-class universities.

If we can't afford to raise our schools at least up to where we are barely in the top 50 percent, which would mean that we were midway up the scale, if we can't afford even one first-class college or university in the entire State, then let's admit it and reconcile ourselves to mediocrity. Perhaps those financially able can send their children to New Mexico or Oklahoma where the systems rank higher than Texas. But please, let's quit this insincere criticism made against Federal aid and those who advocate at least minimum standards of education for all American children, those who live in poor States as well as those who live in the more prosperous States. Let's not plead for the privilege of providing extra money locally when we have no intention of raising it locally.

Average age of Texas public school teachers is 45. Tulia has a number past 60. Most of these are professional teachers who are holdovers from the 1930's when many college students prepared for the teaching profession.

In other words, we are coasting today on a supply created back in the 1930's. What are we going to do when in another 5 or 10 years most of these teachers will have retired? The number of young teachers entering the profession is far below the demand—and even today this handful of young teachers is leaving Texas for other States where salaries are higher. Even Lubbock public schools are unable to stop, the exodus of Tech graduates who are going to New Mexico.

Take a look at Tulia's better teachers. Why are they here? In most instances it is not because they have been attracted here. Some are married teachers who are here only because their husbands live here. Some are teachers who are nearing retirement and don't want to make a change even for greater pay.

Where will Tulia schools find a replacement for Mildred Hulsey when she retires? What is it going to mean to the high school English department if and when it has new teachers every year? And, according to the law of averages, we all know that for every good teacher there will be three or more not so good. A good, permanent high school English teacher cannot be kept in Tulia for what Tulia can pay. We have been fortunate to have Miss Hulsey for many years because this is her home and she has been fortunate enough to have outside income.

Where will a replacement be found for Grace Scott? Oh, we probably can find some kind of a librarian—but her regular duties are a small part of her worth to the school. She, like Miss Hulsey, has strings here and is not looking for a better paying job. But we know of no one else with strings here who will be available to take her place.

Wait and see what Superintendent Swinburn's successor will have to be paid. We'll guarantee it will be several thousand dollars a year more than he is paid—if a competent man is employed. Swinburn has had offers much more lucrative than this one, some in schools the size of Tulia which pay much better, some in much larger systems. But again, Tulia is his home. He owns property here. He plans to live here after his

retirement. That is why Tulia schools have been able to keep him here.

What we have said for Hulsey, Scott and Swinburn could be said about other faculty members.

Washington and Lee Mock Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Washington and Lee University Mock Convention every 4 years has become known throughout our Nation as one of the outstanding practical experiments in politics for students. In 12 previous mock conventions, Washington and Lee students have successfully predicted the presidential nominee 7 times. The Washington and Lee mock conventions have attracted some of our Nation's outstanding leaders as guest speakers. This year, for its May 3 mock convention, Washington and Lee is to be honored by the presence of our Democratic Party's beloved Harry Truman. The Washington and Lee newspaper, the Ring-tum Phi, has editorialized on the acceptance of Mr. Truman to keynote the mock convention. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AUSPICIOUS BEGINNING

The formal acceptance today by former President Harry Truman to keynote Washington and Lee's mock convention bears a twofold significance.

In addition to boosting immeasurably the prestige and significance of the event this year, Mr. Truman's appearance places upon the student leaders of the convention a deeper obligation to make certain that this year's convention can live up to the expectations which this Nation's leaders have placed in it.

Prominent guests are no strangers to the Washington and Lee convention. The appearance 4 years ago of the late Alben Barkley, and the acceptance this year by Harry Truman, however, have boosted the convention to an all-time peak of importance on the national scene.

The next few weeks will be crucial ones in the planning stage for the convention, and it is imperative that every member of the student body realize and fulfill his assigned task. State chairmen have been working for months in the planning stage. Now the execution stage must be considered.

In all probability, Mr. Truman will not be the only celebrity to appear at the convention. Miss America, Lynda Lee Meade, has confirmed her acceptance, and State chairmen from practically every part of the country are negotiating to invite prominent persons from their respective States.

To the leaders of this year's mock convention, we offer a large measure of praise for getting the convention off to what must be its most auspicious beginning in the 52-year history of the event.

To Mr. Truman we extend the heartiest of welcomes on behalf of the student body and university community and hope that his visit will be an enjoyable and worthwhile experience.

And to the student body in general, we charge that each member become aware of his acute significance in this venture and make certain that he is contributing his share to the functioning of the convention.

Mr. Truman's appearance here does not insure a successful convention, it demands it.

Students of Texas' Largest University, the University of Texas, Endorse Cold War Veterans Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, students of the University of Texas, which has an enrollment of over 18,000 students recently passed a resolution urging the Congress to pass the so-called cold war veterans education bill.

This proposal, S. 1138, which we in the Senate passed last year, is still under study by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

It is gratifying to me, and I am sure it is to all of us who worked for passage of this bill in the Senate, to know that hundreds of thousands of students across the Nation recognize the equity in and need for passage of this bill.

In its resolution of March 24, 1960, the student assembly of the University of Texas, recognizes that the bill is "a sound self-liquidating investment for such training will so greatly raise veterans' earning power that their increased income taxes will more than pay the costs of the program in a few years."

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION PRESENTED IN THE STUDENT ASSEMBLY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Whereas during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, introduced a bill (S. 1138), cosponsored by 25 other Senators, which called for the extension of educational benefits to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; and

Whereas this bill, which is referred to as the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1959, passed the Senate on July 21, 1959, by a vote of 57 to 31 and is now in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas this act provides that veterans who served in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, receive payment of educational benefits for a time that is 1½ times the duration of military service; and

Whereas it will be a sound self-liquidating investment for such training will so greatly raise veterans' earning power that their increased income taxes will more than pay the costs of the program within a few years. This is based upon actual proof from the Bureau of the Census, which shows that the training received by veterans under the World War II and Korean conflict bills is paying the Government more than a billion dollars a year more in taxes than we would collect without that training, and those bills will pay themselves out about 1967; and

Whereas it is an act of justice because only 45 percent of our young men serve military duty under the present operation of the draft law, and this law intends to help that 45 percent gain back some lost time, and their educational opportunity, that without this bill is lost forever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Student Assembly of the University of Texas, That the president of the students' association shall send letters to the Texas Senators and Representatives in the Congress encouraging them to give Senator YARBOROUGH's bill their active support.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID KENDRICK,
Assemblyman, Arts and Sciences.

Resolution 6–60, being adopted by the student assembly on March 24, 1960, is hereby certified as expressing the will of said assembly.

FRANK C. COOKSEY,
President, Students' Association.

The ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to present for the consideration of the Members of Congress a resolution adopted by the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This resolution expresses the interest of the VFW in supporting our ROTC program generally, and especially at land-grant colleges and universities.

Our Reserve is extremely important to the proper defense of our country and should not be abandoned but should be expanded more and more. The ROTC program furnishes well trained, oriented, young men to serve on active duty in the military for a number of years and then continue Reserve duty in their local communities. It is essential that we have this high type of Reserve officer in order to maintain the alert, efficient defense posture needed today.

The resolution follows:

VFW NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE ENDORSING ROTC TRAINING IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Whereas, approximately 100,000 young men receive basic military training annually in ROTC units in U.S. colleges and universities; and

Whereas, the armer services depend upon ROTC graduates for a substantial number of their commissioned personnel; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has consistently recommended some system of national security training to enable American youth to adequately participate in the defense of our Nation; and

Whereas there are 94 land-grant educational institutions which owe their existence,

in large part, to the Federal Government; and

Whereas physical training, discipline and the obligations of citizenship are as much a part of education as many other subjects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (meeting in Washington, D.C., February 7, 1960), That American colleges and universities be encouraged to inaugurate or expand ROTC programs and that where such programs ar already in operation every qualified male student attending such colleges or universities be required to participate in ROTC basic training as one of the requirements for obtaining a degree.

Disclaimer Affidavit Provision of National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the statements by student bodies and organizations which have come to me over these past weeks in regard to the disclaimer affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the resolutions and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENTON STATE COLLEGE, TRENTON, N.J., DISAPPROVAL OF LOYALTY OATHS AND DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVITS

Whereas the National Defense Education Act, passed by Congress in 1958, although recognized as a step forward in the Federal Government's financial support for higher education, requires a student or faculty applicant for a scholarship loan to sign both a loyalty oath—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic," and an affidavit 1001(F) to the effect that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Whereas Trenton State College has hitherto participated in the said program: The Student Executive Board, realizing:

1. That loyalty is based upon ideas and cannot be legislated or created by slogans;

2. That, historically, loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits have been a source of much abuse (e.g., 17th century English test oaths);

3. That loyalty oaths are objects of disapproval for:

(a) They do not serve their purpose. No subversive bent upon destroying the Government would have any qualms about signing a loyalty oath. On the other hand, loyal Americans who refuse to sign because of principle are singled out by the oaths and may be subject to undue suspicion.

(b) They offer subtle threat to academic freedom, for:

(1) There is danger that they will serve as a "first step" toward more restrictive legislation;

(2) There is danger that their meaning may be expanded through interpretation (e.g., the word "defend" in section 1001(F) of the NDEA);

(3) The requirement of signing a loyalty oath implies that a college student and/or faculty member is disloyal until he makes a positive statement expressing his loyalty. This requirement does not indicate a belief in the basic loyalty of American college students and faculty.

(4) A student's or faculty member's refusal to sign because of principle unfortunately results in suspicion of disloyalty;

(c) They are discriminatory:

(1) Insofar as they single out from the field of education college students and faculty members to sign loyalty oaths to receive Federal aid, whereas other recipients, such as farmers, do not have to sign such oaths.

(2) Insofar as the above legislation singles out members from the lower economic groups from which will be drawn the applicants for the loan.

(3) In view of the unfortunate situation that is created when financial pressure compels faculty members and students to sign the loyalty oath and the disclaimed affidavit in order to receive Federal aid and thereby violating basic principles which in turn may cast these students and faculty members into disfavor.

4. That disclaimer affidavits are even more so objects of disapproval, for:

(a) In the case of NDEA the affidavit's effect is to proscribe certain beliefs. But it is nearly impossible to ascertain accurately what an individual's beliefs are. Such a provision cannot be justly executed.

(b) In the case of the NDEA, the affidavit is terminologically unclear (e.g., the words "believe in," "supports," and "illegal methods"). This leaves a wide area for interpretation and the danger of a resultant expansion of the meaning of the act. It also leaves a student and faculty member in the position of not knowing whether, in believing in and in supporting a certain organization and in receiving money under the provisions of the NDEA, he is committing a crime under this act.

Resolves to call upon the Congress of the United States to delete section 1001(F) from the National Defense Education Act; and

Mandates the executive committee of the student executive board to communicate this resolution to the Members of the United States Congress and such other personalities as may be deemed fit.

SIMMONS COLLEGE,
STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., March 11, 1960.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: The following resolution was passed by the Student Government Council of Simmons College after consultation with the student body:

"The majority of the student body of Simmons College disapproves of the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit (sec. 1001(f)) in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This majority feels that the loyalty oath implies by its inclusion in the National Defense Education Act, that students are more susceptible to anti-American indoctrination than other groups benefited by Federal funds. As for the disclaimer affidavit, the student body feels that this is a curtailment of individual freedom of belief and a restriction of academic exploration of thoughts and ideas.

"The majority of the student body of Simmons College urges that the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit requirements in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be repealed."

We hope this resolution will be considered in any action taken on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA SAFIER,
President, Student Government Association.

THE STUDENT COUNCIL,
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
New Brunswick, N.J., February 9, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Please be informed that on January 26, 1959, the student council of Rutgers University passed a resolution calling for the repeal of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act, which specifies that Federal funds be granted to individuals only at such time as the individual executes and files an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence. The section also requires that the individual subscribe to an oath stating his allegiance to the United States, its Constitution, and laws.

The council concurs with the U.S. National Students Association which bases its opposition to the section on the grounds that the section is "procedurally ineffective and administratively cumbersome," subjecting institutions of higher education to "a very real Federal control," that it is furthermore terminologically unclear, and raises questions on "constitutionality and freedom of inquiry in the statements requiring denial of belief."

It is the hope of the student body of Rutgers that you will exert every possible influence to expidite the repeal of this unjustifiable and humiliating section of the National Defense Education Act.

Respectfully yours,

SHERIDAN D. BLAU,
Secretary, Rutgers Student Council.

WISCONSIN STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., February 9, 1960.

PROTEST AGAINST NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Whereas the NDEA provides badly needed funds through loans and fellowships for university and college students in the United States; and

Whereas in order for a student to qualify for a loan or fellowship under the NDEA a student must:

1. Swear allegiance to the United States; and

2. (Sec. 1001(f)) affirm that he "does not believe in, and is not a member of an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods"; and

Whereas these provisions:

1. Require an additional statement of loyalty from students and educators not required of other citizens and groups receiving Federal funds.

2. Require loyalty oaths for university and college money while the universities and colleges have no part in determining whether it wishes to have them apply to its funds; and

Whereas section 1001(f) is an ineffectual method of prohibiting subversive persons from obtaining these loans and fellowships, but rather achieves the opposite effect of preventing some particularly conscientious students from accepting funds under these conditions;

Be it enacted that the WSA protest these loyalty oath requirements by:

1. Having the president of WSA notify each of Wisconsin's Congressmen of student senate's action and urge them to vote for the repeal of those provisions.

2. Urging each of the student senators to write to their Congressmen urging his support in repealing these provisions.

3. Mandating the president of WSA to establish a committee of four from the student body to organize a letter writing campaign by the Wisconsin student body to their respective Congressmen urging them to vote for the repeal of these provisions.

4. Mandating the president of WSA to contact other student governments in the United States requesting the establishment of similar campaigns on their respective camp uses.

DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Fact: The National Defense Education Act of 1958 making loan funds available to college students requires the students participating to sign a disclaimer affidavit and loyalty oath as follows:

Title X, section 1001(f):

"No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditures under authority of this act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'"

Principle: The board of control, speaking as the duly elected representative of the students of the University of Washington, states its belief in the following principles:

(1) That loyalty is based upon ideas and cannot be legislated, nor can it be coerced or compelled, and the only kind of loyalty in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt;

(2) That historically, disclaimer affidavits have been a source of much abuse (e.g., 17th century English test oaths); and

(3) That the requirement to sign both a loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit is a contradiction of itself, for after one has signed the loyalty oath, the disclaimer provision then seems to say: "Even though you have just affirmed your allegiance to the Government and the Constitution, you are still not to be trusted." Implicit in signing the loyalty oath is the nonacceptance of any treasonous beliefs or actions.

(4) That this indicates a basic distrust in the American academic world, and as such is discriminatory by singling out college students or faculty members, and the participating institutions, to sign such an affidavit to receive Federal aid, whereas other recipients of Federal aid (e.g. farmers, social security participants, railroads, steamship lines, airlines, etc.) are not required to make such a declaration.

Declaration: The board of control, speaking as the duly elected representatives of the students of the University of Washington, expresses its opposition to the principle of a disclaimer affidavit provision as is included in the National Defense Education Act (1958).

JANUARY 29, 1960.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On January 21, 1960, the legislature of the Associated Students of Stanford University resolved to recommend to the Congress of the United States that the affidavit of the National Defense Education Act be removed in the current session. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the Disclaimer Affidavit, section 1001(f), of the National Defense Education Act does not protect us from organizations seeking to overthrow our country; and

"Whereas the affidavit does discourage otherwise qualified students from taking advantage of the funds available, because of a feeling that the affidavit is singling them out to be worthy of suspicion, and thus that this same affidavit is an infringement on their personal freedom inconsistent with their personal beliefs: Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the legislature of the Associated Students of Stanford University petitions the current session of Congress to remove the affidavit from the National Defense Education Act."

We hope that you will consider this as representative of a segment of today's American university students who are vitally interested in their country and its welfare.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD A. SUNDEEN, Jr.,
President, Associated Students of Stanford University, 1959–1960.

WILLARD SCOTT THOMPSON,
Chairman, Public and International Affairs Committee, Legislature, Associated Students, Stanford University.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION,
SENATE,
Amherst, Mass., January 8, 1960.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The following motion was passed by the student senate of the University of Massachusetts on December 16, 1959, by a vote of 21 to 8:

"Moved that the Student Senate of the University of Massachusetts, representing the undergraduate body of the university, express extreme opposition to the disclaimer affidavit required of aid applicants under the National Defense Education Act, and express approval of the bill presently pending before the Congress of the United States which would repeal this requirement. A copy of this bill to be sent to each Senator and Congressman in the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Vice President of the United States." Resolve.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT ZELIS,
President of Student Senate.

Community Service Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram I have received from John Metts, vice president of the Connecticut-New York Broadcasters, Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The telegram deals with the cooperative efforts of the members of this organization in connection with rendering community service under their licenses.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *April 7, 1960*

Senator BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Noted congressional remarks Wednesday by New York Representative EMANUEL CELLER that nine New York City broadcasting stations last year programed total of 220,000 minutes of community service. Would like to bring to your attention fact that during past year radio WICC's public service programing exceeded 92,500 minutes, or 17 percent of total air time. Figure does not include religious or special programs in the public interest. From Bridgport transmitters WICC serves Fairfield and New Haven Counties. WICC applauds Congressman CELLER'S position that unless achievements of broadcasters, as well as their failures, are taken into account, there can be no effective solution to current problems that would be in the public interest. We urge your support of moves to bring to light significant day-to-day contributions of broadcasters in Connecticut and elsewhere.

JOHN METTS,
Vice President, Connecticut-New York Broadcasters, Inc. (WICC).

Role of Enslaved Nations Under Communist Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have read recently with much appreciation a memorandum prepared by Dr. Stephen Vytvytsky, President of the Ukrainian Government in Exile, which deals with the role and significance of the enslaved non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union in the conflict between Communist imperialism and the nations of the free world.

This memorandum points out that the number of non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. is virtually equal to that of Russians, and that the great source of Soviet industrial strength lies in the natural resources and wealth of these enslaved nations.

It is my sincere belief that those who determine the foreign relations policies of the free world should give careful attention to the factors brought out in this memorandum.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this important appraisal of the role of the enslaved nations under Communist rule and domination be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT BY DR. STEPHEN VYTVYTSKY

1. We would like to point out the role and the significance of the enslaved non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union in the conflict between Russian imperialism and the free world. The greatest weakness of the U.S.S.R. is the problem of the non-Russian peoples it has under its oppression. I would not contend that these peoples are the most important force in the great struggle with

Moscow, but I do say that in this struggle, these peoples are a codetermining factor.

It is fitting here to recall an official announcement made by Khrushchev to the effect that the internal crisis in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which led to the degradation of Molotov, Malenkov, and Kaganovich was, among others, caused by the negative attitude of these former Communist bigwigs toward the widening of the autonomous right of the national republics. This same accusation was made at the 21st Party Congress last January against other members of the so-called antiparty group: Pervukhin and Saburoy, former Deputy Premiers. The New York Times reported on this on January 30, 1959 as follows:

"The Congress continued today with major speeches by Michael A. Suslov and Nuridin A. Mukhitdinov, Presidium members. According to summaries by Tass, the Soviet press agency, both spoke out and against 'the antiparty plotters' and Mr. Mukhitdinov, an Uzbek, raised a new charge against them. He said the group had demonstrated elements of chauvinism and mistrust in the ability of minority nationalities to handle their own governmental problems within the Soviet Union."

2. The number of non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. is virtually equal to that of Russians. On their native territory (particularly in Ukraine) there are to be found vast natural resources on which the economic power of the U.S.S.R. rests. The national republics strive for their independence and are in continual conflict with the regime. It is worth recalling that during the Second World War, whole divisions of Ukrainian soldiers surrendered to the Germans expecting that the invaders were bringing national liberation. Had it not been the antinational policy pursued by Hitler toward the occupied areas of Eastern Europe, and Ukraine was not the least of them, it is to be strongly doubted whether the Soviet Union would have defeated the Germans on its front. The former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, points this out in his book, "War or Peace."

The struggle of the enslaved nations is carried on primarily in the form of economic decentralization and broadening of the autonomous rights of the national republics. The seemingly more liberal politics pursued by Khrushchev and his group in relation to the non-Russian peoples, do not at all change their attitude toward the Communist regime. As proof of this, one can adduce the troubles in Georgia, Armenia, and Kiev in 1956.

Being the largest national republic, Ukraine stands in the forefront of this struggle. It aspires to the free development of its national culture and is opposed to the Communist policy of russification. Ukraine's writers, artists, musicians, are condemned to live under the reign of intellectual and physical terror. Those who oppose the regime in any way are subjected to the treatment recently accorded Boris Pasternak (and many were destroyed physically). Under the seemingly placid exterior, in Ukraine and other non-Russian republics is an undercurrent of revolutionary sentiment. The reports carried by the Associated Press on March 21, 1959 about explosions in Carptaho-Ukraine are symptomatic of this situation. American travelers returning from Kiev tell of being approached on the streets of that Ukrainian city by individual inhabitants who whispered to them furtively: "We are your friends" (New York Times, Feb. 28, 1959).

All of these enslaved peoples are the natural allies of the United States. They live within the U.S.S.R., they know its economic, social, cultural, and political structure well, and are familiar with all of the techniques of Soviet Government. This is a constant and permanent natural force which by its nature is a factor in the maneuvering between the West and the East.

At a time when the remnants of colonial imperialism are being eliminated in Africa and Asia, the peoples of Europe, too, will regain their freedom. It should be expected that the Russian people will not be opposed to this liberalization and that the feelings of national hatred which afflicts Russian imperialists is and will be alien to the majority of Russians whom opposition to this liberation would cost dearly.

3. Khrushchev frequently threatens war and rattles his nuclear weapons. The horror of mankind at the prospect of a nuclear war gives the Communists an opportunity to win the war without fighting, but in considering its war plannings the Soviet Union would have to take into calculation the attitudes of its civilians, particularly the enslaved peoples. It should be borne in mind that modern military technology more and more makes the frontline soldier free of the close supervision of his superiors and leaves him scope for independent action and initiative. The civilian population would aim in the first range to defend their settlements and their country.

A considerable weakness of the Communist regime is to be found in the perpetual state of revolution and crisis. The Communist regime is not one that bears the stamp of stability. Almost continually, some of the most important Kremlin personages are being degraded, denounced, imprisoned, executed * * * Beria, Malenkov, Molotov, Bulganin, Kaganovich, Pervoukin, Saburov, and yesterday's national hero, Zhukov. Two years ago Khrushchev tottered on the brink of political disaster; today he seems to be supreme ruler. This state of internal crisis can easily bring on internal upheavals in which the non-Russian peoples will play an important part.

5. Already Khrushchev is naming the day on which the capitalist world will collapse. Although ostensibly denouncing war, Moscow is waging war, which it calls peace. Communist parties in other countries are to provide future spies, fifth columnists, saboteurs, and partisans. Trade relations are designed to penetrate the economic life of Western countries. Cultural ties are merely another means to prepare the groundwork for Soviet propaganda. Except for some scientific achievements, there is under Soviet rule no culture originating from free thought and free sentiments. There is merely Communist creed enforced by terror for the use of creating a Communist man. It is the product of this type of culture that the Soviets hope to feed the rest of the world and so to make it susceptible to their doctrine. The Communist exhibitions do not depict the genuine reality which is characterized by misery and drabness.

In some official Western World declarations and in all the American press, the term "Russia" is used to designate the U.S.S.R., although this political formation does not exist. There is only the R.S.F.S.R. as one of the republics constituting the Soviet Union. In this way, the very existence of the non-Russian enslaved peoples in the U.S.S.R. is denied although this existence is recognized by Moscow itself.

The indiscriminate use of the term "Russia" instead of U.S.S.R. creates the impression that the U.S.S.R. is inhabited only by Russians. This aids the Communist russification drive. It does not make a good impression on the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, and other peoples, each of whom has its own history, its own culture, and all of whom were overpowered and enslaved by the Russian tsars. These peoples created their own independent states after the First World War, they were invaded by Communist armies from the Russian north, they resisted this invasion, fighting for their independence. Thus communism came to them on the bayonets of an invading army.

The question should be asked: Is the creation of a single uniform type of Russian-Communist man bent on world conquest in the interests of the western states? The noble resolution of the U.S. Congress issued on June 22, 1959, strengthened the faith of the enslaved peoples of the U.S.S.R. in the principles of freedom and justice represented by the United States of America. Unfortunately the exact wording of this resolution was not transmitted by the Voice of America and Radio Liberation to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

7. In order to create effective plans for the defense, it is essential to state who is the real enemy. Communism is the creation of Russian imperialism. The national Russian attitude is permeated with a sense of mission, messianism to save mankind and at the same time, naturally, to dominate it. This is clearly and adequately shown by Russian history, Russian philosophy, Russian literature, and no less by the history of communism.

This is further shown in practice by Communist policies of compromise toward Yugoslavia, nationalistic Poland, and East Germany as well as by the political tactics used in relation to the Asian and African national movements.

As is known, a union of non-Russian peoples enslaved in the U.S.S.R. has been formed in exile. This is the Paris bloc. It was formed to carry out political activities more effectively. This bloc is making efforts to unite with the union of satellite peoples (the Assembly of Captive European Nations), which is sponsored by the Free Europe Committee.

A few words may be added about the so-called coexistence. First of all, the very idea of coexistence is, under the present circumstances, erroneous and misleading. There can be no coexistence of two systems which are based on fundamentally different principles. In this case, on one side there is a free society of men built on principles of democracy and freedom, and on the other, a society ruled by a dictatorial-totalitarian regime. Moreover, Communist totalitarianism shows a clear tendency to expand, having as its ultimate goal, world domination. To this end all possible means ranging from propaganda to direct subversive activities and violence are being used. In this respect, it should be also borne in mind that countries of the free world are easily accessible to all the means of Soviet "peaceful" aggression, while countries of the Soviet bloc are practically closed to any infiltration of the ideas of democratic countries. By this very nature, the Russian communism is bent on destruction of any rivaling political system. Thus, in any arrangement of coexistence, communism will tend to put its partner out of existence.

Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times Favor National Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Racine Journal-Times has recently made one of the most eloquent and concise arguments I have read anywhere for a

national primary. In part, the Journal-Times argues:

But the best argument for a national presidential primary is the same on that old Bob La Follette used more than a half century ago: It would return to the people of the country not only their right to choose a President, but the right to choose the men who would be candidates for President. Today, the voters just do not have that right; it is usurped by the politicians, some of them responsible to no one but State political machines.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful, full-of-commonsense editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Racine Journal-Times, Mar. 31, 1960]

A NATIONAL PRIMARY?

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE'S proposal that the United States hold a national presidential primary, simultaneously in all States, deserves more consideration than it will get. The major political leaders of the major political parties have shown little enthusiasm for the present, limited system of State presidential primaries, and they are not likely to look with favor on its nationalization.

In one respect, PROXMIRE is bucking a trend. The presidential primary, even as a State institution, has been losing favor steadily. Students of Wisconsin political history will recall that this particular electoral institution originated here, in 1905, after Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., had his progressive delegation to the Republican National Convention of 1904 rejected in favor of a "stalwart" Republican delegation. Knowing that he had popular support, La Follette asked for and got a popular election of presidential convention delegates. By 1916, half of the States of the Union had adopted a similar system. However, 20 years later, the presidential primary began to slip in popular appeal, and State after State gave up their primaries, until only 17 States and the District of Columbia have them today.

Admittedly, the present presidential primary system has its faults, and its chief weakness is the fact that the candidates are reluctant to use it, unless they must prove a particular political point to demonstrate their own votegetting ability. As only 727 of the 1,521 votes at the Democratic Convention and 624 of the votes of the Republican Convention come from States holding primaries, the "primary States" could not control either convention if they voted together, which they don't.

But the weaknesses of the present State-by-State primary system are not necessarily the weaknesses of a national primary. In fact, a national primary may be the remedy for the faults of the present system.

Today, candidates have two major objections to the presidential primary system: First, it is a mankiller; the problem of having to conduct a very personalized, handshaking campaign in several States from March to June is a tremendous physical strain, and its takes place before the regular summer and autumn campaigns. Second, this is expensive campaigning; estimates that a single State primary campaign may cost a candidate and his backers up to $75,000 are proving quite modest.

A national primary would have these answers to those problems: The campaigning could be nationwide, using major campaigning media, as the presidential campaign itself does; this would reduce the necessity of the street-corner type electioneering we see now in the spring. The cost would continue to be high, but it would be spread across a national effort, rather than concentrated, State by State, in a series of minor campaigns that may not produce an effective result.

But the best argument for a national presidential primary is the same one that Old Bob LaFollette used more than a half century ago: It would return to the people of the country not only their right to choose a President, but the right to choose the men who would be candidates for President. Today, the voters just do not have that right; it is usurped by the politicians some of them responsible to no one but State political machines.

A national primary would, of course, take the glamor, even the principal purpose, out of the national conventions. That would be a very small loss, as anyone who has attended these political circuses knows. The Nation as a whole has only become conscious of the evils of the convention system in recent years, when the use of television brought the whole Nation to the convention floors. We recall well the reaction of a citizen who had this experience for the first time about 8 years ago and said:

"Is this the way we nominate candidates for the highest elective office in the world?"

Health Problems of Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging has been holding hearings this week on the health problems which face 16 million senior American citizens.

We have heard important and illuminating testimony on the extent of health needs, the problems of financing health care and the kinds of health services older persons require to live not only longer but healtheir and happier.

I expect to present a detailed report on the health problems of older persons at the conclusion of these hearings and to introduce legislation which will provide a program of balanced health services for a healthier-dignified life in retirement.

I thought—however—that it would be of interest to the Members of the Senate to have a few of the highlights of these hearings as they are going on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a memorandum which—in brief fashion—highlights some of the testimony of the witnesses.

There being no objection the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. JOHN D. PORTERFIELD, DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL, U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Of the 10 million persons in the Nation who have heart disease—4 million, 40 percent—are 65 or older. At any given time, some 750,000 persons have cancer and most of these are persons who are over 65. Almost 3 million persons have diabetes and the elderly have more than their proportionate share.

This is also true of the 5 million who suffer from arthritis and the 6 million who are affected by related rheumatic disorders.

Forty-nine percent of those who are 65 or older are limited in activity—compared to 21 percent of all ages. Only 3 percent of all ages have limitations of mobility—compared with 19 percent of those who are over 65.

WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UNITED AUTO WORKERS

"Mr. Flemming has indicated on a number of occasions, that his Department has been continuing to explore ways to meet the undeniable need of older people for help with their medical and hospital bills. In the last few weeks the press has been full of accounts of struggle inside the Republican administration about what action shall be taken on this politically explosive subject.

"But as in so many other questions where Goverment spending is being balanced against human welfare—the people have apparently lost again. The New York Times of Thursday, March 24, reported Mr. Flemming's comment: 'All the administration has endorsed is exploration.'

"In spite of our capacity for the highest standards of health—we Americans are not the healthiest people in the world. The life expectancy of older citizens in our country is less than in a great many countries including Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, West Germany, Iceland, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden," Mr. Reuther declared.

DR. JAMES Z. APPEL, MEMBER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

"Physicians themselves are doing what they can as individuals to soften medical expenses for persons over 65 with modest resources," Dr. Appel said.

The indigent are cared for by public welfare—religious and fraternal programs—as well as donated services by the doctors.

State medical societies and physicians should take action to expedite the development of low cost voluntary health insurance and prepayment programs for the elderly with low family incomes.

The AMA also recommends that physicians accept reduced compensation for their services.

GUY R. JUSTIS, DIRECTOR, STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, COLORADO

Each old age pensioner in Colorado receives $106 a month less any income he may have in cash or kind. In addition he receives necessary hospitalization, nursing home care, surgery, and physician visits paid for out of a $10 million medical care fund administered through Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION AND COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

"Our organization would take the position that while voluntary health plans of every sort should do everything possible to provide protection for the health of our older citizens, it is probably impossible for them to do this in any adequate way without assumption of at least a portion of the financial responsibility by some governmental unit, Federal, State, or local," Mr. Voorhis asserted.

DEAN DOUGLAS BROWN, DEAN OF FACULTY AND ECONOMICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

"Subsidation of private insurance carriers by the Government from taxation to permit them to provide health insurance to aged persons at less than true cost is a most clumsy-hybrid arrangement which involves overwhelming administrative difficulties and excessive costs," Dean Brown said.

"It seems to me that it is far better to have what is 'insurance within insurance' under the OASDI program with costs averaged over the whole working lives of all participants," he advised.

DR. JAMES DIXON, PRESIDENT, ANTIOCH COLLEGE, YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO

"The evidence all indicates that if one uses the health status of the employed person as a norm—the older person is disadvantaged relatively and absolutely in terms of services and their availability. I share entirely Dean Brown's feeling concerning the use of the social security mechanism as the appropriate device at this point of time in our country under the present circumstances to begin to meet this problem," Dr. Dixon said.

DR. MICHAEL DACSO, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL MEDICINE, GOLDWATER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, NEW YORK

In order to prevent excessive institutionalization disabilities must be prevented.

Physical disability is preventable even if the disease causing it cannot be corrected. For example, in many, if not all heart diseases, physical incapacity caused by heart disease can be prevented.

A great deal more research will have to be done in this field as well as in training disabled persons to the point of self-sufficiency, Dr. Dacso emphasized.

JAMES CAREY, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS

"Investigation shows that the majority of our retired elder citizens depend almost entirely upon Federal old-age insurance benefits for subsistence.

"While people seek desperately to put a few dollars aside for their old age—only one person in six who retires at age 65 has as much as $5,000 in savings," Mr. Carey said.

"Costs of voluntary health insurance continues to rise at the rate of 10 percent a year. It now costs about $15 a month for the average retiree to cover himself and his wife for Blue Cross and Blue Shield. For most retirees who depend on old-age benefits this is an impossible price tag," he stated.

HON. ARTHUR FLEMMING, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Estimates indicate that 42 percent of the aged—approximately 6½ million persons—have some health insurance and that 50 percent of the aged would have coverage by 1965 and about 68 percent by 1970.

"Nevertheless, even though we do experience continued progress in this area, I believe we will still be left with serious problems. There will still be aged persons whose policies provide inadequate protection. Also there will still be aged persons who will have no protection but who would be willing to participate in voluntary programs if provided with policies at rates they could afford to pay.

"This administration is acutely aware of the need for approaching these problems with a sense of urgency," Secretary Flemming said.

An intensive study is currently being made of the problem, the subcommittee was told.

"In an effort to arrive at sound conclusions we are now consulting not only with experts in the Government—but also with outside experts and groups—and with State officials. I expect to complete these consultations within the next 2 weeks. I will then move at once to develop a specific proposal within the executive branch," Secretary Flemming said.

On April 7, the Washington Post published a perceptive editorial summarizing a number of important facts developed in these hearings and concluding with the following statement:

"The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program—and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as 'socialistic' without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire.

"They might just about as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments and parks because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was 'to promote the general welfare.'"

The subcommittee has scheduled additional hearings on the general problem for next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 11, 12, and 13.

It will devote extensive attention to one of the crucial questions in this area; namely, the extent to which private insurance is meeting the problem and can be expected to do so in the future. Executives of profit and nonprofit insurance groups plan to participate in these hearings and to give us the benefit of their experience in this field to such a large segment of American society.

Members of Congress and Their Families Will Visit New York City, May 13, 14, and 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional tour of New York City on May 13, 14, and 15 for Members of Congress and their families has been perfected. The tour includes an evening at Roosevelt Raceway, a visit to the United Nations, Empire State Building, Chinatown, and an inspection tour of the New York harbor. There is also the opportunity to go to Broadway theaters.

A copy of the official announcement, which recently was sent to Members of both branches of Congress, is as follows:

NEW YORK CITY 3-DAY CONGRESSIONAL TOUR, MAY 13, 14, 15—MAKE YOUR RESERVATIONS TODAY—DIAL EXTENSION 4576, ROOM 1104, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Tour includes United Nations, Fifth Avenue, Broadway theaters, Empire State building, harbor trip, and Chinatown.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 13: 9:45 a.m., daylight time, party will leave Washington via the Pennsylvania Railroad. Luncheon in the dining car. We arrive Penn Station, New York City, 1:45 p.m., and buses will take us directly to pier where we board sightseeing steamer for New York harbor tour. At 4 p.m. buses leave pier for Paramount Hotel. At 7 p.m. buses leave for Roosevelt Raceway, buffet dinner and an evening at the races. At 11 p.m. buses leave racetrack for Hotel Paramount.

Saturday, May 14: 8:45 a.m., leave hotel for the United Nations and at 10:45 a.m. we leave for New York city hall and reception by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City. At 1 p.m., we arrive Idlewild Airport for luncheon and Capital Airline tour. At 4:30 p.m. we return to Hotel Paramount.

Saturday night will be open for members of our party to go to restaurant, night club, or theater of their choice.

Sunday, May 15: 11 a.m. we leave hotel for Empire State building tour. At 12:45 p.m. we leave for Chinatown reception and luncheon guests of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. At 6 p.m. daylight time our train leaves Pennsylvania Station for return to Washington. We suggest party meet at West Gate track 13 at least 10 minutes prior to leaving time. Dinner will be served in dining car en route home. We arrive Washington 10 p.m. daylight time.

Expense: $39.50. Children 5–12, $34.50.

National Library Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, everybody, it seems, is talking about national purpose of late. There is much honest confusion and, I am afraid, probably some lack of facts, too. At a time when every American should be giving some thought about the goals of his Nation and the goals that he should have as an individual citizen, it might not be amiss to remind ourselves that a good starting place for our ruminations might be our own municipal library. From words written in the present or past we may receive cues for our future conduct and thought.

I was very glad to note, therefore, that the Asbury Park Press, in its April 5 issue, had a few words to say about National Library Week and the pleasant habit of reading.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asbury Park Evening Press, Apr. 5, 1960]

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

This is National Library Week. Other of the many special weeks we celebrate are devoted to enterprises and products which are of interest to segments of the population. But Library Week draws attention to a worldwide institution which is of vital interest to every citizen, whether he knows it or not.

Libraries contain the stored-up knowledge of the past. They contain the history of man's experimentation and constant striving. In this form of the written word they offer all the tools which any individual needs to prepare himself for his career. They provide the knowledge which makes it possible for a person to explore in advance the possibility of success for some new venture which has taken form in his imagination. They offer the facilities for cultural development, for a knowledge of the arts, of the sciences, and of recreation.

It is one of the tragedies of our life that with all this wealth at hand so relatively few avail themselves of it. How many people who regret their limited knowledge of history, of art, or of science realize that the remedy for their shortcomings lies a short distance down the street within the walls of the public library? And how many people confronted with a boring evening make use of the antidote for that boredom which is contained in a library card?

No truly educated person ever achieved that status without books. His formal schooling may have been limited but books have it in their power to supply the deficit. And no man was ever justly called ignorant so long as he loved books. So long as public libraries are available no one has a right to expect sympathy when he deplores the limited advantages which were his in youth.

Reading of books is both profitable and pleasurable. It is a pleasant habit-forming activity. The more one reads the more he enjoys reading. And the better the books he reads the more his appetite is whetted for still better literary fare. Books are friends and those who associate with them come to love them.

For those who never acquired the pleasant habit of reading we suggest that they celebrate National Library Week by visiting their nearby library and borrowing a book. Any book will do. Just acquire the habit of reading and time will take care of the matter of quality. But read.

Wiretapping Ban Aids Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune yesterday carried an editorial emphasizing the need for a Federal law clarifying the present muddled wiretap situation. The editorial properly emphasizes the need for careful restrictions on the use of wiretapping evidence. However, it also makes the important point that New York's own laws on the subject represent "a sensible balance between protecting the rights of the individual against abuses and enabling law enforcement agencies to proceed more effectively against crime."

On Wednesday I introduced a wiretap bill—S. 3340—which would make it clear that no provision of the Federal law is intended to preclude the operation of State laws permitting wiretapping under the safeguards of the court order. This editorial indicates the strong need for enactment of such a provision if we are to avoid jeopardy to law enforcement in New York and other States with similar laws. I hope that there will be early consideration of this bill and that action to relieve New York's plight will be taken before Congress adjourns.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 7, 1960]

BANNING WIRETAPS HELPS THE CRIMINALS

Some 20 years ago the people of New York engaged in a lot of serious debate about the validity and necessity of wiretapping as an aid to law enforcement agencies in fighting crime.

The result was a sensible balance between protecting the rights of the individual against abuses and enabling the aforesaid agencies to proceed more effectively against crime. We allowed official wiretapping, but only on court authority and for good cause. And there is to this day no authentic cause for regret.

Now, however, the Federal courts have upset things considerably by various decisions hinging on a fuzzy 31-word clause in the 1934 Federal Communications Act which reads:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

This has been ruled to mean, among other points, that wiretap evidence cannot be used in Federal trials. But a number of States, including New York, operate otherwise with notable success.

Whether the law actually makes wiretapping a Federal crime is anybody's guess. Certainly it doesn't keep the FBI from tapping, even though the fruits are prohibited from evidentiary display.

But all the New York prosecutors, and Police Commissioner Kennedy as well, fear that this Federal restriction is on the way to being extended to the State courts. In short, that criminal law enforcement (at least the substantial part dependent on wiretap investigation) will be crippled.

It is easy enough to quote Justice Holmes on wiretapping being "dirty business," and that would certainly apply if there were no controlling safeguards. But New York has shown what can be done. We see no reason why District Attorney Hogan and Commissioner Kennedy, among many, should be deprived of an effective weapon against crime.

Before the courts proceed any further with nullification, let Congress clear the air with a law that backs up New York. For surely the country hasn't got to the point where crime is to be protected.

Resolution of St. Mark's Home and School Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the battle against inflation is a continuous one. The establishment of a realistic fiscal program, however, cannot be accomplished by wishful thinking; rather, it will require the cooperation of government, consumers, labor, industry, and all others in our society.

Through sound buying, spending, borrowing, and savings practices, the citizens of our country themselves can make an effective contribution to not only combating inflation, but to our economic progress.

Effective anti-inflationary measures, however, can be adopted only if there is a recognition of its threat, and a willingness by our citizens to undertake effective action to halt its spiral.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mrs. Lawrence Ruetz, of Kenosha, Wis., president of St. Mark's Home and School Association, a resolution adopted by that fine organization on the need for effective measures for combating inflation.

Representatives of real grassroots thinking on this significant problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ST. MARK'S HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

Whereas for nearly two decades, and particularly following World War II, the United States has experienced a sharp inflation of its currency, which inflation is still continuing; and

Whereas during the last decade the value of the U.S. dollar has been reduced more than half; and

Whereas if this trend continues it will seriously affect our economy, destroy our position as a leader in world affairs, aid Russia's avowed intention to destroy us as a democracy, and may even destroy the form of government under which we now live; and

Whereas such inflationary trend has already reeked havoc upon many of our citizens who depend upon fixed incomes such as pensions and other like means of income, and has debilitated the savings of the older citizens who have frugally prepared for their old age and further inflation will reek even further havoc upon them; and

Whereas one of the causes of such inflation has been the Federal Government's policy of refusing to live within its income, borrowing money for current expenses and increasing the legal debt limit; and

Whereas during times of war it may be necessary for the Government to borrow in order to meet extraordinary expenses, but to continue to do so in times of peace is against the rules of sound economy and against our tradition as a Nation; and

Whereas our Government, by pursuing a policy of thrift and frugality can, we believe, live within its income, balance its budget and reduce its indebtness, and by pursuing such a policy reduce the heavy burden of taxes as well;

Now, therefore, we do hereby resolve that we urge our elected Members of the Congress of the United States to use their voices, influence, and votes to reduce waste and extravagance in Government, to cease borrowing additional moneys with which to meet current expenses, to work for a balanced budget, and to refuse further raises in the debt limit except in cases of extreme emergency.

Dated at Kenosha, Wis., this 21st day of March, A.D., 1960.

ST. MARK'S HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATION,
By MRS. LAWRENCE RUETZ,
President.

Attest:
MRS. EDWARD W. JEANNAT,
Secretary.

Malaria World Health Day Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, within the past few years we in this Nation and others elsewhere in

the world have gradually come to realize the value of a global campaign aginst disease of all kinds. On April 7, World Health Day, the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post discussed "a venture without precedent in history"—a worldwide campaign to stamp out malaria.

Such an effort is worth the attention of everyone concerned with the elimination of human suffering and waste of human resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALARIA WORLD HEALTH DAY TARGET

Eradication of malaria has been called a "challenge to all the world." But that is the challenge concerted international forces are taking up this year. Never before have these forces been deployed on such a scale against a single disease.

And today, World Health Day, is designed to recall to all peoples the urgency of this great undertaking.

The present worldwide campaign to stamp out malaria is a venture without precedent in human history. Never before have doctors, engineers, laboratory workers, and helpers of all kinds been mobilized in such large numbers in so many different countries to combat the same evil.

Never before has a scheme been launched that so intimately affects the living conditions of such vast numbers of the earth's inhabitants.

This year, 1.2 billion human being are living under the constant threat of malaria. It is not a spectacular disease. Its victims show no wounds or mutilations to excite our pity; it comes upon them as they sleep, in the stillness of the night, carried by a silent attacker, the mosquito.

The ultimate aim of the antimalaria campaign is to eliminate the disease, to wipe it off the face of the globe, never giving up until the very last case in the remotest corner of the earth has been tracked down.

Described as the world's most costly disease, malaria is estimated to account for from 10 to 15 percent of the infant mortality rate in tropical countries where its inhabitants have become resigned to it.

Without a dissenting voice the 90 members of the World Health Organization have resolved to pool their knowledge and resources to eliminate the disease from the globe.

Physical deterioration from malaria makes a sufferer an easy prey to other dangerous diseases.

Today, according to Dr. M. G. Candau, Director-General of WHO, we know how malaria is transmitted and by what mosquitoes. We know how the malaria parasite behaves within the human body, and how it causes a fever that may lead to death. We have found effective ways of destroying the mosquitoes and we possess drugs that successfully attack the parasites within the human body. The techniques for fighting malaria are continually becoming more powerful and precise.

But we also know that the deadly mosquitoes have found ways of fighting back—that is why speed is essential. The campaign against malaria must be carried through while the weapons still remain effective.

Candau tells us there are still 56 countries where no effort has yet been made to subdue the malaria monster.

"The world antimalaria campaign evidently calls for large numbers of trained workers of many kinds, quantities of equipment and supplies, considerable financial investment and efficient administrative machinery," Candau said. "It is even more important, however, that the governments engaged in the campaign should pursue it with conviction and with the determination to succeed."

The eradication of malaria is, indeed, a challenge to all the world. In an era when man thinks he is about to set foot on the moon, he should on his own planet be capable of stamping out one of his oldest and most destructive enemies.

Night Life in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Night Life in Washington," written by Charles McDowell, which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of March 4, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIGHT LIFE IN WASHINGTON

(By Charles McDowell)

It was 12:25 a.m. and Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, who had been speaking for an hour and a half, was beginning to get to the point of his speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate. He was against the civil rights bill.

Senator ERVIN was standing behind a desk piled high with books and sheafs of papers. His legislative assistant sat beside him, occasionally handing him documents from a fat briefcase. The Senator looked fresh and happy and quite capable of making the 4-hour speech that was expected of him by his southern colleagues.

Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi, was relaxing a few seats away, his feet on a desk. Senator EASTLAND was playing question man for Senator ERVIN. The way the southerners were working the filibuster, a question man was always on hand to ask long questions every 20 minutes or so to rest the speaker's voice. Whenever Senator EASTLAND got up to ask a question, his shirttail showed below his coat. He had pulled it out for comfort.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, came into the Chamber from the darkened cloakroom, took a seat at the rear, and watched Senator ERVIN intently. He was checking on his man's condition, looking for signs of weariness. Satisfied that his man was in good shape, Senator ELLENDER returned to the cloakroom. But he wouldn't go any farther from the floor than that because he was team captain for the current 24 hours and it was his job to be there to cope with any parliamentary tricks by the opposition, make substitutions, and keep in touch by telephone with the coach, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who was hidden away in a hotel downtown.

Senator ERVIN paused for a moment to take a sip of water. Then he said, "You know, this is the funniest organization I ever belonged to." He said the Senate had passed all sorts of fair labor standards legislation, and yet here he was violating the 40-hour week and not getting time and a half. He looked across the Chamber at Senator JAVITS, of New York, smiled, and said he supposed this kind of work was necessary for "some of us who are trying to save the Confederacy as well as the Union."

Senator JAVITS smiled back at him and returned to signing a stack of mail on his desk. Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, who had been motionless at his desk for nearly an hour, stirred slightly and may have smiled; we couldn't tell from our angle in the gallery.

Senator ERVIN and his question man and Senators JAVITS and COOPER were the only Senators on the floor. The last two were playing watchdogs for the majority, the Senators in favor of a civil rights bill. The watchdogs' job was to see to it that the speaker kept talking and didn't rest illegally.

A pair of stenographers took turns recording Senator ERVIN's remarks. The Senate Parliamentarian was reading a paper-back novel. A clerk was reading a hard-back novel. The other clerk on duty was drawing excellent five-point stars, one after another, on clean sheets of paper and then throwing them away. A sleepy page boy was sitting on the carpeted steps to the rostrum staring at a French grammar book.

It was nearly 1 a.m. now, but there were still several hundred citizens in the public gallery watching the world's greatest deliberative body, and there were perhaps a dozen of us in the press gallery.

ELMER J. HOFFMAN, a large freshman congressman from Illinois, who was curious about filibusters, came into the Chamber and sat down on a sofa at the rear. Members of the House have the privilege of the floor in the Senate so long as they keep quiet and stay out of the way. Representative HOFFMAN went to sleep within 10 minutes. He began to emit long, resounding snores, and a teen-age girl in the gallery began to giggle.

Senator ERVIN grinned and kept talking.

At 1:05 a.m. the question man, Senator EASTLAND, arose stiffly, asked the Speaker to yield for a moment, and said to the sleepy-eyed acting president of the Senate, Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, "Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum."

This meant that Senator ERVIN could quit talking and rest until 51 Senators appeared on the floor and answered to their names. The majority had about that many of its troops sleeping on cots in nearby rooms, in the old Supreme Court chamber and in their offices. Bells began to ring throughout these regions and grumbling, dull-eyed Senators rolled out of bed and groped for shoes.

The basic strategy of the 18 filibustering Senators, working in well-organized relay teams, was of course, to keeping talking indefinitely to prevent a vote on the civil rights bill. The strategy of the majority was to keep the Senate in round-the-clock session, day after day, to wear the filibuster down. The counterstrategy of the filibusterers was to demand quorum calls at all hours of the night to get the majority out of bed and break its spirit.

Slowly and grimly, the rumpled Senators straggled into the Chamber. Senator BENNETT, of Utah, still had on yellow bedroom slippers. Senators KERR and ANDERSON leaned on each other for support. Senator MORTON of Kentucky yawned mightly and bumped into Senator WILEY of Wisconsin. Senator SYMINGTON was wearing a dark blue, turtleneck pajama shirt under his suit coat and several friends—in the bleary gaiety of the dead of night—suggested he looked like a gangster.

Having answered to their names, the Senators drifted away to bed again, several stopping by Senator ERVIN's desk to mutter and laugh. Soon he began to speak again.

Of the 18 filibusterers, only 5—members of the "on-duty" Ellender team—had answered the quorum call. The others were sound asleep in their beds, secure in the knowledge

that they were not helping the majority to raise a quorum. Some, like Coach RUSSELL, were keeping their sleeping places secret so even the Sergeant-at-Arms couldn't find them if he were sent out to drum up the necessary 51 Senators.

At 2:50 a.m. Senator ERVIN was still talking, but his 4-hour shift was coming to an end. Already Captain ELLENDER was on the sideline warming up his next man, Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Senator JOHNSTON was crisply dressed, freshly shaved and bright of eye. He had been asleep for the past 10 hours, and he had a speech he could hardly carry in both arms.

A Serious Problem Exists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was reprinted in the March 14, 1960, edition of the Medford Mail Tribune. It discusses the need for legislation which would help provide medical care to older citizens. The editorial originally appeared in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin:

OPPOSITION NOT ENOUGH

The Forand bill has been in the news of late. Recently, Senator JOHN S. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, introduced a piece of legislation which has become known as the Kennedy bill. Both have the same general purpose. Both have been greeted with cries of anguish from some groups.

The Forand and Kennedy proposals are designed to provide additional protection under health-care plans for persons over 65. Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and the various commercial insurance companies have been loath to cover this age bracket in the past.

Insurance companies which have carried plans for older persons have—in many cases—done so only with restricted policies at considerably higher rates than those paid by the rest of us.

One can't particularly blame insurance companies. As persons get older they are more susceptible to some diseases. They recover from illness less quickly. In other words, their medical expenses are likely to be high. Insurors traditionally have charged higher rates for higher risks.

At the same time, one must sympathize with the oldsters involved. At a time when their incomes are being reduced through inadequate retirement plans and provisions, they are asked to increase the amount of those incomes which they spend for medicine, doctors, and hospitals.

Both the Forand and Kennedy bills would have the Federal Government help pick up the difference. Representative FORAND, first on the scene with his bill, would handle the problem through amendments to the basic Social Security Act.

FORAND would set up a program whereby some 16 million persons eligible for social security payments would be entitled to receive a limited amount of hospital, surgical, and nursing home treatment under a Government-managed program.

Opposition to the proposal is led by the American Medical Association, which traditionally sees that old bugaboo "socialized medicine" behind every bush. Other opposition comes from insurance companies—not hard to figure that one out—and various farm and business groups.

Yet the Forand bill—and the later Kennedy proposal—remain attractive to many persons, particularly those who are over 65.

The AMA and other groups opposing the legislation do so as a traditional position to all such proposals. They have followed the same line for many years.

This is no longer enough. A serious problem exists—serious for the senior citizen whose income has been reduced—and some solution must be found for it. Blind opposition to proposed solutions is not enough.

The Milwaukee Journal—The Best Big-City Metropolitan Newspaper in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article recently printed in a Kentucky newspaper printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., April 3.—What are the 15 daily newspapers in the United States "most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service?"

A poll of the Nation's newspaper editors conducted by scholastic magazines selected the following, in order of preference:

1. The New York Times.
2. The Christian Science Monitor.
3. The Milwaukee Journal.
4. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
5. The Washington Post and Times Herald.
6. The Courier-Journal.
7. The Wall Street Journal.
8. Atlanta Constitution.
9. Chicago Tribune.
10. Des Moines Register.
11. The Kansas City Star and Times.
12. The Baltimore Sun.
13. The Miami Herald.
14. Chicago Daily News.
15. Los Angeles Times.

The poll was conducted in connection with a special issue on "How To Read Newspapers," published annually by Practical English, one of the scholastic magazines for high school students.

The poll was taken in two parts, the magazine publishers said. First, a list of all newspapers in cities with 200,000 population or more was sent to all editors of daily newspapers in the United States. Editors were asked to check the 12 newspapers that, in their opinion, were "most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service." Room was allowed for write-in votes.

A runoff ballott was then drawn up, including newspapers that polled at least 12 votes. Write-in candidates with two or more votes were also included. More than 335 editors voted in the final runoff ballot.

The results of the runoff showed such a close vote that 15 newspapers were chosen instead of 12.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the No. 1 paper, the New York Times, and the No. 2 paper, the Christian Science Monitor, are not metropolitan papers. They are primarily national or even international papers. Both serve a constituency throughout the length and breadth of this country. They are fine newspapers but there are peculiar advantages which both of them have as national newspapers that put them in a special category.

This brings us to the No. 3 paper listed—the Milwaukee Journal—this means, Mr. President, that in a nationwide poll of newspaper editors—judging on a standard of "news coverage, integrity, and public service," the Milwaukee Journal led every big city newspaper in America.

In my five primary and five statewide campaigns in Wisconsin, this great newspaper has never supported me; so I feel I can pay tribute to it without any feeling of obligation; but simply because I am convinced that this very great newspaper is one of the most important institutions in making the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin far better informed, and more conscious of our moral and social obligations than we could possibly be otherwise.

In recent days the unique qualities of Wisconsin have often been discussed and analyzed in connection with the exciting presidential primary that took place in our State. Largely because the Journal stayed aloof from this race, she was ignored in attempts to get at the character of the people of our State. This was a serious error, Mr. President, because the characteristics of comprehension of the issues, insistence on morality in government and the assumption of social responsibility—these characteristics are unusually strong in Wisconsin people—exactly because this great newspaper has been coming into hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin homes day after day for many years quietly and surely building these qualities.

Statement of George J. Burger Before Senate Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate Small Business Committee on March 22, 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUISNESS, BEFORE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, MARCH 22, 1960

Subject: Small Business Administration.

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740–742 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

We are a national organization composed exclusively of small, independent business and professional people. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in our country. We have membership representation in federation chapters in almost all of the Nation's congressional districts, including Alaska and Hawaii.

I am also more than pleased to advise the committee that during the past year or so our membership has shown a consistent increase nationwide.

From the first moment that the Congress established the Small Business Administration in 1953—shortly thereafter, at the direction of our head office, I personally conferred with regional offices of SBA in certain major cities throughout the Nation. In one of these conferences—in the Kansas City regional office—it developed at that time there were some serious misinterpretations of the administration of the Small Business Administration Act, and upon my return to the Washington office I arranged for a conference with the then Administrator.

Due to this conference, the facts developed called for a second conference a few days later with Treasury, Commerce, and SBA officials. The record will show that due to these joint conferences the regulations affecting the administration of the act were changed, resulting in all small business being able to enjoy benefits under the Small Business Administration Act, as Congress originally intended.

From that point on, Mr. Chairman, following the instructions of our head office, similar visits were made nationwide by me, conferring with the regional directors in many areas throughout the Nation.

At this point it is to be noted that in my appearance before the House Banking Committee May 9, 1958, Congressman PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, and third-ranking majority member of the House Banking Committee, made this observation:

"Are you going to cover the entire country with similar surveys? I wish you would, because it would be very interesting and revealing."

Then again in 1959 I conferred with regional offices in the following cities: San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, Minneapolis, Detroit, and Cleveland, such visits taking place in October-November 1959.

Prior to my conferences I submitted a memorandum to the various regional directors asking them to compile the information on the following questions, and that the answers be ready during the time of my conference with them:

1. What has been their experience in the issuance of certificates of competency?

(a) Is the Army, Navy, and Air Force cooperating in the COC program?

(b) How successful have the small-business concerns been in the completion of awards received under COC's?

2. What is their experience of small-business concerns receiving subcontracts in the weapons system?

3. Do they find that small business has difficulties in getting the names placed on qualified manufacturers lists, and on qualified bidders lists?

4. Do they believe that there should be a unified code of regulations for procurement in the civilian procurement field by General Services Administration and in the defense procurement field by the Department of Defense?

Let it be understood for the record that exceptional consideration and cooperation was extended to me by the regional directors in the various visits, the fullest cooperation extended—and in each instance these conferences lasted many hours.

During my visit in the San Francisco regional office, at the request of that office—they had a visit from a delegation of industrialists from Japan—I would say business representatives of a dozen or more from Japan—so being in the San Francisco area at that time they requested that I address that group, giving them the information on the Small Business Administration and the overall problems facing small business in our economy. I must say it was a very delightful experience.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time to include in this statement the complete answers furnished to me to the questions enumerated above, but my files will be available to the staff to review on the complete answers. Therefore, I will highspot what might be considered the overall of these visits, to some degree.

It is to be noted that as to the overall on question No. 1 I might state the answer would be: "The question sometimes comes to mind as to whether or not the military procurement agencies are notifying Small Business Administration in all instances where COC procedure should be instituted."

The summarized answer to question No. 2 would be: "It has been the experience of this regional office that large prime contractors of the Government have the tendency to hold on to all work possible which can be performed in their own plants."

Some report large contractors will not subcontract to small business when their own facilities are operating below capacity. They will offer subcontract opportunities to small business only when they are operating at full capacity or when certain components may have a nuisance value which would make them prefer to subcontract such items.

It is to be noted in many of these conferences that I attended, as they report, the recent hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee, and the House, have caused some concern among the large prime contractors.

On question No. 3, the summarized answer, as they report, is: "Many small business concerns have difficulty in getting their names placed on qualified manufacturers lists and bidders lists."

On question No. 4: "We firmly believe that there should be a uniform 'bid form' used by both military and civilian procurement agencies of the Government."

In one of the conferences the comment was made as to the necessity of decentralization in the operation of the Small Business Administration. In other words, the comment was: "More power in operation of the agency at the local level."

Also a comment was made that I believe has considerable merit—that SBA in Washington should take a more direct stand on many economic problems helpful to small business, and it is interesting to note that when I received that suggestion I then discussed this subject in other visits with SBA officials and I might state that there was a concurrence in the recommendation.

It would be my belief that when legislation is introduced to aid small business—that is, where it has been the practice of many congressional committees to send such legislation to the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce for their views, that same action should be taken on such legislation in requesting the views of the Small Business Administration. I believe this is something that the committee should take under consideration.

It was my observation in my visits in 1959, in these many conferences, that there was increased activity of the personnel in carrying out the original intent of the Congress.

In some of the conferences it was brought out as to the complaints they were receiving from small business as to the operation of post exchanges, ships stores, and commissaries. In some areas demands were being made on the SBA for some corrective action to be taken by the Government.

We believe this is a subject matter that should be developed by the Senate Small Business Committee in cooperation with the Small Business Administration. The expanded operations of these activities in the continental United States may be found to be going beyond the original intent of the Congress when they were established.

Mr. Chairman, I made it my business, in these interviews, to closely check into the number of loan applications being received by the various regional offices. In most instances the reports were that there was a declining number of applications. It would strike me that this is a healthy situation, and it was remarked in many of the visits that if the trend continued the appropriations to SBA on loans would be adequate unless there was a sudden upward surge in applications.

It is significant to note that in one conference an Army specialist for small business was present, and he remarked that in his opinion small business lacked managerial ability to carry out a Government contract. I, in no uncertain terms, answered that charge most definitely, and, Mr. Chairman, this leads me up to a recommendation that should be considered for the overall good of the Small Business Administration, and in most conferences there was concurrence as to the recommendations; namely, that the small business specialists in the armed services should be placed in the exclusive employ of the Small Business Administration.

It is significant and important to note that in one comment made by an SBA official he concurred with this with the exception that before they were transferred to SBA employment that a close screening should be made of these business specialists.

I think that recommendation should be considered for the overall good of SBA in its help to small business.

It is our opinion that up to this point, during its short existence (7 years in June) that the Small Business Administration has served a most essential need for small business particularly as to financial aid for small business. It is our understanding approximately 20,000 small businesses have been able to save themselves through the help of SBA, and it would appear to me from my many conferences that banks are taking a more cooperative attitude with SBA in participating loans.

Criticism reaches us every now and then, and no doubt also reaches Members of Congress, as to delay experienced in processing loan applications. Where these are reported to us, giving us the facts, we immediately take appropriate action on these complaints either in our personal visits with regional offices or through communication. In the majority; of cases we find that the responsibility does not rest with the agency, but, on the other hand, through the failure of the applicant, directly or indirectly, to furnish complete required information to SBA at the time of the original filing.

It is our hope and trust that the report I am making will be helpful to the committee, and that the committee will follow through on the findings and recommendations.

We try to present to the committee a fair and impartial view of our observations due to these many conferences in the various regions of SBA during the life of the agency.

The "China Problem" Reconsidered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, CHESTER BOWLES, has presented a penetrating analysis of the present situation with regard to American relations with Red China, in the April 1960 issue of Foreign Affairs magazine.

Providing us with a very realistic approach to the problem in an article entitled "The 'China Problem' Reconsidered," Representative BOWLES makes certain recommendations about ways we can "start to move off dead center in East Asia."

This is exactly the kind of thought-provoking assessment of the needs of U.S. Far Eastern foreign policy I had in mind when I made an address on this subject on the floor of the Senate last May. While my conclusions were not the same as Representative BOWLES' in every instance, we share the common belief that this country must develop a more flexible policy in Asia if we are to contribute to the stability of the free nations in that area. CHESTER BOWLES has made a major contribution to American thinking on a very complex problem and I commend his article to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "CHINA PROBLEM" RECONSIDERED

(By Chester Bowles)

In the autumn of 1949, after 22 years of bitter and protracted struggle, Mao Tse-tung and his Red armies finally established Communist rule over mainland China. The initial American reaction was division and confusion. It has remained so to this day. We still are certain only of what we will not do about China. We will not give formal recognition to the government in Peiping. We will not agree to Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations.

For too long now we have remained at the mercy of events set in motion by leaders in Taipei and Peiping. We have neglected to make constructive use of the periods of uneasy, calm between recurring crises. We have failed to take into account adequately the long-range forces which seem certain to shape future developments. Has the time not come to face the fundamental realities of our "China problem"? Until we do, we shall continue to be severely hampered in our relations with all of Asia.

Under present conditions, debate over recognition of Communist China by the United States is largely a dead-end street. If we should propose an exchange of Ambassadors, Mao Tse-tung would surely ask if our recognition extended to Communist sovereignty over the Province of Formosa. And when we replied that it did not, his response would inevitably be a contemptuous refusal of our offer. A similar outcome can be predicted if we proposed that "both Chinas" be admitted to the United Nations. Chiang Kai-shek would also reject such a proposal. The stalemate would persist.

This means that the two primary questions which have caused such deep discord here in America are not at the moment solvable. At some later stage we may find it useful to test the peaceful intentions of the Chinese Communists by proposing that both sides accept a situation which neither we nor they can alter short of war. But until then, let us bypass the question of formal relationships and focus on the immediate and, perhaps, obtainable.

If there were no other reason to seek a fresh perspective on Communist China, the crucial issue of disarmament would in itself be enough. For it is clear beyond doubt that no disarmament plan can have meaning without her participation. She possesses not only the world's largest army but a potential capacity for the production of nuclear weapons. Nor is there any reason to believe that we can hold the Soviet Union accountable for Peiping on this matter. Either we must give up any thought of reaching an agreement on a safeguarded system of worldwide disarmament or search for ways to influence the course of events in the China theater.

While we may be almost totally unable to affect short-term developments in Communist China, our capacity to influence other aspects of the China problem is greater than we seem to realize.

Formosa (Taiwan) offers a case in point. The island is rich and its economic development has been spectacular; yet its political position remains precarious, not only in regard to mainland China but also in its relations with the whole arc of free Asia from India to Japan. This is so because Formosa's political status is founded on a myth that Chiang Kai-shek, who was driven from the mainland 11 years ago, remains the ruler of 650 million Chinese. This myth—rejected by most Asians, by our NATO allies, by our closest friends the Canadians, and by a large number of Americans—is supported only by three or four Asian governments under heavy pressure from Washington, by our Department of State and by some Members of Congress. Perpetuation of the myth will increasingly isolate Formosa at a time when its leaders should be striving in every way to identify their future with the mainstream of thought and action in free, non-Communist Asia.

Americans and Nationalist Chinese alike should now strive to find a common ground with their allies and friends, and to relate their policies more rationally to the forces which I will shape events in Asia during the next decade. Such policies, I believe, may be based on the following assumptions:

1. That the Peiping government, although beset with difficulties, is in firm control of mainland China.

2. The mainland China, with an inadequate resource base, spiraling population, ruthless Communist leadership and intense nationalist spirit, will develop fiercely expansionist tendencies directed toward the weaker neighboring states to the south.

3. That a primary aim of American policy should be to prevent the armed expansion into southeast Asia which Chinese Communists leaders may be tempted to undertake.

4. That any effective disarmament program will ultimately require Peiping's participation.

5. That in the present circumstances no negotiation of our major differences with the Peiping Government seems likely to be productive.

6. That the 8 million Formosans and the 2 million mainland Chinese on Formosa have the right to a secure, independent existence and to cultural development outside the Communist orbit; and that such an evolution on Formosa is in the interests of the American people.

7. That for the time being Formosa's independence will continue to depend on American military guarantees and economic assistance.

8. That in the long run the security and prosperity of the people of Formosa will depend on the orderly political growth of the non-Communist nations of Asia, particularly India and Japan, and on their attitudes toward the Formosa Government.

9. That if ever it becomes practicable it will be in our national interest to restore our traditionally friendly ties with the Chinese people on the mainland.

Let us now examine, within the framework of these assumptions, the realities with which American policy must grapple.

II

Formosa, an island of 14,000 square miles of lofty mountains and fertile valleys, has hovered on the edge of Chinese history for several hundred years. In the mid-17th century, when the invading Manchus displaced the Ming emperor in Peiping and overran China, Formosa served as a refuge for adherents to the Ming régime, much as it now serves Chiang Kai-shek. In 1683, after 40 years of fitful struggle, the Manchus finally annexed the island and made it for the first time a province of China. In 1895, following the Japanese victory over China, Formosa passed under the rule of Tokyo and remained there until its liberation by American forces 50 years later.

Today political power in Formosa rests exclusively with the Generalissimo's authoritarian Nationalist Government. The 2 million mainlanders who fled with Chiang across the Formosa Straits in 1949 provide most of the Central Government's staff and account for two-thirds of his army of nearly 600,000 men. For a decade, American policy in regard to Formosa has largely focused on this Nationalist Chinese ruling minority. Yet in the long run it is the 8 million native Formosans who will shape the island's fate. We hear very little about their wishes, hopes, and fears. One of them, writing in this review recently, noted that there are no independnet Formosan newspapers and no recognized Formosan political parties.[1]

Some observers have suggested that the ultimate solution in Formosa may be to hold a plebiscite. As a practical matter, however, a plebiscite would almost certainly be rejected by both the Taipei and Peiping Governments. We, therefore, can only guess what most Formosans really want. Several significant facts can nevertheless be cited.

For nearly two generations prior to 1945, Formosans knew only Japanese rule. Although most of them speak the Fukien dialect of southeast China, they were educated in Japanese schools. Because the island prospered, many of them had come to feel closer to Tokyo than to the mainland. But 15 years of Nationalist rule have brought significant changes. Time, proximity, and education are creating, among the younger ages in particular, a gradual amalgamation of the island's Chinese and Formosan communities. There may slowly be emerging a new national identity predominantly Chinese by culture but Formosan in outlook.

This process has been aided by several important economic and political developments which critics of Chiang Kai-shek often neglect. Since 1949 the Nationalist Government has taken a series of constructive steps which it failed to take while it was on the mainland. Among the most important is its recognition of the decisive importance of the villagers who, as in all Asian nations, not only constitute the majority but also control the food supply and hence provide

[1] Li Thian-hok, "The China Impasse: A Formosan View," Foreign Affairs, April 1958.

the economic and political key to orderly growth. Under Chiang's direction, a reform program which limits land ownership to 10 acres and substantially reduces rentals has been combined with a competent rural extension service, easy credit, and an expanded fertilizer industry. The result has been a sharp increase in the output of rice and cotton per acre and an easier and more prosperous life for the peasants. Formosan living standards are now the second highest in Asia, surpassed only by Japan.

The internal political situation has also improved since the bloody 1947 uprising against the misrule of a carpetbagging Nationalist Governor. To be sure, the national government is still run almost entirely by mainlanders. The assembly has 1,576 members, of whom only 26 are Formosans. Yet there has been some progress toward democratic participation by Formosans. In the provincial assemblies and county administrations, for instance, the islanders hold large majorities through reasonably free elections. The mayors of most towns are also native Formosans.

For over 30 years in victory and defeat the Generalissimo has almost singlehandedly held the Kuomintang together. But though he is robust at 73 he cannot rule forever. Formosa's future depends on the stability of the government which will survive his passing from the scene.

As long as the United States maintains adequate sea and air power in east Asia, and the will to use it, there is only one way in which Mao Tse-tung can establish his sovereignty over Formosa and that is by a coup d'état which would depose Chiang or his successor and place in power a new island government prepared to come to terms with Peiping.

This development is improbable but not impossible. For 10 years the 2 million Nationalists on Formosa have been told that sooner or later Chiang's army—backed by massive American military support—would invade the Fukien coast and start the long-promised reconquest of the motherland. An increasing number of them have come to understand the practical impossibility of such a venture. Meanwhile, Peiping's propaganda broadcasts have skillfully played on their nostalgia and promised them forgiveness for their past sins, a hearty welcome home and even privileged positions in the new China. At the same time, Peiping has offered Formosa a special status as an autonomous area.

The persuasiveness of these appeals has been cut, of course, by reports of the way the communé system is working on the mainland and by Peiping's actions in Tibet. Yet the pull of the homeland still contributes to the potentially unstable political situation.

On the mainland, powerful totalitarian forces are reshaping Chinese society, remolding Chinese thought, and rewriting Chinese history within the constructing framework of the Lenin-Stalin-Mao ideology.

An independent Sino-Formosan nation can offer the contrast of a modernized non-Communist Chinese society, free from mass regimentation, with an increasing measure of political liberty and with expanding economic opportunities for all citizens. In building such a society the younger generation of Taiwanese and Chinese can find a common sense of purpose and at the same time supply a cultural base for the 13 million overseas Chinese.

III

How can we adjust our policy to foster such a development?

Let us accept the fact that Formosa's adoption of an affirmative new role in non-Communist Asia cannot be stage managed by American policymakers, however well supplied with good will and dollars. Nor can it be arbitrarily imposed on the Formosan majority by the Nationalist refugees from the mainland. Our role must be that of a genuine friend. The native Formosans, the Nationalist Chinese, and the world generally must be convinced that our objective is not to create a military base for the invasion of the mainland but to encourage the orderly growth of a new, independent nation.

In this perspective, our exposed position on Quemoy and Matsu makes very little sense. As Secretary of State Herter said on September 29, 1958, in a speech at Atlantic City: "Anyone can see from looking at the map" that these islands "are not strategically defensible in the defense of Formosa * * *" despite the fact that the Nationalist Chinese "have a fixed devotion to these islands which is almost pathological." In spite of this the State Department still hesitates to bring its tactics into harmony with such realities. So long as our position remains unclear we leave the initiative to others and expose ourselves to the possibility, if not the probability, that once again we will face the unhappy choice of retreating under fire or attempting to stand firm on a militarily untenable position.

On the one hand, we should encourage the neutralization of the offshore islands immediately adjacent to the Chinese coast. In their present status they serve only to keep alive the myth that a Nationalist invasion of the mainland is imminent and thereby give Peiping a handy excuse for "counter" hostilities.

On the other hand, our assurance that we will offer all-out military opposition to a Communist attack on Formosa itself should be substantially strengthened and extended to include any measures necessary to deter a coup d'état. In the event of such a coup, we should institute an economic and naval blockade to deny the Peiping Government effective occupation.

It might well take some time for Formosa's position in the United Nations as an independent nation to become accepted. Once this happened, its security would be backed by the organization's full guarantees. In the meantime our unilateral military commitment to defend the island must be unequivocal. We can no more abandon the people of Formosa than we can those of West Berlin.

As our military obligations in the area are gradually brought in line with the realities, we shall be able to reduce our military grants substantially. The savings can be profitably diverted into a further expansion of the Formosan economy.

The solid industrial and agricultural base now in process of creation will be a long step toward economic self-reliance. If the resulting economic benefits are directed largely to the peasants and workers instead of to the Nationalist minority already at the top of the economic pyramid, orderly political growth will be further stimulated. Private capital investment in Formosa should also be vigorously encouraged. If the island's independent future could be made more sure, increased capital would become available from Hong Kong.

American policy and American funds should also be directed toward the development of Formosa as a cultural center for non-Communist Chinese everywhere. Substantially increased assistance to Formosan colleges from public and private American sources can be an important first step in that direction. Scholarships for overseas Chinese to study on Formosa as well as scholarships for both Chinese and Formosans to study in the United States should also be increased. Similarly, more fellowships to enable talented American students to follow Chinese studies in Formosan institutions would help create the basis for a new partnership. Despite our long association with the Chinese, too many Americans are ignorant of their history and culture.

Finally, and of the utmost importance, every effort should be made to persuade the Nationalist Government to adopt a more realistic approach to their non-Communist fellow Asians. Formosa's future as an independent nation is tied to the future of free Asia and particularly to those two great geographic and political anchors, India and Japan. Unhappily, many Nationalist leaders have shown nothing but contempt for those free Asian governments which do not share their own doctrinaire interpretation of the world conflict. Instead, they often seem to speak and act on the assumption that a third world war is inevitable and that anyone who fails to agree is a Communist dupe. And, of course, such an assumption is basic to the myth of mainland reconquest. A wide gap therefore exists between the Nationalist Government and most of the peoples and leaders of non-Communist Asia. We should do all we can to close this gap and thus diminish Formosa's present political isolation.

Now what of "the other China," the giant on the mainland? Here our field for creative action is inevitably more restricted.

The Chinese Communist Government today is embarked upon a gigantic effort to industrialize its 650 million people on a resource base which is woefully inadequate. There seems to me to be three possible results of this experiment.

The Chinese Communists may be impelled by the harsh economic limitations of their position to modify their policies gradually, reduce their objectives, and seek to relieve their food and other shortages through peaceful foreign trade. In view of their intense, deeply rooted and doctrinaire Communist nationalism this development appears unlikely in the foreseeable future.

A second possibility is that they will seek to resettle part of their swelling population in the vast expanses of the Soviet Union bordering on China. But a large-scale development of these inner Asian regions of severe and uncertain climate would not be easy, and it is hard to imagine the conditions under which the Soviet Union would accept a great influx of Chinese settlers.

The third possibility is expansion into southeast Asia, with its wealth of underpopulated, food-rich countryside, as well as the great reserves of oil, tin, rubber, and other resources which China badly needs. Our objective must be to create a military, political, and economic barrier sufficient to discourage any such attempt.

For us to indulge in threats of atomic war would merely frighten the non-Communist Asian nations and further feed the fires of aggressive Chinese nationalism. It is vital, however, that we make clear in temperate language and through diplomatic channels our total commitment to defend southeast Asia against Chinese attack. And unlike an attack on Formosa, a Chinese thrust southward would also bring into play the existing guarantees in the United Nations Charter.

Ultimately, however, the fate of the non-Communist nations of south and southeast Asia will be determined by two factors which we can influence only indirectly: first, by their own economic and political stability and by their willingness to oppose any infringement on their sovereignty; and second, by the willingness of the two principal nations of the region, India and Pakistan, to add their weight more and more to the balance against Chinese aggression.

The role of India is of particular importance. Indeed, it is fair to say that an India which is politically stable and developing economically, and which works in harmony with the rest of non-Communist Asia, is the key to the ultimate balance of power in Asia and the Middle East as well. The recent Chinese probings of the Indian border regions have underscored both the significance of India and the dilemma she faces. Nor

has the lesson been lost on India's neighbors. Indeed, the attitudes in free Asia seem to be moving closer together in face of the common danger.

By wise and sensitive diplomacy we can contribute to this development. In the military sense, our role should be one of quiet readiness for any emergency, much as the British Fleet gave meaning to the Monroe Doctrine during our neutralist 19th century. Our direct economic assistance should give the highest priority to those nations which are willing and competent to help themselves and to devise programs to stabilize raw material prices at levels fair to the producers.

We undoubtedly have the strength to play our proper role in Asia; the question is whether we have the necessary tact, subtlety and flexibility. Let us, to begin with, put aside some of our own doctrinaire preconceptions and and examine realistically the complex nature of the Sino-Soviet relationship.

Deep potential differences exist between Chinese and Russian communism as a result of the radically different cultures, experiences and leaderships in the two countries. These are magnified by the fact that the two societies are at different stages of development—the one industrialized, with rich resources and an abundance of land; the other with a shortage in agriculture, inadequate resources and a burgeoning population.

Because of these differences we may assume the the Soviet Union and Communist China view the cold war from quite different perspectives. The Peiping Government utilizes the present tense situation in East Asia to fan the nationalistic fervor of its people, divert attention from internal difficulties and assure continued economic assistance and military support from the Soviet Union. When Moscow professes a desire to lessen tensions with the non-Communist world, there is every reason to believe that Peiping tends to pull hard in the other direction.

No outsider can be sure of the present nature or future development of the Sino-Soviet alliance, but certainly it is an infinitely complex and delicate arrangement. The assumption that it is rigid, monolithic and unchangeable is out of date. In view of this, recent efforts of State Department spokesmen to score debaters' points by depicting Mr. Khrushchev as leader of the world Communist movement and twitting him for not keeping China in line are naive and self-defeating. Let us realize that Communist alliances as well as Communist nations are subject to the eroding effects of economics, nationalism and history.

Between 1919 and 1933 the United States had no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Yet during that period thousands of Americans traveled in Russia and thereby increased both our knowledge of developments there and the Russian people's awareness and understanding of us. It seems to me that today we should be striving by all reasonable means to establish people-to-people contacts with mainland China. It may be useful as a first step to offer a fresh approach to the exchange of correspondents with Red China. We are badly in need of the facts and perspective that able American reporters can give us, and we have no reason to be embarrassed by what Chinese journalists may see in America.

Such a two-way exchange has been obstructed so far both by Peiping and by our State Department. It would be wishful thinking, of course, to assume that our attempts to reopen communications with the people of China will be welcomed by Peiping. In many ways, the Communists serve their own interests best by keeping us their public enemy. It is up to us, however, to remove all technical obstacles to the travel of correspondents still existing on our side so that responsibility for the continuing communications barrier will clearly rest with Peiping.

But the freer flow of news is only the beginning. Educators, politicians, businessmen—all the many Americans who could profit by a first-hand understanding of the Chinese revolution and who could transmit their understanding to the rest of us—should be allowed access to the mainland by our authorities, with reciprocal privileges for the Chinese. A by-product of such contacts would almost surely be the freeing of the five Americans charged with espionage and still held in Chinese prisons.

As I have already pointed out in regard to trade, it would be unrealistic at this stage in China's development to expect the doctrinaire Communist government in Peiping to attempt to meet its steadily growing food and raw-material needs by major purchases overseas. Yet in the longer perspective it seems clear that China's only practical alternative to an effort to seize the material and land resources of Southeast Asia by force is to embark on a greatly expanded trade program. Since world peace will depend on which road China ultimately chooses, this question deserves the most urgent attention of American policymakers.

Only when we start to move off dead center in east Asia, beginning with the creation and implementation of imaginative policies based on the reality of two Chinas, will we start to exert a constructive influence on the shape of events to come. And as we do so, is it too much to hope that the sheer magnitude of the war danger in east Asia may gradually bring a degree of at least tacit cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in that area? Despite our profound ideological and political differences and aims we seem to have a common interest in the development of a less precarious military, economic, and political balance of power in Asia.

Nationalist extremists on Formosa will not be happy about the policies which I have suggested, and the Communists in Peiping will denounce them violently. The patriotic but quite unrealistic Formosan nationalists who demand that we push Chiang aside and help them set up their own government will reject them also.

At this point, our policy should be directed toward proving these things to the Chinese Communist leaders: One, we will oppose by all necessary means any movement of theirs into southeast Asia. Two, we will not allow them to overrun Formosa either by direct attack or by subversion. Three, our military installations on Formosa are not designed to aid or abet a nationalist attack against the mainland. Four, Formosa is to remain a free entity and all its people should eventually be consulted as to its form of government.

If we adopt these objectives, it is possible that as the prosperity and stability of Formosa become evident the Peiping government may grudgingly come to accept the island's independence as one of the facts of life in non-Communist Asia.

Commendation for Representative Al Ullman of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the April 1960 issue of Northwest Ruralite. It recognizes the good work by my hard-working friend and able colleague from eastern Oregon, AL ULLMAN, on behalf of the people of his district and other areas:

GOOD MAN

Word leaks back to us from Washington, D.C. that, after two terms in the House of Representatives, Oregon's Congressman AL ULLMAN of the Second District is rising rapidly in skill and stature.

Mr. ULLMAN went to the House 4 years ago as one of the pioneer fighters for the Federal Hells Canyon project. In that battle and since, he's demonstrated aggressiveness and imagination. By formal education he's well equipped to analyze resources and fiscal problems. He knows, for example, that the heart of the interest rate problem lies in broad Federal financing policies, rather than in a strict, special interest approach; and he has helped greatly in mustering House strength against plans for more inflationary money cost measures.

Farmers and small businessmen all over Oregon should take note of this.

The Military Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative and interesting article entitled "The Military Mission," which appeared in the April issue of Air Force magazine and Space Digest, so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY MISSION

(By John F. Loosbrock, editor, Air Force magazine and Space Digest)

When we began Space Digest in November 1958 we chose the editorial path of what Associate Editor Bill Leavitt termed "space realism."

We believe that our peaceful pursuit of tomorrow's goals in space is best insured by living safely through today on earth. We also believe that the Lord, in His wisdom, knew that man would not have to be born with wings if he wanted to fly through the air nor with a self-contained earth environment if he wished to venture farther. So He did man a much greater favor. He gave man reason—an intellectual key with which to unlock the secrets of the universe. And He gave man a will—the freedom of choice with which to stimulate the brain to do man's bidding.

Using these tools man has flown through the air, to every cranny of the globe. And man has sent his instruments into space, to be followed ultimately and inevitably by man himself. But at the same time man's free will has led his brain into paths of mischief, of theft and murder, of war and pillage. He has created instruments of destruction which can, in the twinkling of a historical eye, erase the accomplishments of hundreds of centuries. This is the paradox of good and of evil, of peace and of war, as

impossible to separate one from another as to part man's will from his intellect.

Surely, against the backdrop of history, it is no longer possible to argue logically that there is little need for this Nation to exploit the military potential of space and to exploit it with urgency, diligence, and imagination. If we do so, and thereby gain an honorable and lasting peace, the road will automatically be open to peaceful exploitation. If we do not, someone else inevitably will, and we will find ourselves in a world shaped by those bold enough to become our masters.

This is not an attempt to degrade the scientific achievements of U.S. satellites. They have been manifold. But it is specious reasoning to pretend that we can profitably separate peaceful space from military space. Like the earth upon which we walk, the sea over which we sail, and the atmosphere through which we fly, space holds great advantages for both military and civilian use, and it is dangerous and misleading to try to split the two.

Our first national duty is to preserve a free world, from which spacecraft of the future may take off with serenity and to which they can return with confidence. This is the only possible way to insure the achievement of our national goal of utilizing space for peaceful purposes. The horse must be put before the cart.

How, then, do we use space for national survival and eventually for controlled peace in a better, richer world?

One of the best ways is to increase our knowledge of the enemy's actions through reconnaissance, surveillance, and improved communications. But before blindly leaping into space to meet these requirements, the military planner must take a cold look at the advantages and disadvantages. He doesn't go into space because it's there, as a mountain climber does, but rather because it allows him to do things there that he cannot better do anywhere else. Space is an extremely hostile environment. It is difficult and expensive to operate within. One must have a real need to go there before it is worth the effort.

On the other hand, space as an operational medium offers several real, measurable military advantages:

It offers greater altitude and longer line of sight.

Once you are in it, or your devices are in it, the effort required to stay there is quite small. You get a free ride, so to speak, once in orbit.

Space offers the opportunity to pass over enemy territory without violating national sovereignty or committing a hostile act.

By seizing upon these advantages this country can immeasurably better its deterrent position by reducing the vulnerability of the retaliatory force—both manned aircraft and missiles. With an acknowledged missile gap approaching, we need earlier warning against surprise missile attack. Another 15 minutes—the time it takes to drink a hot cup of coffee—would make all the difference in the world.

With 30 minutes' warning—instead of 15—SAC's manned bombers would be off and winging for Russia before the missiles came crashing in upon them; our liquid-fueled ICBMs plus the IRBMs in Western Europe would be topped off and ready to go; NATO's tactical air forces would be airborne, ready to supplement SAC on close-in targets; our national decision-making machinery would gain precious time to assess the situation; and those civilians fortunate enough to possess a fallout shelter could take cover. We would achieve an immeasurably stronger military posture.

We have the technical capability to do this No breakthroughs are needed, beyond the mental breakthrough required to pursue military space programs with the kind of intensity, funding, and priorities accorded the intercontinental ballistic missile program over the past few years.

The military space system closest to attainment is Midas (missile defense alarm system). Midas, a product of collaboration between the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Division and Lockheed, is a satellite bearing infrared, heat-seeking sensors which will locate and track ballistic missile firings anywhere in the world.

Even the brief, 5-minute "glimpse" afforded by the powered portion of ballistic missile flight will allow computers on the ground to compute the trajectories.

Beyond Midas is Samos, a photo-reconnaissance satellite, also a Lockheed product. It will furnish visual evidence that may indicate an attack is imminent. It is designed to provide strategic warning of an impending attack, rather than tactical warning that an attack has been launched.

To be ready in time to be of value, Midas and Samos demand support, both in terms of understanding of their underlying concept and in providing funds, facilities, and people. Neither is an isolated, one-shot satellite, but a complete system, involving several satellites in orbit simultaneously and, equally important, supporting electronic data-processing and communications systems on the ground. These include long leadtime items that must be developed and produced under the concept of concurrency.

Neither Midas nor Samos is the end of the line in its field. Each has great growth potential—Midas in the form of more definite warning and pinpointing of targets through improved infrared techniques; Samos in the shape of better picture resolution, wider fields of coverage, improved picture processing—all designed to get more and better information into the commander's hands more quickly.

Beyond early warning and reconnaissance—the immediate needs—lie communications satellites to better utilize the information derived, satellites to garner weather information (both meteorological weather and the so-called electronic weather which affects electromagnetic communications systems), and satellites to aid in navigation and aerospace traffic control.

As the size requirements for military satellites increase there will be a need for bigger boosters, and for new concepts in booster design—something that is cheap, easy to build, recoverable for other shots. And when satellites get beyond a certain weight—some say 5,000 pounds, others, 10,000—it will be possible to replace some of the electronic equipment with the human hand, eye, and mind—to change course, perform in-flight maintenance, to provide the commander on the ground with human judgment as well as raw information. Satellites could be kept operating longer, space-borne electronic equipment could be less complicated, photos could be developed and interpreted on the spot.

This is the military mission in space, these and other systems yet unforeseen.

Their achievements will make it possible for the free world to keep the peace on earth. Armament control and reduction will begin to make sense. Improved communications and travel will further shrink the globe. International funding could provide enough money for peaceful "far-out" space exploration and exploitation on a scale large enough to be rewarding. Inevitably and inexorably benefits of a peaceful nature will flow across an earth protected from destruction.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner Honoring Rabbi Harold H. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at a testimonal dinner in honor of Rabbi Harold H. Gordon's 25th anniversary in the rabbinate and 13th anniversary with the New York Board of Rabbis. Mayor Wagner delivered his remarks at the dinner which was held on March 24, 1960, at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER IN HONOR OF RABBI HAROLD H. GORDON'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE RABBINATE AND 13TH ANNIVERSARY WITH THE NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS

Rabbi Gordon, Rabbi Golovensky, Rabbi Mowshowitz, Governor Rockefeller, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be with you this evening and to extend the greetings of the people of the city of New York as well as my own on this happy occasion, this testimonial dinner in honor of Rabbi Harold H. Gordon. This occasion marks his 25th year in the rabbinate and his 13th year—his "Bar Mitzvah"—with the New York Board of Rabbis.

It has been my great fortune during the years of my incumbency as Mayor to learn at firsthand of the work of the New York Board of Rabbis and of Rabbi Gordon in particular. The office of the mayor of the largest city in the world has had many occasions to work closely with the board, the largest representative rabbinic body in the world, serving the largest Jewish community in the world. We have found it easy and natural to work with you.

We have worked together in many areas and our combined efforts have done much to help the men and women of this great metropolis. Since the departments of correction, health, and welfare are served by New York Board of Rabbis' chaplains, my office is in constant touch with you when you recommend chaplains for the agencies of our New York City government. Many of your corps of 120 chaplains serving 180 voluntary and municipal hospitals, mental and correctional institutions, city prisons, homes for the aged, convalescent homes and youth shelters, serve in institutions operated by the city of New York and supervised by its departments. We know the great work that they do, visiting the sick, distributing religious and inspirational literature and conducting religious services on the Sabbath, high holy days, and religious festivals. Your program is the most outstanding of its kind and is a model for similar programs throughout the country.

The Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry, sponsored and maintained by the New York Board for Rabbis for the past 11 years, remains to this day the only one of its kind in America. As a training school for rabbis and rabbinical students, it provides them with a greater insight into their role as spirtual leaders with particular emphasis in the area of pastoral counseling. To a community beset with many problems, such understanding is invaluable. I feel proud that

Bellevue Hospital, our own city institution, is being used as the training ground for this work.

Your advice and counsel have been helpful to me as mayor of the city of New York in many areas. You have not hesitated to speak out on social and economic issues as they arise, whether it is a continuing problem of juvenile delinquency, divorce, revision of our discriminatory immigration and naturalization laws, or a question of civil rights. In our efforts to combat juvenile delinquency, we have organized the clergy throughout the city and have asked them to help us. The New York Board of Rabbis has been prominent in its representation on this body, the mayor's committee of religious leaders to help combat juvenile delinquency. To the work of this committee, you have effectively brought to bear the wisdom and knowledge of your tradition for the benefit of all citizens of this great city.

You have always served as watchman for the Jewish community and you continue to do so, endorsing that which is beneficial and opposing what is harmful. You have never hesitated to raise your voices on the social and economic issues as they arise, and in true prophetic spirit speak out on matters that are of importance not only to the Jewish but also the general community.

In the field of mass education through radio and TV, your sponsorship of religious programs of interest to all faiths of our city is a step forward to closer relationships between peoples of all faiths.

Our honored guest, Rabbi Gordon, I have had the pleasure to meet on many occasions over the years. He has become a familiar figure at the public functions in which I have had the honor to participate. His tremendous contributions to the welfare of our community as a whole and his sincere interest in obtaining the greatest good for all citizens of this city regardless of race, creed, or color, is well known to me. It has been my great pleasure to consult with him on a number of occasions on matters of deep concern not only to the Jewish community but to all the citizens of this great metropolis.

As a member of the mayor's committee on scholastic achievement, Rabbi Gordon has done invaluable service in helping this committee make available to the needy students of both public and parochial schools, 4-year college scholarships.

Recently I had the honor and the pleasure to break ground for the proposed international synagogue and Jewish center at Idlewild International Airport. This romantic project is the brain child of Rabbi Gordon, and, in addition to acting as secretary of the project itself, he is one of its leading spirits.

He is a veteran of World War II and we can all take pride in the role he played in that conflict. His congregation was spread over a 25,000-mile area in the North Atlantic and he flew over a quarter of a million miles serving them. His service to men of all faiths during this conflict earned him the affectionate title of "the Flying Chaplain."

He still travels widely and from time to time I will receive a card from somewhere in this universe, but so far removed from us here that it would seem to come from outer space. The card is signed by Rabbi Gordon and he tells of some interesting visit to some Jewish community far away. I am certain that he has brought comfort and joy to those who were privileged to come within his purview in the far-flung communities of the world.

Finally I should like to say that I know that the greater part of the program of the New York Board of Rabbis was set in motion in 1946. That was the year when Rabbi Gordon first came to work for the board. That was also the year when the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, an organization which has done so much for our community, added another glorious chapter in their richly endowed book of good deeds, by giving financial assistance to the New York Board of Rabbis.

I want to express the thanks of the citizens of this city to the NYBR for your 79 years of service to the community, to you who serve the whole Jewish community as religion itself serves the whole human being. Without religion and faith and spiritual understanding, we are imperfect human beings. Without the strength and support that our city receives from the NYBR, we would be an imperfect municipality.

To Rabbi Gordon, who is now celebrating his 25th anniversary in the rabbinate, I want to wish the best of everything in the future. I look forward to that day 25 years hence when he will be celebrating his 50th anniversary, and I hope that I will be available and that you will invite me to participate.

Again, my good wishes and congratulations to our guest of honor and to all of you whom he serves on this anniversary celebration.

Thank you.

At the conclusion of his remarks Mayor Wagner presented to Rabbi Gordon, on behalf of the city of New York, a citation, the text of which follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK.

Know all men by these presents that I, Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby cite for distinguished and exceptional service Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, dedicated international religious leader who, for a quarter century, has magnanimously served the Jewish people and, indeed, all peoples; scholar, humanitarian; strong friend of the weak and unfortunate; champion of Jewish rights; beloved and conscientious citizen who contributes much to the welfare of his home community, the city of New York.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 24th day of March 1960.

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

Four Negroes and the Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we near the final days of a long discussion about voting rights in the South, we may well appreciate any words which give a fresh reminder of the importance of the objects we seek. Leon W. Lindsay, in the Christian Science Monitor of April 6, has given us such a reminder in a vivid article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 2, 1960]

FOUR NEGROES AND THE VOTE

(By Leon W. Lindsay)

Many Negroes in the South exercise the right to vote; many more do not. Why don't they vote? The reasons appear to range from apathy to register hocus-pocus to actual intimidation. But if Congress passes a voting rights bill this year, at least the legal ruses and intimidation may be eliminated, and perhaps eventually the apathy.

Having been brought up in a rural Deep South community, I tend to think of this impending event in terms of individual Negroes I have known. What will it mean to them? Will they vote wisely? Is the ballot a strong enough lever to pry them loose from an economic system that has kept some of them in the status of lackeys? Will it be more meaningful to the generation now approaching voting age than to their parents?

Giving fictitious names, let us try to see what this most basic of democratic tools might mean to four of my rural neighbors.

We meet them across the counter of my family's country store over which flows more conversation than foodstuffs—conversation being so much cheaper.

In conversations with Phillip Denson, I learn to associate one term peculiarly with him: self-satisfaction. Phillip is the young father of five children and husband of a teacher in the Negro school in our community. He is not formally educated, but I have found that he reads more widely than most of his friends and that he is capable of discussing the significance of the bomb almost as knowledgeably as his favorite ballplayer's batting average.

But Phillip is careful in certain fields to refrain from becoming personally involved. He has set himself certain bounds and is content to stay within them.

Phillip's self-satisfaction stems from steady employment, comparatively good income, home ownership, and a wife who not only makes more than he does but whose family background and professional position give both her and Phillip a great deal of prestige. Phillip is quick witted and industrious. His employer knows he can depend upon Phillip, and they have a good relationship.

Phillip's wife votes in every election. In some southern communities perhaps she couldn't, though she is a schoolteacher and a member of a family that was free and owned property even before the Civil War. But in this community certain standards of education and family background by custom prevent a Negro's being kept off the voting rolls. Phillip could vote, but he disdains it. He is satisfied to influence his wife's vote on the one hand, and on the other hand to publicly malign all politicians.

What will Phillip do when all his friends and neighbors begin to exercise the newly guaranteed privilege? He will probably vote, too, for he will find that to do otherwise would eventually undermine the prestige and superiority he owns. And, I am sure, Phillip will be a well-informed voter.

Phillip has a 12-year-old son. Hardly the age to vote, his chief concern today is whether he will, after graduating from the four-room, four-teacher, seven-grade rural Negro school, ride a segregated school bus to a segregated high school in town, or whether the pressure for integration will provide him the kind of equal opportunity he feels he deserves.

At times I think Harold is a budding politician, himself. Eager, optimistic, friendly, intelligent, and shrewd, he seems always able to barter me out of an inordinate amount of goodies in return for some joyous little task such as restocking a shelf of canned goods.

You can be sure Harold will vote when the time comes. Already he has surpassed his father, and in some ways even his mother. He will, one feels, be ready for more demanding duties of full citizenship than the mere casting of a ballot.

Two of my regular customers during the time I worked in the store come to mind when considering the Negro and the vote. Both Randolph Carter and Leroy Edmunds

are cotton farmers—sharecroppers, or as we call them, half-hands. They farm parcels of river-bottom land on a nearby plantation. Out of what they produce, half goes automatically to the landowner, about one-quarter usually goes to pay the landlord for seed, insecticide, and for day laborers who might be needed to help "chop" (thin out the cotton plants and hoe out the grass) and pick cotton. This leaves about one-quarter for the half-hand—or does it?

Randolph is prosperous for a half-hand; he has three grown daughters, two of voting age, and his wife to help cultivate and harvest his crop. Aside from payment for seed and insecticide, he has little else to settle for, since his family is able to do most of the labor. Therefore, he is able not only to harvest one-quarter of the crop free and clear, but perhaps even more. This means that he clears enough in good years to tide his family over from one crop season to another without borrowing and even without seeking outside work. He has time for long conversations by the store heater during the winter.

Leroy's lot is different. With a wife and three preschool-age children, he has no family assistance with his crop. This means that he is not able to work as large a parcel land as Randolph, and that more than one-fourth of his crop goes to pay for seed, insecticide, and extra labor. And that is not the end of it; he clears so little on his crop even in good years that he annually goes into debt to his landlord for advances for food, medical bills, clothing, and so forth. During the off season he works as often as possible cutting railroad crossties, but since the off season is in rainy winter, much working time is lost.

The chronic and embarrassing burden of debt has driven many of Leroy's contemporaries to leave the farm—to go to the nearest town, or to Chicago, or Houston, perhaps. But Leroy stays on, despising the land he is shackled to, but loving it too much to desert it, one feels. Leroy says little, but his habitual glowering at his shoetops tells much of the struggle within him.

Leroy has never voted, though he has been eligible by age through three general elections. Randolph told me about his one experience at the polls. Once he lived on a plantation where the half-hands were duly registered and summoned to the polling place on election day. There they cast their ballots for the "right" candidate. Illiteracy was no barrier in that election—there was someone to guide each hand in marking a ballot.

Neither Randolph nor Leroy has tried to register. Perhaps it's because of some kind of apathy on their part. It could be, possibly, fear. Maybe they still remember that a few years ago white men threatened to meet with shotguns any Negroes who showed up at the polls. Of course, there were Negroes who voted in that election—and they were not met with shotguns. But for many the threat was enough, and continues to be enough.

How do these men react to disfranchisement? Neither man is illiterate. Each reads his Bible, and Randolph is a deacon in the church. Randolph, ebullient in good humor, tries to shrug it off. ("One crook ain' no diffrunt from 'nuther. We gits the same treatment, so what do we care who is the guv'ment?"). But I know him well and can see the hurt under the sarcasm.

Leroy cannot hide his bitterness. If he were voluble, he would rant. However, he just mutters and stares at his shoetops.

Will they vote under Federal protection? I think they will. Doubtless, they will vote as wisely as some white men, less wisely than others. There are others who will never vote, just as there are whites who do not vote.

Will the vote solve Leroy's problems? Not directly, but it could well serve to lift his vision from his shoetops. It may do much to cut through the disdain of Phillip and the rueful sarcasm of Randolph, to make them even more useful individuals than they now are.

But perhaps it will mean the most to Harold, and perhaps it is Harold who can be expected to make the most of it.

"Equal Opportunity in Housing"—Address by Harris Wofford, Jr., Associate Professor, Notre Dame Law School—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent address on the subject of "Equal Opportunity in Housing" by Harris Wofford, Jr., associate professor at the Law School of the University of Notre Dame.

The address was delivered on Equal Opportunity Day, November 19, 1959, in South Bend, Ind., at an observance sponsored by the South Bend Urban League and Hering House Community Center, Inc. November 19 marks the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Professor Wofford has a distinguished background in both public and private life. He has practiced law in Washington, D.C., and has more recently been serving as legal assistant to the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame and a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Professor Wofford served on the staff of the Commission.

As a research assistant to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, in 1957, Professor Wofford accompanied Mr. BOWLES to India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Professor Wofford holds a degree from the University of Chicago and has bachelor of laws degrees from Yale University and Howard University Law Schools.

He was largely responsible for the organizing of the Conference on Civil Rights held at the Notre Dame Law School on February 14, 1960.

Part 1 of the text of Professor Wofford's address follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

(Address on Equal Opportunity Day, November 19, 1959, South Bend Urban League and Hering House Community Center, by Harris Wofford, Jr., associate professor, Notre Dame Law School)

You don't know how glad I am to be here and on time. I was so late to two recent talks on the Civil Rights Commission's report that I was beginning to fear that fate was against me or the report. The story of being bogged down by snow in Peru, Ind., last week, on the way to McCormick's Creek State Park, to talk to Indiana educators on the Commission's findings about school desegregation, is perhaps a good beginning tonight. An oldtimer at the gas station in Peru where we bought some chains to get us through the snow insisted that we should hole up in Peru for the night and let time take care of the roads. And my wife and I were almost fainthearted enough to do so. But the president of the association that was waiting to hear my talk gave us the moral leadership to keep on going. In McCormick's Creek, he said, it was just raining softly. "Drive safely, but keep on driving," he urged. And we did and got through, an hour and a half late. Which shows, as Justice Frankfurter once said and as the Commission on Civil Rights has paraphrased in its report, "It is not time alone that helps, but the constructive use of time." Without the help of sand thrown on the road and some plowing by the State of Indiana, the chains we bought, and the moral leadership of the association president on the telephone, we would not have reached our destination.

This problem of civil rights will take more time, but we are already late enough. We need further assistance from our Government for it is as Justice Brandeis once said, "the potent, the omnipresent teacher" that "teaches the whole people." We need moral leadership from the President of the United States. And we need to keep on driving toward our destination, the full equality of opportunity promised by the Constitution.

There is one other moral in this story. Shortly after we left Peru the snow stopped and turned to slush and then there was only soft rain and we knew the worst had passed. It may be that we passed the worst of the present civil rights storm in Little Rock, but we will not know this until the drive is over. Even when equal opportunity is everywhere established in law and duly enforced there will probably remain the soft rain of private prejudice. This will seem bad enough, of course, and those who never knew the kind of legal discriminations now facing American citizens in some parts of this country will not really believe that things could ever have been so bad.

OUR SELF-EVIDENT TRUTHS

This talk, I hope, will not only be on time, but be at the right time in the right place. For a discussion of the report of the Commission on Civil Rights ought to be appropriate at a meeting called by the South Bend Urban League and the Hering House Community Center on Equal Opportunity Day. On this day 96 years ago this Nation through Abraham Lincoln dedicated itself to the unfinished work of fulfilling the underlying promise of the U.S. Constitution. That promise, solemnly made to the world in the Declaration of Independence, renewed in the preamble to the Constitution, again declared by Lincoln at Gettysburg, enacted as the law of the land in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution, and then elaborated by decisions of the Supreme Court and enforced through acts of Congress and the actions of many Presidents rises out of the fundamental proposition that all men are created equal. The very fact that 96 years after Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg the Congress and the President found it necessary to establish an official Commission on Civil Rights, to investigate denials of the right to vote by reason of race and other denials of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment, such as enforced segregation in public schools or in housing; the fact that the South Bend Urban League is in existence with so much unfinished work to do in securing equal opportunity here in South Bend; the fact that we can still refer to the equal protection of the laws as a promise—all this demonstrates that, Benjamin Franklin to the contrary notwithstanding, the truth that all men are created equal is not self-evident, at least not yet to enough

of the people to turn the promise into a reality.

In clarifying this basic principle of our Constitution it might help to recall Lincoln's explanation that the Founding Fathers "did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellectual, moral development, or social capacity." But they did consider all men equal in their God-given and hence unalienable civil rights. "They meant," said Lincoln, "to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere." Enforcement of these equal rights, said Lincoln, would "follow as fast as circumstances should permit." Or, as the present Supreme Court puts it, "with all deliberate speed." But you may say, the men at Philadelphia said this in 1776, yet slavery continued for 87 years; and Lincoln said it again 1863, the year of emancipation, yet the promise of full first-class citizenship is still not fulfilled, 96 years later. That is a long time to wait.

THE GAP BETWEEN PROMISE AND REALITY

The report of the Civil Rights Commission states that "The gap between the great American promise of equal opportunity and equal justice under law and its at times startlingly inadequate fulfillment in practice has * * * been a major—and probably a creative—factor in American history from the beginning of the Nation." But that is not a sufficient answer. The only adequate answer is that this gap between our words and our acts must now become a spark-gap. And at this late date I think that is just what is happening. The tension in the American mind and in American laws has become so great that a flash of illumination is now taking place. The 1954 and 1955 school decisions of the Supreme Court, the 1948 and 1953 housing decisions of the Court, the 1957 Act of Congress to protect the right to vote, the several Presidential Executive orders in the last 10 years establishing the Federal policy of equal opportunity in employment, the many State and local laws prohibiting discrimination in employment, housing, and public facilities, and now the report of the Commission on Civil Rights—all these are part of an electric current now running through our body politic, awakening the conscience of the Nation, and stirring us into action. I would like to add to that list South Bend Mayor Edward F. Voordes' Proclamation of Equal Opportunity Day this November 19, adopting the words of President Eisenhower that "every American who helps, even in the smallest way, to make equality of opportunity a living fact, is doing the business of America."

Tonight I want to discuss what the Commission's report has to suggest for the constructive use of time, on one of the three problems of discrimination the Commission studied. But in focusing on housing I do not mean to imply that Indiana and South Bend have no other problems of civil rights. Nor did the Commission intend to isolate voting, education and housing as the only important aspects to be studied. Now that its life has been extended for 2 years the Commission is studying two other central problems: discrimination in employment and in the administration of justice. In the conclusion of its report last September the Commission stressed "the organic nature of the problem as a whole." Improvement in no one factor alone will suffice, for as the Commission pointed out:

"If the right to vote is secured, but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing, the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance. If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums."

This organic nature of the problem is no news for the urban league, which has long been working to promote equal opportunity along the whole broad front and to raise both standards of living and standards of citizenship. For the urban league knows from personal experience what the Commission found in its housing study, "that the low-income and employment status of a majority of Negroes is a central fact in the discrimination in housing." Therefore, your current program here to open new opportunities in employment is one constructive use of time that contributes also to opening of new housing opportunities.

THE GOAL IN HOUSING

Let us be clear about our goal in housing. It is not imposition of an artificial pattern of integration by which Negroes are scattered equally, willynilly throughout a community. Rather our aim must be, as President Eisenhower told Congress, "to assure equal opportunity for all of our citizens to acquire, within their means, good and well-located homes." As the Commission's report stated, "there may be many Americans who prefer to live in neighborhoods with people of their own race, color, religion, or national rigin." Mr. Roy Wilkins, the executive secretary of the NAACP, testified in the Commission's New York hearing that there are "colored people in Harlem who wouldn't move out of Harlem if you gave them a gold-plated apartment." There are still some members of national-origin groups—Swedes, Germans, Poles, Italians, Irish, to name a few—who choose to live in the same vicinity with others of their group.

What is at issue is freedom of choice. If, as the Commission's report puts it, "some Americans, because of their color, race, religion, or national origin have no choice but to grow up and live in conditions of squalor and in rigidly confined areas, then all America suffers."

After hearings in New York, Chicago, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C., field surveys in a number of other cities, and reports from State advisory committees in most States, the Commission found such a denial of freedom of choice and equal opportunity in housing to exist throughout the country. Let me read part of the Commission's unanimous finding:

"A large proportion of colored Americans are living in overcrowded slums or blighted areas in restricted sections of our cities, with little or no access to new houisng or to suburban areas. Most of these Americans, regardless of their educational, economic, or professional accomplishments, have no alternative but to live in used dwellings originally occupied by white Americans who have a free choice of housing, new or old. Housing thus seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay. It would be an affront to human dignity for any one group of Americans to be restricted to wearing only hand-me-down clothing or to eating the leftovers of others' food. Like food and clothing, housing is an essential of life, yet many nonwhite American families have no choice but secondhand homes. The results can be seen in high rates of disease, fire, juvenile delinquency, crime, and social demoralization among those forced to live in such conditions. A nation dedicated to respect for the human dignity of every individual should not permit such conditions to continue."

THE AFFRONT TO HUMAN DIGNITY

You can see that the central point in this finding is the affront to human dignity. The affront takes two forms: First, the very existence of slums in which some Americans have to live, and, second, the denial to colored Americans of higher incomes of the equal opportunity to better housing in better neighborhoods that is available to other Americans. Slum clearance, public housing, and urban renewal, if carried out with primary attention to the pressing housing needs of lower-income residents, can remedy part of the problem, but only part. A large portion of the slums in our central cities are inhabited by Negroes. If the housing conditions of the present Negro residential centers are improved, but the possibility of living elsewhere—in the suburbs, for instance—is closed to Negroes, then they will continue to call these areas "ghettoes."

The term "ghetto" originated in Venice where the Jewish section was surrounded by a high wall, and entry and exit were regulated by means of an iron gate called in Italian "ghetto." As the Commission's report states, "In this country, the Constitution would prevent any such public manifestation of discrimination. But the invisible barriers to equal opportunity for Negroes are manifest when a Jackie Robinson, with a high income and the respect of the country, cannot find a satisfactory suburban home in the State of New York."

It is this shutting of the door of opportunity to other Americans that is compounding the housing problem of Negro Americans. They, like most newcomers to the cities, like the successive waves of foreign immigrants before them, most of them initially at the bottom of the social, educational, and income ladder, naturally first concentrate in the oldest and worst sections of the cities. But white immigrants who learned the American language and had an American haircut became Americanized—and part of their Americanization was a gradual dispersal among the whole community. As they prospered they were able to move outside these original areas of concentration to better homes and better neighborhoods, and this was a great incentive to them—an incentive for hard work, for saving, for education.

The testimony of Cardinal-Designate Meyer of Chicago posed the uncomfortable question which every American community must ask itself. There are, as the Archbishop of Chicago said, many Negro Americans, "teaching in the classrooms of our universities, pleading cases in our law courts, performing operations in our hospitals, and in short doing work that only the highest intelligences most perfectly trained are capable of." He asked: "Has this new and rapidly increasing Negro middle class been able to choose its place of residence as the children of our European immigrants were able to do? Does the fully competent Negro person have the option we alluded to above? Unfortunately, the only honest answer we can give it, at best, is a qualified no." Cardinal-Designate Meyer stressed that "it is the restrictions against the most capable and self-reliant portions of the Negro population which call the loudest for remedy and which must be rectified most speedily."

The Record in Civil Rights: Republican Promise Versus Republican Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, few freshman Members of this body have ever made such a distinctly favorable impression in and out of the Congress as has the talented and conscientious Member from the Third District of Indiana, my good friend, JOHN BRADEMAS.

Typical of the effective leadership he has exhibited on many public questions are his outstanding contributions to our national thinking on the divisive issue of civil rights.

At the Democratic Midwest conference in Detroit on March 25, he persuasively stated the case for executive leadership if we are to move ahead steadily and soberly toward genuine democracy for all Americans. I call the attention of my colleagues to the text of Congressman BRADEMAS' address, The Record in Civil Rights: Republican Promise Versus Republican Performance. Mr. BRADEMAS' speech follows:

THE RECORD IN CIVIL RIGHTS: REPUBLICAN PROMISE VERSUS REPUBLICAN PERFORMANCE

(Text of an address by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, at Democratic Midwest Conference, Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., March 25)

Unquestionably the most memorable experience in my first year in Congress was hearing the magnificent address delivered by Carl Sandburg to a joint session of Congress on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

I vividly recall the moving and deliberate reading by Sandburg of the opening lines of Lincoln's House Divided Speech of 1858: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

I do not know a better way to begin a discussion of civil rights than with Lincoln, for somehow this entire problem is represented by that one tragic hero of our history.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: "WE CANNOT ESCAPE HISTORY"

"Fellow citizens," Lincoln once warned Congress, "we cannot escape history." And we of the Prairie States, of the land that was frontier in Lincoln's time, we cannot escape him. For everywhere we go in our politics today, we find Lincoln coming back. Listen, for example, to these words from a letter Lincoln wrote in 1855 to a Kentucky friend:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty."

"If we could first know where we are * * *," said Lincoln. Where are we, this 100th year after his election?

WHERE ARE WE IN CIVIL RIGHTS?

Where are we in completing the great unfinished work he left us, the work of translating into reality the bold statement of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal"? Where are we in civil rights?

It is nearly a century now since slaves became citizens, since the Constitution guaranteed to them the equal protection of the laws and the right to vote. No man who appreciates the complexity of human behavior will deny that time and patience are usually the sine qua non of great change. But a century is a long time to wait.

And where is Lincoln's party, the party whose Representatives in Congress were too busy last month making Lincoln Day speeches back home to sign their names to a discharge petition to force the civil rights bill out of the House Rules Committee?

Where is the Republican Party on this most crucial domestic issue confronting the American people today?

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS HELP WEAKEN CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Having just come from the civil rights debate in Congress, I saw with my own eyes the skillful and cynical way in which Republicans in the House contributed to the erosion of an effective civil rights bill. I do not refer to any single dramatic rejection of civil rights, although there was one occasion when the Republicans in mass joined the Dixiecrats to strip the bill of any voting rights section at all. But I am talking about a steady, persistent effort to weaken meaningful legislation to protect the right to vote and equal opportunity in education and employment.

Day after day, on vote after vote, the majority of the Republicans in Congress either abstained on crucial civil rights votes or voted with their Southern Democratic friends who, it can at least be said, do not when home tell their constituents how hard they're working to pass a strong civil rights bill.

REPUBLICAN "OPERATION EMASCULATION"

This Republican "operation emasculation" is not on rollcall votes so much as on voice votes and teller counts—on the votes that in large part determine the shape of a bill, the votes that the folks back home don't know about.

It is easy to vote for a civil rights bill on the final rollcall. Practically everyone north of the Mason-Dixon line, Republican and Democrat, did so yesterday.

But why is the bill coming out of Congress this year likely to be a weaker bill than the Nation needs? Because when the House was sitting as the Committee of the Whole, when the crucial amendments were being voted on, the votes not recorded by name in the press, the Republicans voted with the "Dixiecrats."

Normally the Republican-Southern conservative coalition operates behind the scenes and quietly. Its cynicism sometimes shows as, for example, when a Congressman who opposes a Federal housing bill offers an amendment requiring racial integration in public housing. He realizes that the conservative Southerners will abstain in order to let the amendment pass and so make it impossible for their liberal southern colleagues to vote for the housing bill as a whole.

Some of you may recall the dramatic moment last year when this cynical effort to kill the housing bill failed because in order to save it Congressman CHARLIE DIGGS, of Michigan, and BILL DAWSON, of Illinois, and the other two Negro Democratic Members of the House courageously led our troops down the aisle to vote against such a rider.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION ASKS FOR WEAK CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

But such close victories in Congress cannot prevail against the Republican-Southern coalition when the coalition is in control of the White House—when a Presidential veto awaits one progressive measure after another.

It is therefore important to understand that it is not simply the GOP-Dixiecrat coalition in Congress that resulted in an inadequate civil rights bill in the House this week. The Eisenhower administration itself recommended a weak bill.

Bowing to the pressures of the coalition, the White House did not even urge on Congress the so-called title III that was stricken from the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the title authorizing the Attorney General to bring equitable suits to enforce constitutional rights, including the right to desegregated schools.

The Eisenhower administration itself proposed this same measure a few years ago and time has only proved the necessity of granting such authority to the Department of Justice. The burden of enforcing the guarantees of the Constitution of the United States ought not to be borne completely by a private organization like the NAACP. According to the Civil Rights Commission, the average cost of one desegregation lawsuit is $15,000.

NOTRE DAME CONFERENCE BACKS TITLE III AUTHORITY

At a civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame last month, many of the leading constitutional law experts from the major law schools of the Middle West agreed strongly and unanimously that Congress should enact title III authority for the Attorney General into law.

The Eisenhower administration made no effort to win over Republicans in the House or Senate to this proposition and it went down to defeat in both Houses.

The same charge of hesitation and vacillation can be brought against the Republican administration with respect to the central issue in the current civil rights debate—the voting rights provision.

The Commission on Civil Rights, which produced such an extraordinarily able report, was, I remind you, President Eisenhower's own Commission and therefore had not a single northern or liberal Democrat on it. It was headed by a distinguished Republican, John Hannah, president of Michigan State University. That Commission strongly recommended a bill to empower the President himself to appoint Federal registrars to enroll Negro voters when State registrars refused to do so.

U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION CALLS FOR FEDERAL REGISTRARS

Having found the U.S. Government "under present law to be helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution," the Commission declared "some direct procedure for temporary Federal registration" to be necessary—some direct procedure that avoids what the Commission described as "the delays inherent in litigation."

"The burden of litigation involved in acting against each new evasion of the Constitution, county by county, and registrar by registrar, would be immense," said the Commission.

What was the administration response? For months it said and did nothing. It poured occasional cold water on the Commission's plan. Then, when mounting pressure from Democratic Members of Congress to adopt the registrar proposal made clear that the administration could no longer defend its previous pallid civil rights recommendations, when the findings by its own Civil Rights Commission of mass disfranchisement proved too politically explosive, when it became evident that some legislation had to be proposed to enable the Federal Government to guarantee the right to vote—what did the Eisenhower administration do?

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES FEDERAL REGISTRARS

It came up with a scheme for more court litigation and court-appointed referees.

I hope profoundly, as I know you do, that the referee plan will get the job done that needs so sorely to be done, insuring the right to vote to millions of American Negro citizens now effectively disfranchised.

But I want to make very clear that the liberal Democrats of the House and Senate have done their best to win a stronger and better measure in accord with the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission. Much of the credit for this effort in the House of Representatives goes to two extremely able and dedicated freshman Democrats, Congressmen JIM O'HARA, of Michigan, and BOB KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin. Although first termers, they showed vigorous leadership during the course of the civil rights fight in the House these last several days.

CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS SUPPORT FEDERAL REGISTRARS

As you may know, last week Congressman KASTENMEIER proposed and brought to a vote in the House Senator HENNING'S Federal enrollment officer plan, which combines both judicial and administrative approaches. The Hennings-Kastenmeier proposal is a dual trigger plan whereby either a Federal court or the Civil Rights Commission—which is to say, either a judicial or an executive official—could make the initial finding that a voting registrar or other State or local official had deprived persons of an opportunity to register. The President would then be advised and empowered to appoint Federal enrollment officers—registrars—actually to register disfranchised Negroes on a large scale.

But the Republican southern coalition voted this proposal down.

The liberal Democrats in the House then proposed an amendment to the Attorney General's plan to provide that once the pattern or practice of discrimination had been found, the disfranchised Negro would not have to go through the indignity of applying to the local registrars who had been found to be discriminating—they could come directly to the Federal court referee for registration. But the heirs of the party of Abraham Lincoln refused to accept even this improvement.

CONGRESSMEN KASTENMEIER, O'HARA OF MICHIGAN SHOW LEADERSHIP

We did succeed, just barely and in large part due to the articulate leadership of JIM O'HARA, in winning enough Republican votes to pass his amendment assuring a Negro swimming in the sea of this litigation the right to vote provisionally and to have his vote impounded, pending final determination of his application on appeal.

Surely this amendment will make the plan more effective. But you should have seen how many Republicans either abstained or voted against this obviously strengthening amendment.

Of equal significance was a technical amendment authored by Congressman WILLIS, of Louisiana, an amendment that placed more burdens on the back of the Negro applicant with respect to what he must do and prove to get registered—an amendment that could serve no good purpose, an amendment which even the Attorney General and the Republican leadership opposed. Yet probably a majority of the Republicans who voted, and not many did, voted with their southern colleagues.

REPUBLICAN PARTY OPPOSES CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Hear, then, the reading of the first lesson, the story of how a Commission on Civil Rights proposes and the Republican Party disposes.

Against the fundamental finding of the Commission and against the overwhelming advice of constitutional law experts who made clear that this problem was more appropriately a responsibility of the executive branch, the Republicans pressed for adding more weight to the backs of the already heavily burdened judicial branch of our Government.

The entire posture of the Republicans in this matter is another example of the effort of this administration to sweep its political problems under the judicial rug. As Prof. Paul Freund, of Harvard, said in a memorandum to Senator KENNEDY, "The Commission plan brings the President into the process of safeguarding the right to vote. The Justice plan seems designed to shield the President from any such participation."

REPUBLICANS WOULD ADD MORE BURDEN ON COURTS, SHIELD EXECUTIVE

"There is reason to believe," says this leading constitutional law scholar, "that the Federal judges have been shouldering more than their fair share of responsibility in this general area and that in all fairness the executive branch should lend its weight to the discharge of this national responsibility."

This was, I might add, the predominant view of the law teachers at the Notre Dame Conference on Civil Rights.

Yet the administration turned its back on this body of legal opinion to adopt the approach that requires Negroes to go through a court process to register. How many white people would get registered to vote if they had to go through court litigation and the possibility of cross-examination on the witness stand rather than taking 5 or 10 minutes to complete an application form?

I do not suggest that we judge the Republican record on civil rights on the basis of their actions on this bill alone. This is only the top of the iceberg, the part that shows. What doesn't show but which the Civil Rights Commission saw was what the Commission described as the disappointing record of the administration in using and testing the power granted in the 1957 act to protect the right to vote.

In over 2½ years the Attorney General has brought only four suits under this provision and all these only after the Civil Rights Commission or the press had brought the facts to light.

GOP OFFERS ONLY PLATITUDES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The lack of imaginative leadership in the field of school desegregation is, if that is possible, still more tragic. Adlai Stevenson incisively summed up the failure of the administration to show the way when he said there has been nothing between the platitudes and the bayonets.

The President has talked a great deal about law and order but he has never used the majesty and dignity of his great office to help the American people understand the nature of the problem, the constitutional and moral principles involved and the variety of possible solutions.

This year when I spoke to the freshmen at Howard University in Washington, D.C., one Negro student asked me why it was not better to have Republicans in control of Congress because of the opposition of southern Democrats to civil rights legislation. It was a fair question but I am bold to say I think my reply was fair, too. I told him that by and large the Republicans simply didn't believe in effective civil rights action, and when I reminded him that in all President Eisenhower's 7 years in the White House he had not once made a nationwide television plea for action on the most burning domestic issue of our day, I was greeted with a volcano of applause.

The Negro students of our country are very perceptive in assigning the blame in this matter where it belongs.

STATE DEPARTMENT HITS SOUTH AFRICAN SEGREGATION BUT PRESIDENT HESITANT ON U.S. SEGREGATION

It is particularly ironic that, while the President hesitates to condemn segregation in the United States, our Department of State this week in the most blunt language deplored the violence used by South African police against Negroes who demonstrated against segregation in that country.

"In this and like communities," Lincoln said, "public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed. Consequently he who moulds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

What has President Eisenhower done in these crucial years since the 1954 decision to mould public sentiment? He says that this is a problem of the minds and hearts of men but what has he done to reach their minds and hearts? It is no adequate response to say that he sent in troops to enforce the law when he says he hasn't even told his wife what he thinks about the Supreme Court's desegregation decision.

I direct your attention to the sit-in demonstrations throughout the South. President Eisenhower said that he did not want to make any judgment about the lunch-counter demonstrations "because I'm not in a position to."

Responds the brilliant New York Times correspondent, James Reston, "Why isn't he?" One hundred years after Lincoln's election, adds Reston, an American President "ought to be willing to say at least a word for the Negro trying to eat a hamburger next to a white man in Atlanta."

FATHER HESBURGH SAYS LAW HELPS CHANGE MINDS AND HEARTS

And while I have indicated my awareness of the truth in the contention that ultimate solutions must come from individual minds and hearts, I must here repeat what the Reverend Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and a distinguished member of the Civil Rights Commission, said about the role of legislation in arriving at these solutions. Said Father Hesburgh "Law, defining the goals and standards of the community, is itself one of the great changers of minds and hearts. In this democracy, law points the way toward ultimate freedom and justice for all Americans, everywhere in our land."

But this is only part of the story of the Republican record in civil rights. The other part concerns the economic and social measures necessary to lift the level of living of all the disinherited sectors of our population—the measures of economic and educational advancement required if we are to tap the full creative potential of the people of our land.

The President's Commission on Civil Rights addressed itself to this problem as well. "Prohibiting discrimination in voting, education, and housing, or other parts of our public life will not suffice," said the Commission. "The demoralization of a part of the nonwhite population resulting from generations of discrimination can ultimately be overcome only by positive measures. The law is not merely a command and government is not just a policeman. Law must be inventive, creative, and educational."

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION CALLS FOR ACTION IN HOUSING

The Commission suggested some positive measures. In housing, it found that the "disabilities of colored Americans are part

of a national housing crisis involving a general shortage of low-cost housing."

"Since colored people comprise a rising proportion of the city dwellers with lowest income, these slums are becoming increasingly colored," the Commission noted. From this finding, the Commission concluded "that for decent homes in good neighborhoods to be available for all Americans, two things must happen: the housing shortage for all lower income Americans must be relieved, and equality of opportunity to good housing must be secured for colored Americans."

I am sure all of us here can agree with the Commission that "equal opportunity in housing will come more readily as part of a great program of urban reconstruction and regeneration." But we must equally be aware of the way in which the effort of a Democratic-controlled Congress to frame an adequate program for slum clearance, urban renewal, and low-income housing has been frustrated and indeed twice vetoed by a Republican administration unwilling to make the investment which prudence and sound economics indicate.

PRESIDENT IGNORES CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION HOUSING PROPOSAL

Nor has the Executive order calling for an end to discrimination in all Federal housing programs, which the Civil Rights Commission urged the President to issue last September, yet seen the light of day. In these 8 gray years there has been little inclination to undertake the great program of urban reconstruction and regeneration which the Commission held to be essential to the promotion of human rights throughout the country.

The same negativism that has characterized the administration attitude toward housing holds true of education. The Commission report stresses the necessity of improving the facilities for public education as part of the solution to the difficulties posed by desegregation.

"Better teachers and better schools," says the Commission, "will go a long way to facilitate the transition in public education."

NIXON TALKS FOR EDUCATION BUT VOTES AGAINST IT

But again the contrast between Republican promise and Republican performance is eloquent. Only a few days after a Chicago speech on January 28 in which he said, "Inadequate classrooms, underpaid teachers, and flabby standards are weaknesses we must constantly strive to eliminate," Vice President NIXON cast a tie-breaking vote in the U.S. Senate to kill a bill to provide Federal funds for both classrooms and teachers' salaries.

Nor has the administration taken any action on the proposal by Commission Chairman Hannah, Father Hesburgh, and Commissioner George Johnson that Federal aid to colleges and universities be conditioned on the practice by those institutions of nondiscrimination.

The Executive actions which the Commissioners proposed in housing and education require no lengthy congressional debate, no court litigation. They require only a President with a will to act. As Father Hesburgh told the Notre Dame Conference on Civil Rights, "this is a simple thing that could be accomplished tomorrow morning if those in power would decide to do something about it."

GOVERNOR WILLIAMS OF MICHIGAN URGES PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Governor Williams, whose profound dedication to human rights inspires us all, has made this same plea to the President in a first-class article in the February 18 issue of the Reporter magazine. He specifies the many powerful avenues of action the President could pursue tomorrow morning if he were determined to make a moral breakthrough on this problem—the kind of action President Roosevelt began with his wartime Fair Employment Practices Committee and that President Truman continued with his Executive orders calling for equal opportunity in the Government service, the armed services, and in the field of Government contracts.

Once again to quote the Civil Rights Commission: "To eliminate discrimination and demoralization, some dramatic intervention by the leaders of our national life is necessary."

CHESTER BOWLES SAYS CIVIL RIGHTS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

We Democrats of the Middle West cannot pretend that we have done all that we should have done or that our part of the United States is practicing what we so often preach. As CHESTER BOWLES so well reminds us, civil rights is not a regional but a national problem.

Nonetheless, good starts have been made—laws against discrimination in employment and housing in our cities and States, and not laws only, but agencies and commissions working to bring light rather than heat into these difficult areas of our public life.

The Civil Rights Commission reported that there were 13 States and 34 cities with laws against discrimination in some field of housing, but I understand that Michigan and Minnesota are the only two States of the Middle West on the list. We lag badly behind the pioneer States of Connecticut, Colorado, Massachusetts, New York, and Oregon.

MIDWEST HAS CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEMS IN OWN BACKYARD

So we have work to do. We will be far stronger in our struggle to protect the right to vote in Mississippi and to encourage desegregation of the schools in the Deep South if we more squarely face up to the tests peculiar to our own part of the country—equal opportunity in employment and housing and the problem of de facto school segregation because of residential racial concentrations.

It ought to be clear to all of us who live in the Middle West that we will be more effective in the fight for civil rights throughout our Nation and that we will obtain a stronger platform on civil rights at Los Angeles and more resolute action from the next Democratic administration if we accept fully our own moral and political responsibility here at home.

So that, in shorthand, is where we are.

Whither are we tending?

MATIN LUTHER KING: "IF YOU HAVE WEAPONS, TAKE THEM HOME"

"The wind of change is blowing," Prime Minister Macmillan warned the Parliament of the Union of South Africa. It is blowing not only on that continent just now emerging onto the stage of world events, but it is blowing in this country, too, in the massive Negro demonstrations at lunch counters, in the passive resistance symbolized by a Martin Luther King, who tells his people in soft but fearless words: "If you have weapons, take them home. If you do not have them, please do not seek to get them. He who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword."

This is a dedication and a spirit that will not be easily overcome. Its intensity is a measure of the change that is upon us. But it is not a change that should take us by surprise. For it is a change which means simply that the gap between the noble promise of our Constitution and its fulfillment in the life of our country is at last being closed.

EARLIEST CHAMPIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS WERE SOUTHERNERS

For the American dream is now to become a reality for colored Americans as well as white ones. The dream which Thomas Wolfe of North Carolina put into these words—and let us remember that both the author of the Declaration of Independence and the earliest champions of civil rights, the men who got the first 10 civil rights adopted as our Bill of Rights, were southerners—that dream is alive and at work in the minds and hearts of southerners today, black and white, and of northerners, too.

It is this dream which it must be the primary purpose of the Democratic administration of 1961 to shape into reality, the dream and promise described by Thomas Wolfe:

"To every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity, to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever things his manhood and his vision can combine to make—this, seeker, is the promise of America."

Loyalty and Disclaimer Affidavit in the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a further series of articles and editorials from student publications regarding the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Simmons College News, Mar. 18, 1960]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH LOYALTY OATHS?

Not many people approve of the loyalty oath and affidavit provisions in the National Defense Education Act. Members of the academic community at large who have spoken at all, have insisted firmly that section 1001(f) is very bad indeed.

Although most students walk around spouting this altogether correct judgment, one suspects that they really do not understand what it is that makes loyalty oaths and affidavits "bad." What can be wrong in making a written affirmation of our loyalty, when we are expecting to borrow money from the taxpayer's pocket?

Loyalty oaths and affidavits are offensive because they violate the relationship between the individual and the Government established in the Constitution. Every American is guaranteed freedom of speech, thought, and belief. This individual does not exist to serve the needs of the government; the Government exists to serve the needs of the individual. In this relationship, a set of laws is set up in order for the Government to protect the individual. Most crimes punishable by law are infringements of these "Thou shalt not * * *" laws. (N.B. commit murder, park in a tow zone.)

A COMPACT

Thus we have made an agreement, for our own safety, not to do certain things. At the same time we are guaranteed some inalienable rights. Implicit in these rights is our freedom to choose any other manner of speech, thought, or action that we please. These choices have nothing to do with the law. The law does not tell us what to say, think, or do; it simply tells us what we cannot do if we expect to enjoy the services of the Government.

The affidavit which appears in section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act states that the loan recipient "does not believe in, and is not a member of, and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches; the overthrow of the U.S. Government * * *." In other words, the affidavit passes judgment on a person's belief.

When a student is required to sign such a statement, he is not just saying that he won't plan to overthrow the Government. He is in effect admitting that it is all right for the Government to tell him what he must believe, as well as what he must not do. It may seem as though we belabor an obscure point. Yet this point nevertheless violates the agreement between the individual and the Government which has heretofore guaranteed intellectual freedom. A requirement of belief or conviction conflicts with our basic tradition of intellectual noninterference.

STUDENTS DON'T OPPOSE LOYALTY

We do indeed wish to show our loyalty, but we do not wish to be forced to show our loyalty by signing oaths. Says presidential aspirant JOHN KENNEDY: "I would be concerned, if we cannot eliminate this provision, about the United States of America. Never before have we tried to legislate orthodoxy in our colleges. Never before have we sought to put college students in jeopardy for their private beliefs. Never before have we assumed a scholar is disloyal until he swears to the contrary."

"Surely this is not the way to 'catch up' with new Russian excellence—by imitating their objective of teaching students what to think instead of how to think * * *. Do we really believe that loyalty can be reduced to an automatic formula, coerced and compelled instead of inspired?"

When the Kennedy-Clark bill comes before the Senate this month, it will advocate only the removal of the affidavit. (Supporters of the bill feel it will be impossible to pass legislation calling for removal of both oath and affidavit.) The oath is not opposed as heavily. It states the following: "I do solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

JUST AS BAD

Although all civil servants are required to take a similar oath, it is fully as objectionable in principle as the affidavit. In a person's American citizenship, his "faith, allegiance, and support" is assumed. A man's loyalty is always taken for granted according to law until he is convicted of treason. Although a citizen may not do certain things, there is nothing he is compelled to do for the specific purpose of proving his loyalty.

Presence of the oath (as well as the affadavit) in the NDEA implies disloyalty—it would not be included if there were no question. Yet an assumption of guilt is not ever made in a court of law before a person is tried. He is innocent until proved guilty. Thus a student who receives loan money should be assumed loyal until proved disloyal. He should not be required to state his loyalty.

Because our Bill of Rights distinguishes our Government from totalitarian governments, we must prevent ourselves from destroying our own freedoms. We therefore deplore the oath and affadivit, we support the Kennedy-Clark bill which will remove the affidavit, and we implore our Congressman to vote for it. Furthermore, we insist upon the removal of the loyalty oath from all contracts which the Government now administers.

[From the Skidmore College News, Mar. 17, 1960]

SKIDMORE JUMPS TO NDEA CALL

(By Betty Garman)

The NSA board reports a great response to the efforts it made last week to educate the campus about the National Defense Education Act.

Hoping to encourage students to write directly to Washington stating their views, NSA distributed 703 postcards in a total of 18 hours, and over 400 copies of information about the NDEA were picked up by students at campaign headquarters in the mailroom.

Approximately 400 students signed the petition to be sent to Senators KENNEDY and CLARK. The board feels, however, that the petition will be meaningful only if a majority of the student body signs; it will be circulated again this week.

The actual success of the campaign cannot be measured in the quantity of material distributed. It will only depend on the responsibility of each student to carry through her stated desire to write a letter. Post cards and letters should be mailed as soon as possible, for the debate on the NDEA will probably follow soon after civil rights.

It is also important that each person write her Representative in Congress for only 10 percent of the lower House has chosen sides at present. The Senate is nearly assured the 52 votes necessary to pass the legislation. However, the strength of the Senate stand may determine the Representative vote.

[From the Eastern Michigan University Echo, Mar. 10, 1960]

POSTSCRIPT: LOYALTY OATHS

"For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it."
—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Student council's action against the loyalty oath of the national student defense loan program last week seems to have been the stirring rod necessary to perk up student reaction on an issue of national importance.

Judging from the letters received by the Echo this week, which are printed on this page, the council's position is not cheered unanimously by all EMU students.

We would have been concerned had the council attempted to convey the idea that their opposition to the loyalty oath reflected unanimous student body approval. They, of course, did not do this. The person who proposed the motion assures us that the statements to be sent to Members of Congress stipulate that the opinion expressed is that of the council only.

We welcome the action of the EMU branch, American Association of University Professors, which backs the council's resolution against the oath.

And we're happy to see students voice their opinions, whatever they be. For the record, we'd like to reiterate our stand on loyalty oaths:

As has been pointed out, under the program, college students—and only college students—are forced to have their loyalty questioned among all civilian groups which receive Government loans or aid.

Nobody else—from the farmers who get loans for their crops to members of REA co-ops to big publishers of magazines and newspapers (including the Daily Worker) who are subsidized by the Government Post Office to persons receiving Government insurance under the FHA program—has to sign the loyalty oath required of college students.

If the oath were an across-the-board affair—where anyone receiving Federal loans had to sign—objections wouldn't be so strenuous. But why are college students singled out? Why is the loyalty of college students suspect?

More important, however, is the fact that the loan program can inhibit free speech, investigation, and thought. Kentucky's venerable Senator COOPER put it thus in Senate debate on the oath.

"Why then are we asking these college students to prove their loyalty? Is it because we distrust them? Is it because we distrust the teaching in our colleges? Is it because we distrust a free system of education—the search for ideas, and the search for truth?

"These young boys and girls will change their minds time and time again while they are in college. A few of them may become Communists. Among the hundreds of thousands who go to college under this bill there may be a dozen, or there may be 20, or 30—or there may be 50—who will become Communists. But there will be 200,000—if this is the full number expected in the program who will be loyal to this country.

"The very essence of our system is that it is free—freedom of ideas, freedom of search for the truth. We must believe that the free system of education will win out over conformity—the conformity of communism."

The belief that the loyalty oath is necessary to help trap Communists through perjury is frowned upon by President Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Arthur Flemming. In calling for the repeal of the loyalty oath, he points out that "laws designed directly and specifically" are already on the books to deal with anyone "receiving assistance under this act (who) is identified as a person who is in violation of our internal security laws."

[From the University Daily Kansan, Feb. 17, 1960]

MURPHY AND THE OATH

(By Doug Yocom)

We doff our hats to Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy for his stand on the loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit.

He said his own opinion is that the loyalty oath is "unnecessary and improper" in regard to student loans. He gave the university's stand as being:

"The money is being given to the student on an individual basis. Therefore, it is strictly left up to the student to decide whether he wants to sign the papers or not."

This is only fair. After all, a recent survey of 379 KU students showed that 47 percent felt they were not familiar enough with the loyalty provisions of the National Defense Education Act to form an opinion on the oath. The university should not refuse the NDEA loans with almost one-half of the students not knowing why. It would be equally unfair to outlaw the loan fund when 29.5 percent of the 53 polled said they opposed the oath but believed KU should continue using the fund.

Dr. Murphy has stated the official university stand on accepting the Federal loans is based on the individual's own decision. If a student feels the loyalty provisions of the loan are objectionable, he has to answer to his own conscience.

Technically, the loyalty provisions can be divided into two separate parts. The loyalty oath asks the student to once again go through the formality of swearing allegiance to the U.S. Government. The disclaimer affidavit asks the student to swear he is not a

member of a subversive organization or any organization "that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by illegal or unconstitutional methods."

We can see no purpose in the disclaimer affidavit. A card-carrying Communist would not have any qualms against swearing falsely to the document. And who determines what organizations are subversive? The affidavit does not specify the organizations that are disloyal. Could we be convicted of perjury if an organization we joined today would become labeled as subversive tomorrow? The affidavit does not say. The state is belittling the individual by striking blindly in hopes of finding a few subversives.

There is another danger in having the affidavit. The Federal Government could decide to extend the provisions of the oath. It might read "are you now or have you ever been in a group which openly discussed Marxism?" Or, equally as ridiculous, "are you in favor of recognition of Red China?"

Our wrath descends upon the loyalty oath as much as the disclaimer affidavit. It is an honor to recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag or blend our monotone voice to the music of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Doing either is an American tradition.

But the loyalty oath implies that Uncle Sam does not trust the judgment of American youth. If we, after 15½ years of education, are not mature enough to distinguish communism from socialism or fascism or democracy, it is doubtful we will ever be able to make these judgments. Forcing us to give out allegiance so we can obtain a few dollars is putting patriotism on a material basis. We place our loyalty alongside any professional patriot in the American Legion. But we resent anyone trying to buy it. Loyalty is difficult to judge in terms of dollars and cents.

[From the Montana State University Kaimin, Jan. 22, 1960]

THE OATH RETURNS TO HAUNT

That old bugaboo, the loyalty oath, is back with us again, only this time it's after students, not "evil Red professors." Many had thought this unpleasant episode in academic history would have been interred with the skeletons of the anti-Americans during the early 1950's. Many had hoped that its implications that those who didn't sign were Communists and traitors would have been forgotten. No, not yet.

This time the oath is required of all students receiving financial aid from the Federal Government under the terms of the education act. Several colleges and universities have refused to accept Federal funds as long as the oath remains a part of the requirements for receiving aid. Others, have accepted the funds grudgingly, indicating the disapproval of the loyalty oath requirement.

Recently President Eisenhower told a press conference that he did not approve of the inclusion of the loyalty oath requirement in the Education Act saying "when we begin to single out any group of citizens and say, 'this is a matter of legal compulsion,' I can see why they are resentful."

That is exactly the point. The oath implies that those required to sign it are suspect of their loyalty to the United States.

It's hard to understand why Congress would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act's requirement of an anti-Communist oath by union officials and at the same time defeat Senator JOHN KENNEDY's motion to delete the loyalty oath from the Education Act. Can it be that our Nation's principal internal enemies lie within ivy-covered walls and sulk in ivory towers?

The oath is an insult and defeats the purposes of the Education Act, to train specialists essential to the defenses of our Nation. But what Communist, or other subversive would hestitate for a moment to sign such an oath?

There is only one solution to the problem created by the oath and that is to bury it.

The only use the oath was to serve as a foundation for the dreams cherished by a few who dearly hoped that it would scare away anti-Americans (Communists, segregationists, integrationists, etc., ad nauseam).

[From the University of Kansas Daily Kansan, Dec. 9, 1959]

DON'T QUESTION OUR LOYALTY

(By George DeBord)

Section 1001(f) of title X of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 sits like a tin can on a fence post.

Nobody can pass it by without throwing a rock.

Educators and students from Maine to Oregon are taking potshots at this section, the so-called loyalty oath.

The American council on education opposes the affidavit for a number of reasons. The council calls it discriminatory, unfair, inappropriate, superfluous, and ineffective, and says it involves Government interference in institutional affairs.

Each argument is well supported.

But these are just so many words in a controversy already muddled by weighty writing. We think the president of Harvard University got to the heart of the objections when he said:

"Arguments for the requirement reveal an unwarranted lack of confidence in American young men and women, in American education, and in free inquiry."

In support of the oath a Minnesota student wrote the following to the university's newspaper:

"Perhaps I may sound a little old-fashioned in this era of liberal freethinkers, but I am a proud American citizen and even a little bit patriotic.

"I would be more than glad to sign any kind of paper stating this."

We are equally proud to be Americans, but will line up behind the Harvard man to cast the next stone at this can of distasteful stew.

We object to the loyalty oath for the very reason the Minnesota student supports it. As Americans we cherish the right to think and do as we please. We will fight any intrusion upon this right.

The oath, in effect, asks us to guarantee the Government that we are loyal citizens. This is like telling a man he must prove his love for his mother. It is an insult.

The question becomes a matter of principle. We maintain that we are good Americans and do not have to prove it to anyone.

The insecure thinking behind the oath—thinking that spreads distrust among our people—this we feel is the real threat to our freedom.

We do not fear the few Communists who are in this country. We fear the men who preach patriotism while they destroy the trust that is essential to our unity. For this unity is the real source of our strength.

No Nation can hope to survive, that is, built on a foundation of paper.

[From the University of Washington, Nov. 30, 1959]

OATH REQUIREMENT PROTESTS TOO LATE

(By Mary Richardson)

Two of the Ivy League "giants," Harvard and Yale, have announced their withdrawal from the Federal student loan program as a protest over the loyalty oath requirement. The two universities join the ranks of six other schools who have refused to accept the oath on the grounds that it violates the principle of academic freedom.

Certainly these institutions have a right to protest the Government's demand for a loyalty affidavit. And just as certainly the eight schools involved have little real need of the funds they are relinquishing in the name of educational liberty.

All the schools who have wtihdrawn are extremely well-endowed colleges and universities. On the other hand—and may we utter an unhappy sigh here—the University of Washington is not. In common terms, "We sure could use the money." Consequently, it would be unwise for the university to consider a similar withdrawal.

We are not saying, however, that we should not protest the forcing of the loyalty oath upon students. To the contrary, we feel that the original lack of protest was a basic factor in the inclusion of the oath.

The inadequate number of public complaints allowed the requirement to be left in the bill when it was passed by Congress. And students alone were not to blame—even many of the faculty members on this compus last spring would not make a statement concerning the oath.

The oath itself seems like a kind of window-dressing, a holy-holy attempt to permit only the good and the pure to get an education on Government funds. The truth of the matter is that little faith can be put in such oaths.

Students—and faculty—on this campus should let their protests be known. Only by making our feelings public can we expect any action to remove the oath from the loan program.

National Library Week—Union County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the public library has been called the university of all the people. This week, National Library Week, is an appropriate occasion for the Congress of the United States to recognize the irreplaceable role of the library in all our lives. We who represent the people here at the seat of the National Government should be especially aware of the special contribution libraries make in bringing the information and understanding on which the people must rely in the work of self-government.

Under a previous consent, Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of my remarks a most informative article which appeared in the April 4 issue of the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, and which describes one of the finest public libraries in our area, the Plainfield Public Library and Reading Room.

I also include an editorial from the April 7 issue of the Summit (N.J.) Herald which I believe sums up briefly and cogently the real and lasting value

of libraries—as "treasuries" which "open our minds to other views."

The articles follow:

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, Apr. 4, 1960]

LIBRARY ALL THINGS TO ALL PLAINFIELDERS

(By Teresa Polychronis)

Did you know that the Plainfield Public Library and Reading Room has something to offer every man, woman and child in this area? Whether you work, or keep house, or go to school, you will find something in line with your interests, hobbies and needs.

Go over to the library one of these days (it's at the corner of Park Avenue and West Eighth Street), look around and talk to one of the librarians. Chances are you might decide that a whole "world" can be found in that old Job Male building and its annex, the Carnegie building.

The library, with reason, has been called: A problem solver, a how-to-do-it expert, a recreational center, an entertainer, a meeting place, a study hall, an art gallery, a consultant, a house of knowledge, a preserver of the past, a conserver of the present and a builder of the future.

"Our library can be more things to more people than most public libraries and can cater to more interests because private funds help us to do things we couldn't do otherwise," Lynniel A. Moore, the director, said today.

Although the library is tax supported, it benefits greatly from moneys left to it in its early days by far-sighted Plainsfielders.

"Not only is our library a public library," Moore explained, "but we have had to build up a collection which ordinarily falls into the realm of a university library because of a large student population here."

"Many have commented that this service is unusual," he added.

"Why does it have so much variety?"

"We have had to build up many collections because there are so many community groups and because the community is so active culturally," he answered.

The library's services are not limited to Plainfield residents. It includes the entire area, since residents of other communities can join for a fee. One membership is good for a family.

Perhaps one of the library's most widely known services is the circulation of materials. However, you may not know that more than books, pamphlets, and magazines are included. Also available for the asking—if one has a library card—are motion picture films, recordings, portfolios (mostly of prints and art reproductions) and vocal music scores.

The library also maintains a rental collection, including best sellers and other popular books.

What about the library's special collections?

Besides the standard reference facilities one finds in a college library, the Plainfield library has a genealogy collection, Plainfield history and New Jersey history collections, a large collection of scientific books and periodicals (maintained by the Babcock Fund), a large Americana collection (maintained by the Tyler Fund).

The library has microfilms of the Courier-News and former Plainfield newspapers going back to 1837, the New York Times, and the Saturday Review. Bound copies of the New York Times, published during the Civil War, are shelved in the basement.

Less well known is the library's extensive art collection. Moore said it very often is lost to the public because of space limitations which forbids a proper display.

Besides operating a children's library, with a children's librarian and staff, the library regularly conducts story hour and film programs for the youngsters.

Among activities for adults are great books discussions groups, and film programs. Concerts and art and photography exhibits are regular occurrences at the library.

Rooms within the library are available for public meetings. Many local groups, ranging from the Camera Club to political parties meet there.

Have you or your family or your club or church members ever wondered where you could get information you need right away?

The library staff answers questions and prepares reading lists and bibliographies. They are available to answer anything and everything within their power, except contest questions.

Besides local inquiries, the library receives many questions from other communities and States.

Did you know the library can help you improve your business operations or provide you with vocational guidance materials?

The library is building up a service to local businesses. Among the materials acquired so far are Thomas' "Register of Manufacturers," a complete set of Moody's "Manual of Investments," Standard and Poor's "Financial Records," Barron's "Financial News," Kiplinger's "Changing Times," industrial directories for New Jersey and New York areas and Philadelphia; a complete file of Plainfield city directories, a commercial atlas and manuals on subjects such as stocks, bonds, industrials, public utilities, investments, banks, insurance, real estate.

Among its other collections are books in foreign languages, how-to-do-it books, college catalogs, career and vocational guidance materials, instruction on how to pass examinations (gneral and civil service), consumer reports and comparative purchasing information, and a file on community organizations (with current officers listed).

Here are some of the things the library does for the community:

It cooperates with local schools in teaching students how to use a library and making reference materials available to them, in working closely with school libraries and in helping set up school libraries. The Clinton School PTA receives assistance in operating a library at the school.

Special libraries in the area, such as those at Muhlenberg Hospital, Union Carbide, American Cyanamid, Ethicon, receive cooperation from the Plainfield Library. And, the library helped plan a library for the new Neighborhood House building.

Library staff members speak to community groups. They also help organizations by setting up exhibits. During the Plainfield Art Association's exhibit last year, art books and materials were featured in the library. An exhibit on the Hawaiian Islands was tied in with the chamber of commerce's Hawaii day. They are cooperating with the Plainfield Council of Church Women on their current program on Africa.

Services to individuals even range to evaluating books in their private collections.

The library periodically plans special displays to inform and stimulate interest in other countries, special events, commemorations, writers, and the like.

You could continue endlessly to account the highlights of the world within the local library's walls. Then, you could take off from there and show how it is a channel through which the greater world comes to you the individual. But, it might be more fun for the individual to explore and to discover all these things for himself.

[From the Summit Herald, Apr. 7, 1960]

LIBRARIES POINT THE WAY

The current observance of National Library Week underscores the constant reminder that through reading comes understanding and through understanding comes truth.

Libraries throughout the State and Nation this week are bringing home the fact that the strength of our Nation is founded in the minds and hearts of its citizens. The knowledge that lies within books has been instrumental in shaping our society, our customs, our laws and our inalienable right to be free men.

This week local residents can take advantage of this observance of National Library Week by visiting the city's local facilities where displays and exhibits point the way to better understanding through reading. This week furnishes an excellent opportunity to highlight the total resources of our own library. Those who wish to be better acquainted with the amount of reading materials available, would do well to stop into the library and peruse. We are sure all will find something of interest whether it be in the field of fiction or non-fiction.

Reading takes on many mantles. Some read for pleasure, while others read for relaxation. Others read for education. But all in effect, read for one purpose, and share a common experience * * * the realization that they are opening their minds to other views.

This week, take time out from the routine matters of day to day living and visit the library. We are sure there will be found a vast treasury, more valuable than money or gems. The treasury found will be knowledge and truth. Both open the door to better understanding of ourselves, our neighbors and the nature of things which surround us.

A Thoughtful Doctor Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James Brooke of my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., is a thoughtful man. Too often, in my opinion, our doctors have no time for taking thought. They are too busy treating their patients and keeping up with new developments. Dr. Brooke is an outstanding example of a doctor who not only superbly practices his profession but takes time to give its problems careful consideration.

His remarks before the health section of the West Central Oregon District Conference on Aging which was held in Eugene in January are worth the attention of every person interested in helping aged persons. Under a previous consent I am including them here:

It is something of a paradox to have a successful effort of the medical profession produce a sociological problem of national scope. Medicine by controlling infant mortality, maternal mortality, wiping out the scourge of pneumonia, and so forth, has enabled such a number of people to attain a ripe old age that now we are faced with the problem of what to do with them. One problem begets another, and perhaps the present one is somewhat like that of the Queen of Babylon's cats.

In considering rehabilitation of the aging, we first must answer three fundamental questions:

1. What do we mean by aging?
2. Rehabilitation from what?

3. Rehabilitation to what?

1. No one has as yet given us a good definition of aging. Age has many connotations. Do we mean chronological age? If so, we have a wide spread of functional capabilities. One 70-year-old may have much less functional capacity than an 80-year-old. Do we mean physiological age? If so, we should note that some bodies are old in the twenties, whereas others retain youthful attributes into the eighties and perhaps later. Do we mean mental age? If this is so, some people would be eternally youthful. Do we mean emotional age? Or just what do we mean by aging? If we consider age as a chronological thing exclusively, then we have defined ourselves a problem. We have artificially created the "problem" we set out to solve. By defining age as the years beyond 65, we have committed one of the most physiologically and biologically foolish errors a supposedly intelligent society could commit. We have turned our backs on much painfully accumulated scientific knowledge and spurned simple ordinary commonsense. This categorizing of our "over 65" population as aged is a most grievous unkindness. Compulsory retirement because of age and age alone is utterly unrealistic, and the empty appellation of "senior citizen" is a sorry substitute for the self-respect which comes from leading a useful productive life. We are all accustomed to adapting ourselves to waning physical capacities. Why should it be otherwise when one has greater experience over a longer period? Perhaps it might be well for us to consider another type of age, functional age. Although medical science has made it possible for many more people to live to their seventies and eighties, there actually hasn't been much added to the lifespan. A 70-year-old's life expectancy is only 1.3 years more now than it was many years ago. We haven't "added to life" appreciably. All we've done is produce a large number of 70-, 80-, and 90-year-olds for a society not prepared to receive them. We must know more about the physiology of aging tissues to understand why one aged person becomes a human vegetable and another one retains a certain measure of his bodily faculties. If we are to deal with a large number of older people, we need to know more about what makes them tick, how fundamentally an old heart, or blood vessel, or brain differs from a younger one. We need geriatric research hospitals just as we now need pediatric hospitals not just old folks homes. If older persons differ from the standard human animal as much as the infants and children do, then let's devote some specialized efforts at solving the peculiar problems of this group. And one of the first problems to solve is that of a definition of what constitutes an aging person.

2. Rehabilitation from what: To invoke rehabilitation a disability must exist. What specifically are the disabilities peculiar to the aging? In general, they are due to degenerative processes involving the central nervous and musculo-skeletal systems. Apathy, depression, mental confusion, forgetfulness, and loss of memory for recent events mark the former. An unceasing torrent of complaints about the joints marks the latter. The general widely recognized principles of rehabilitation will apply to any disability regardless of age except those peculiar to the aged, and there they partly apply. The reason they don't wholly apply is because we simply don't know enough about the biological raw materials we are working with to employ accepted procedures effectively. We should ascertain what disabilities are:

a. peculiar to the aging, and

b. different in the aging than in the younger.

Then we can intelligently apply the broad, well-developed principles already at hand.

3. Rehabilitation to what: The objectives of rehabilitation must be defined. What do we seek to accomplish with our rehabilitation of the aging? Do we wish to restore physical vigor the better to seek somewhere, someplace, somehow a job not denied because of age? Do we intend to make these older people physically self-sufficient the better to pursue nonproductive make-work activities? Do we wish to rescue them from the kindly apathy and gentle confusion which engulfs them so that they can better appreciate their current status as a beloved but vexing problem? One generation cannot see through the eyes of another. Perhaps we should ask these people what they want instead of rather arrogantly planning for them. Maybe they should work out their own solution to the problem of being considered a problem. I suspect that this might be a good idea. Assuredly, many more old folk are killed by kindness and solicitude than we realize. The happiest people seem to be those who are in the process of overcoming adversity. Perhaps instead of putting our aging populace on a honored and expensive shelf, we should remove the artificial barriers to self-support and self-respect and require more than years alone to merit veneration.

Rehabilitation has two components: Physical restoration and mental adaptation. They are like love and marriage; you can't have one without the other. Physical restoration of the aging is a swiftly developing field and it will develop even faster when we can learn more about the fundamental physiology of aging tissue. But good physical restoration is only a cold, technical, medical triumph unless it yields an increase in human happiness. The other portion of rehabilitation is up to society not medicine, which in this case has outstripped the social scientist. I have a few anachronistic suggestions on this score:

1. Eliminate the age barrier to employment.

2. Quit overcoddling our older people. Add a few drops of tincture of Darwin to the sticky-sweet sirup of socialism we are now attempting to swallow.

3. Establish a few more geriatric research hospitals for study of the fundamental physiology of aging instead of more "old folks" home.

4. Start preparations for retirement early but make retirement only a change of occupation consistent with waning physical and mental vigor.

5. Settle this whole thing the standard American way by (a) composing a lot of slogans and forgetting about it, or (b) appointing a committee and forgetting about it.

Thank you.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

3140

Appendix

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Over Radio Station WGN, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in further regard to the economic situation, I was privileged to participate this weekend in a special broadcast series over WGN, Chicago.

In the broadcast, I reviewed a number of ways in which, in my humble judgment, constructive efforts could be made to further strengthen our country.

These included: First, encouraging more of our people to invest in our economy; second, as previously stated, to revise our tax system; third, effectively combat inflation; and a number of other general ways in which we can improve the economy.

Reflecting upon this great challenge before the American people, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES PUBLIC TO "INVEST IN AMERICA"; STRESSES NEED FOR HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION FOR OVERHAUL OF TAX SYSTEM; OUTLINES SEVEN PROGRAMS FOR STRENGTHENING ECONOMY

(Excerpts of address prepared for delivery by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, over radio station WGN, Chicago, April 3, 1960)

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you a number of issues confronting our country and the world.

As citizens, you and I face daily decisions on a wide variety of issues affecting the personal lives of ourselves and families; community projects and programs; issues at the State level; national and international developments that relate to our security, progress and outlook for the future.

Briefly, now, I would like to review challenges in the domestic economic picture that, I feel, are of special interest to all of us.

As a people we face such problems as:

Does the bread winner earn enough take-home pay to meet the family bills?

Is it possible to afford to send eligible children to school, and to college?

Do self-employed folks in business and professions retain enough income to meet needs and obligations?

Do we have opportunities to enjoy enough of the good things created by the free enterprise system?

For the answers to these questions, we must turn a microscopic eye on our domestic economy to determine (1) how it is meeting the needs of our people; (2) where it may be failing; and (3) what can be done to further improve the economic outlook for all of us?

WILEY SAYS: INVEST IN AMERICA

Question. Senator WILEY, what can we do toward a better, stronger economy for the future?

Answer. First, I believe we need to further educate the American people on the merits, benefits, and opportunities provided by our free enterprise system. All too often it is taken for granted that our economy has created the highest standard of living and the greatest agriculture and industrial output in the history of the world.

As citizens of a free country, it is important that we do everything possible to further strengthen our system.

Question. How would you suggest this be done?

Answer. A major contribution can be made by encouraging more people to invest in our economy.

Today, there are more than 12 million shareowners of publicly owned corporations in this country. These shareowners, represent not just the rich, but a broad cross section of our people, including modest income individuals such as workers, housewives, teachers, professionals, and many others.

To encourage such investment, I have introduced a resolution in Congress to authorize and request the President to proclaim April 24 through 30, 1960, as National Invest-in-America Week.

By observance of such a week, Americans can reaffirm their belief in the power of work, savings, and investments to create new business and better job opportunities for all our citizens.

This is particularly important since our free system is now on trial globally in a battle of survival against communism.

NEEDED REVISION OF OUR TAX SYSTEM

Question. What are some further recommendations for strengthening our economy?

Answer. Secondly, I believe we must carry out a sound, fair, top-to-bottom revision of our tax system. As you and I well know, taxes—direct and hidden—take one of the biggest bites out of our income.

In themselves, also, taxes can be inflationary—driving up prices, and thus further reducing the buying power of our dollars.

Unfortunately, the great demands on Uncle Sam—particularly the hight cost of a space age defense—dims the outlook for early relief from Federal taxes at the present time.

In view of this fact, I believe this provides a good opportunity to undertake a complete—and much needed—overhaul of the tax structure.

We recall, of course, that over the past months, the Ways and Means Committee of Congress has held hearings on various aspects of this system. However, these studies have not as yet, in my humble opinion, been of a sufficiently broad scope to really do the job.

That is why I am again urging enactment of my bill, S. 1885, for establishment of a Hoover-type commission to revise the tax system.

Question. Just what would you do, Senator WILEY?

Answer. The purpose would be to iron out inequities; plug loopholes; if possible, establish a fairer distribution of the tax burden; and, overall, encourage tax policies that would stimulate, not stunt, economic growth and opportunity for individuals, as well as businesses and enterprise.

The Commission, comprised of competent individuals from both private and public life, would also aim at reflecting new light on such aspects of our tax system as (1) the interrelationship of Federal, State, and local taxes; (2) the impact of the present system on individuals and enterprises; (3) "rooting out" taxes that may be discriminatory; and (4) generally assuring that the system allows incentive to earn, grow, expand, and enjoy the fruits of labor.

Question. What taxes would be involved?

Answer. Although the whole system should be scrutinized, special studies should include—

Taxes on job-creating businesses and industry, particularly those included in the small business category;

Treatment of retirement benefits;

Possible tax adjustments to help meet the increasingly high costs of education, and thus help to fill a national need;

Depletion allowances for oil, gas, and other similar resources;

Treatment of working mothers under the tax laws;

Deductions for business expense accounts;

Excise taxes continued long beyond their wartime purposes;

Capital gains taxes.

In addition there are a great many other areas of taxation which deserve careful reconsideration.

We recall that it has been traditionally stated that "the power to tax is the power to destroy."

In our own system, we need to assure that our taxes do not destroy individual incentive and progress in our economy. Rather, the system must be designed to assure that taxes are imposed only to meet real needs of our people—and, insofar as necessary, these be fairly proportioned, according to sound principles in the best interests of the economy.

Question. Now, what are some of your other recommendations for strengthening the economy, Senator WILEY.

Answer. Although these cover many fronts, they should include:

Third. Improving job opportunities for our working force of almost 69 million workers, of which nearly 4 million are still unfortunately out of jobs.

Fourth. Encourage realistic Federal spending policies, including a balanced budget and, if possible, a surplus to begin reduction of the national debt. This also involves—

Carefully restricting Federal programs to proper limitation of Federal responsibility so as to prevent undue competition on the money market or to create unnecessary competition with private enterprise; and

Further educating our people to the realism that demands for more and more services by the Federal Government can only postpone the time for a lessening of the tax burden.

Question. What else should be done?

Answer. Fifth, assuring a competitive climate in which businesses, industries, and other enterprises—both small and large—have an opportunity to prosper and make their contribution to our economic life;

Sixth. Encourage management and labor to plan cooperatively together for the common good, and to work together against the destructive powers of inflation; and

Seventh. Public encouragement should be given to nongovernmental sectors of the economy to increase productivity, guide production into items of greater durability, and less obsolescence, and lower prices.

Overall, the Government, as well as consumers, labor, industry, and all others, have a proportionate responsibility not only for sharing in the efforts to combat inflation, but also to promote economic health for the country.

Question. How can this be accomplished, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Through sound buying, borrowing, spending, and saving practices by consumers.

By labor making only realistic demands for pay and better working conditions based among other factors upon increased productivity.

And by industry establishing realistic pricing and profit practices on commodities.

And prospects for an ever-brighter future can be fulfilled only if there is full cooperation of all segments of the economy, with planning based on realistic economic principles, not wishful thinking.

CONCLUSION

Senator Wiley, thank you very much for this fine review of ways for strengthening our economy.

I have welcomed the opportunity to present these ideas to you.

If you folks listening in have any comments on these proposals, I would be glad to hear from you. Also, if you feel that some of the recommendations have merit—for example, the invest-in-America and tax revision proposals—you might want to directly contact Members of Congress—in addition to myself—to express your interest in them.

Many thanks for listening.

After the First Quarter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, prophesies are easy to make, statistics are easy to maneuver, but results cannot be gainsaid.

The first quarter of 1960 has been one of the most prosperous and highly productive in our history.

The following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 10, 1960, gives great emphasis to the fact that 65 million Americans have jobs and vast purchasing power.

The editorial writer points out that there does not seem to be any fundamental reason for a change in confidence of a prosperous future on the part of our citizens and I commend the editorial to my colleagues:

AFTER THE FIRST QUARTER

Now that the first quarter of 1960 has entered history, businessmen and economists are engaged in assessing the outlook for the rest of the year. That the 3 months just concluded constituted one of the most prosperous and highly productive periods in this Nation's annals is, of course, clear. Steel production averaged well over 90 percent of capacity; fears of inflation were widely reduced; the net outflow of gold declined; the list of economic indicators which have something pleasant to tell us about January, February, and March is long indeed.

But in business, as in life, the problems and prospects of the future tend to be more important than the achievements of the past. So it is not surprising that many observers are now more concerned with the question marks that seem to hang over the economy's future than they are about the good news still appearing about the first quarter. The high optimism which marked most forecasts at the beginning of the year has been significantly reduced.

The rise in inventories, the recent fall of the steel production rate to under 90 percent of capacity, the decline in the index of new orders prepared for the National Association of Purchasing Agents are among the factors causing disquiet. The stock market responded strongly to pleasant tidings about recent automobile sales, but the automobile industry itself is reported planning a 13 percent cut in new car production this quarter.

In a dynamic economy like ours, however, it would be unwise to overemphasize the fact that some indicators are falling. There are other factors at work—for example, the favorable trend in the rate of interest. Moreover, this is an election year, one in which we can be particularly confident that the administration will be extraordinarily alert to assure that Government policy on credit and related matters does not become a drag on the economy. But, far beyond that, the basic fact is that some 65 million Americans have jobs and vast purchasing power. For 20 years now those who have had confidence in a prosperous future have done well indeed and there seems to be no fundamental factor on the scene which would suggest any reason for a change in the foreseeable future.

Rampart Canyon, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, one of the most challenging projects confronting the United States is the Rampart hydroelectric project on the Yukon River, which is capable of producing 3,700,000 kilowatts of prime power. A most interesting discussion on this vast undertaking was presented to the Fairbanks, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce last month by Mr. Harold L. Moats, who is assistant to the chief of engineering in the division for civil works, Alaska District of the Corps of Engineers. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Moats' speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to have this opportunity to give the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce a report on the status of the Corps of Engineers' work on the Rampart Canyon Hydroelectric Power Investigation.

The responsibility of the Corps of Engineers in the field of hydroelectric power stems from two main sources; the first, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1925, directed the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission to prepare and submit to Congress an estimate of cost of such examinations, surveys, and other investigations as, in their opinion, may be required of those navigable streams of the United States, and their tributaries whereon power developments appear feasible and practicable, with a view to the formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation and the prosecution of such improvements in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods and the needs of irrigation.

The response to this act, a report published as House Document No. 308, 69th Congress, 1st session, and enacted into law in the River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927, provided the framework for water resource planning. This basic law, clarified and amended by subsequent legislation, has been a major factor in the development of the many multipurpose projects in the southern 48.

Second, the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1950, specifically extended the above coverage to Alaska, directing a study of Harbors and Rivers of Alaska with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interests of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and related water uses, and stating that Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways in Alaska, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and allied purposes shall be continued under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Corps of Engineers.

This direction has resulted in a series of interim reports covering the State of Alaska. These reports have recommended some 15 navigation or flood control projects, 7 of which have been completed, 3 are to be advertised in the near future and the remaining 5 await appropriation of funds.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1961 contains $100,000 to start design work for the $10,800,000 flood control projects here in Fairbanks.

A major part of the work directed by the Flood Control Act of 1948 has been a preliminary evaluation and cataloging of the hydroelectric power potential of this great State. We have made this preliminary evaluation of some 169 possible sites having a potential installed capacity of about 19 million kilowatts.

This seems to be only a big number until you realize that the total installed generating capacity of all the hydroelectric plants in the United States is just over 25 million kilowatts. The individual capacity of these 169 sites range from a few thousand kilowatts to what can be the largest single generating plant on the North American Continent and probably in the world.

The last of these interim reports covering the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers was completed by our office in Anchorage in December 1959 and is being reviewed by higher headquarters. It will probably be released to the public in about 6 months. This report includes the major hydroelectric sites of Alaska which, when fully developed, will have an installed capacity of about 11,300,000 kilowatts. The largest of these sites is Rampart Canyon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING introduced a resolution into the Senate Public Works Committee last spring requesting a full-scale report on the hydroelectric capabilities of Rampart. On April 24, 1959, the committee directed the Corps of Engineers to make such a study.

Let me review for a moment the preliminary information which we had accumulated in our original evaluation of this important resource. I want to stress that this information has been developed from field reconnaissance, map study, and the use of existing precipitation and streamflow records and is

subject to correction and adjustment as more information becomes available.

The Rampart Canyon site on the main stem of the Yukon River can be developed to produce about 3,700,000 kilowatts of prime power. The installed capacity would be 4,760,000 kilowatts. A concrete gravity dam 1,300 feet long at present water level, 2,700 feet long at the crest and 500 feet high, will develop a usable head of about 440 feet. The regulated flow would be about 118,000 cubic feet per second.

Big figures alone mean little to most of us; let us relate them to others that most of us have seen.

At Rampart Canyon the dam, with only about three-fourths of the volume of the dam at Grand Coulee, will impound enough water to warrant an installed capacity of 4,760,000 killowatts; about two and one-half times the present installed capacity at Grand Coulee.

The area and capacity of the reservoir is interesting. The reservoir will cover an area of about 10,700 square miles or an area about 10 percent greater than Lake Erie. Due to the great area of the reservoir, it is anticipated that the seasonal drawdown will be under 4 feet. The total reservoir storage will be about 1,300 million acre-feet, better than 40 times the storage at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam.

There are many interesting areas of speculation that open up as we study this tremendous project.

What, if any, will be the effect of this large reservoir on the climatic regime? It is almost certain that this area of water would increase the precipitation to some extent. The water mass would cause the mean annual temperature to rise—how much we cannot say—but assuming that it might be 2 or 3 degrees, it is interesting to note that a few days longer growing season would enhance the agricultural potential of the region.

It has been said that the reservoir area contains enough timber to sustain a small pulpmill during the filling period.

The short but extremely pleasant summer weather of the region might well induce recreational activities here that would compare favorably with those at some of the popular reservoirs in more populated areas.

Let us look more closely at the structure itself. The dam will be a gravity structure with adequate fish-handling facilities. Cargo-handling facilities would be constructed in lieu of locks.

Power could be developed by generators ranging in size to a possible maximum of 280,000 kilowatts.

It is anticipated that ultrahigh voltage transmission, probably about 500,000 volts could serve ice free industrial sites at Valdez, Cordova, Anchorage, Whittier, and Seward. Fairbanks and other interior communities, as well as many mining operations, will be served by conventional transmission lines.

Congress provided $49,000 to start the detailed studies in fiscal year 1960. The major portion of this money is being used to make detailed maps of the damsite area and to prepare a plan for the necessary foundation investigations. As a first step, last fall we sent three geologists to the site to look over the geological formations and to plan a drilling program.

It is anticipated that this study will require 3 or 4 years to complete and that the total cost of the Corps of Engineers portion of the report will be over $500,000. In addition to our study the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act requires an analysis of the impact of the project on fish and wildlife be made by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, to be included with our report.

This concludes my report to you on the status of our work on the project.

I would like to leave one thought with you: Rampart Canyon is important to Alaska. It is a key that might unlock our mineral resources, but even more important, it could attract raw materials from all over the world for basic processing here, utilizing the low-cost power that would be available at tidewater ports.

Disquisition of a Philosopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, Col. R. L. Thompson, the editor of the Moran Sentinel, generally writes a full page of homespun editorials for his weekly newspaper published in Moran, Allen County, Kans.

On Thursday, March 24, the colonel expressed his thoughts with respect to virtue and sin and concluded that even the wisest of men are often without virtue. This disquisition of Colonel Thompson, I am sure Mr. Speaker, will be of real interest to other Members, and I ask that it be included in the extension of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

VIRTUE AND SIN

That odd creature we call man has always been curious to learn what makes him tick decently and what makes him tick indecently.

The struggle of philosophers to penetrate the unknowable and establish the truth has been going on for many centuries, yet today they are just as far apart in their judgments as they were 2,500 years ago.

The ethical sciences have always engaged the thoughts of our best minds, but there is yet no sound evidence that the will of man is really free; and there is no sound evidence that it isn't. The ancient philosophers were never able to agree on what produced good and evil in men and the modern thinkers are still sharply divided upon the subject.

Socrates, who was born in 469 B.C., was probably the first man to advance the theory that the behavior of an individual is controlled by his own history, which gave birth to the doctrine of determinism.

Socrates wrote nothing himself but his pupil Plato who wrote about him made it plain that his old teacher believed that knowledge and virtue were one and the same thing and that a man full of wisdom was incapable of performing an amoral act.

Plato himself, followed Socrates for a time but as he grew older he began to entertain misgivings and drifted in the direction of free will. This was also true of Plato's pupil Aristotle who wrote that "if we are unable to trace our acts to any other origins than those within ourselves, then acts of which the origins are within us themselves depend upon us, and are voluntary."

But Aristotle seems to have been unsure of himself for later on he wrote that "the origins of an act are not in the will, for the agent may be forced into acting by external compulsions or misled into it by ignorance," which is an echo of Socrates.

Most ancient thinkers such as Tertullian, the lawyer, Origen and Irenaeus also believed that man was the master of his own acts.

The determinists had easy sailing for a long time, and it was many years before Augustine came along to challenge them and to preach the doctrine of grace and original sin. This occurred in A.D. 387 when Augustine embraced Christianity and was baptized after years of wobbling.

Augustine also met with opposition in the person of Pelagius, a learned Irishman who adduced the argument that man could not be free to act as he wished with old Adam in him and corrupting him at every turn. He was the first to advance the belief that grace and original sin on the one hand and free will on the other were irreconcilable, and it was many years before the popes were able to induce the faithful to forget Pelagius whose polemics never received the attention they deserved.

Augustine answered him not with logic but with such eloquence that his theories were made official by the Council of Carthage in 418.

But even today, with at least half of the civilized world believing that sin can be wiped out by the grace of God, determinism is by no means a dead doctrine. In one of his recent books Bertrand Russell, esteemed the world over as a philospher and mathematician, argues that "knoweldge is virtue" and thus stands where Socrates stood nearly 25 centuries ago.

It would be interesting to know precisely what meaning Earl Russell attaches to the word virtue. If he means that the possession of wisdom is in itself virtuous he is certainly correct but if he means that only wise men can lead exemplary lives, he has missed the mark.

An examination of the history of obscure and prominent men alike will reveal that the uninformed as well as the judicious can and do lead well ordered lives. It will also reveal that the very wise are capable of scandalous acts.

There is no doubt at all that men of superior intelligence generally conduct their lives upon a higher plane of moral decency than ignorant men, but this is not always the case. Men of no learning at all have been known to lead impeccable, though not necessarily admirable, lives.

Until he died only a few years ago, the author of this disquisition had an uncle who was looked upon correctly by his contemporaries as a puritan of lofty rectitude. He could neither write nor speak a grammatical sentence and he was unread for he had only two books in his house, the Bible and Tom Sawyer.

How much of his time he gave over to reading, I do not know, but he could not discourse upon the Bible with much coherence, and he missed most of the humor in Tom Sawyer.

During his long life which ended at 84, it is a positive certainty that he never violated the ascetic moral code that his mother established for him when he was only a small boy. He paid his bills promptly and contracted none that he could not pay promptly; he did not swear, smoke, or chew tobacco; he attended church regularly, always remaining for Sunday School; he never tasted whisky in his life and there never was a deck of cards in his house. He believed it was immoral to attend picture shows, and he never ate a meal in his adult life without first saying grace. The cruel hand of misfortune was upon him constantly, yet he never complained, and regularly thanked God for what he called "His gracious favors."

But was this uncle a virtuous man in the sense that so-called intellectuals look upon virtue today? In the behavorist sense, certainly; in Russell's philosophical sense, no.

What was his contribution to the world in which he lived? Precisely nothing. Did he ever have a new idea? He never did. Was he capable of changing his mind when obviously mistaken? He was not. Was his mind hermetically sealed to reason? It was. Was he capable of making other men happy? He was not. On the contrary, it was often unpleasant to be in his presence. I went to see him often in his old age and it nearly always meant sitting through a long

lecture on the evils of tobacco and rum. If he were alive at this minute and knew that I was engaged in composition late of a Sunday afternoon he would telephone to upbraid me for desecrating the Sabbath.

Here was a man of iron will who had countless attributes that demanded respect but almost none that evoked admiration. He believed what he wanted to believe. The truth about life held no interest for him and he did nothing to foster it.

The genuinely virtuous man, so it seems to me, is not only the fellow who behaves well but contributes something to world enlightenment and does not bring grief to other men. Earl Russell is certainly such a man. He has given the world humor and he has given it wisdom and knowledge in a dozen great books which will amuse men and make them think for many long ages to come. His life has been eminently successful and worthwhile and hence eminently virtuous.

Returning to free will against determinism, what the philosophies seem to forget or ignore is the simple fact that the average human being gives very little thought to either sin or virtue. He obeys only those impulses which bring him pleasure.

The thief steals because he finds satisfaction in living without working. Many of them are wise and successful and are never caught but no one would call them virtuous men. The liar lies because he enjoys deceiving people, and he is in the same case. The uncle just mentioned derived satisfaction out of being good just as Russell finds pleasure in writing sensible books to improve the minds of men who are not as smart as he is.

What is abhorrent and sinful to one man often brings satisfaction and a sense of virtue to another. Cheating people was certainly repugnant to John D. Rockefeller, but Jay Gould, who was equally wise, derived genuine delight out of robbing widows and orphans, bribing legislatures and cheating friends. It has been said after he unloaded $5 million worth of worthless stocks on a gullible public that he laughed for weeks. He no doubt looked upon himself as a virtuous man.

Thus we see that the theory that only the wise are capable of virtue is palpably full of holes. Oscar Wilde had one of the finest minds of his day but it would be stretching the truth to the breaking point to say he had a spark of virtue in him. Francis Bacon was full of wisdom but he was a very evil man. Easily the wisest man of this generation was Joe Stalin but he was also the most wicked.

Just what impels men to sin and virtue is only a guess. All we are sure of is that the wise and the ignorant alike are capable of both.

Treasury Tests the Long-Term Bond Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have always been a firm supporter of the President's position in calling for the removal of the 4¼ interest rate ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds. I was heartened recently when the Ways and Means Committee approved a compromise plan allowing this ceiling to be partially removed. In this same light, the developments of recent weeks indicating that this compromise may not be voted upon this year are disappointing and I certainly hope incorrect.

Mr. President, because the money market has improved and funds are now available at lower rates, those who favor retaining the 4¼ ceiling have been saying—"see, we told you so." The Treasury has not stood still in the face of this challenge. Department officials responded in a straightforward manner by issuing new 25-year bonds at the 4¼ ceiling.

The results of this sale have been widely discussed. I was very pleased to note that the editors of the Washington Post in an editorial which appeared this morning take the position that the results of this issue were disappointing and that they very clearly indicate the need to raise the unrealistic and existing interest rate ceiling on long-term Treasury issues. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent and informative editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1960]

THE SQUEEZE CONFIRMED

The Treasury's testing of the long-term Government bond market was a bold move politically. This is true even if Senator DOUGLAS and others are right in arguing that the test was not as vigorous as it might have been. And the gamble has paid off, we think, for advocates of Treasury-sponsored legislation to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on bond interest rates. The disappointingly small subscription to the 25-year, 4¼-percent issue tends to show that any substantial lengthening of the average maturity of the Federal debt in prosperous times—when the effort ought to be made—will remain very difficult unless the ceiling is raised.

This does not mean that better procedures for bond marketing are unnecessary. Mr. DOUGLAS and his colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee have suggested some improvements that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board ought to be acting upon. But despite the short notice, the existence of a kind of monopoly in Government bond marketing and other shortcomings, the experimental 25-year offering showed plainly enough that the 4¼-percent ceiling is too low to allow needed flexibility in debt management. We hope that the experience will persuade Congress that the compromise plan for partial removal of the ceiling already approved by the House Ways and Means Committee ought to be adopted as a minimum.

Civil Rights: Less Talk, More Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ever since my vote was cast against the House civil rights bill, politicians high in the party command have said and written that my vote was hurting their efforts to induce the colored people to vote the Republican ticket. The colored vote cannot be bought.

They asked why my vote was cast against the House bill. The answer is simple. It was a bad bill. It gave arbitrary power to politically appointed referees and established procedures which could have been corruptly used. It was discriminatory in that it gave the courts power to punish the violators of some injunctions, not of others.

We have legislation which, if enforced, would protect the right of every qualified voter to cast a secret ballot. The House bill contained unsound provisions which have been eliminated. The bill was a political maneuver—top politicians in both parties thinking they would get a political advantage out of the issue in the coming November election. The Senate has now so amended the bill that when returned to the House, it is my intention to vote for it.

TOO MUCH POLITICAL MANEUVERING

On trouble, caused in the main by agitators who have too much leisure on their hands and by a comparatively few sincere, charitable individuals who mus-judge the national need, was on the way to a satisfactory solution. The present agitation has retarded the ultimate goal of equal justice for all.

As the daily press has indicated, the controversy has not been minimized, but emphasized, not only here, but in other parts of the world, especially South Africa. Today's issue is not alone the right to vote, but the extent of the right of association. There has been far too much talk, too little action. I have always acted, not just talked—done what I could to end discrimination.

Let me give you the facts: In 1934, my first primary campaign, we had eight young women, university graduates, two young white men, and one colored man, Elijah Ampey, a personal friend from my home county, campaigning. We toured the six counties in the district. There was no discrimination until we hit Benton Harbor at the Bridgman Hotel. The clerk, a young Jewish man, told us Lija could not eat in the dining room with us. A controversy arose. It was settled when I insisted there would be no discrimination against him because of color. He ate with us. We had no other trouble.

In 1951, in Benton Harbor and St. Joseph, our committee held hearings to correct an order of the food department. The chairman of our committee, William Dawson, a colored veteran, presided. He was a guest at the Whitcomb Hotel, owned and operated by my personal Jewish friend, Leon Harris. Friend Dawson was welcomed as a guest at a dinner in his honor, was treated with every courtesy. Even the most critical agitator could not discover any trace of discrimination because there was none.

If more people would adhere to the Golden Rule, attend to their own business, cease their efforts to regulate the social and business life of their neighbors, discrimination because of color would end more quickly.

As often happens, the votes against the House bill, the debate in the Senate,

has resulted in far more equitable proposed legislation. If it comes back to the House with the Senate amendments, I shall vote to adopt it, even though adequate enforcement of our present laws at this time would seem to make it unnecessary.

I am wondering what the professional agitators will bring up next; when, if ever, they will enforce the legislation which permits a man to work at an acceptable job without paying tribute to some pressure group; when more will back their enactments with action as some have been doing; when we will get labor legislation without partisan political implications.

The Castro-Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on April 4, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] referred to my recent address on the Cuban situation. I appreciate his commendation of my speech and I am happy to note that he has taken a strong stand in this connection.

An editorial which appeared in the April 6 edition of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader entitled "Liberal Democrat Blasts Appeasement" pays tribute to another Member of this body for his strong position on the Castro-Cuban situation. I refer to the able junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

I believe this editorial deserves the attention of all the Senators and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERAL DEMOCRAT BLASTS APPEASEMENT

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS is one of a handful of Washington solons who have attempted to tell the American people the truth about this country's relations with Cuba. For that, he has earned the undying enmity of the Castro government, whose state-owned propaganda media ranks him among the leading enemies of the Cuban revolution. But this newspaper believes that the overwhelming majority of the American people would rather hear the truth, whether that truth angers the Communist-ridden Castro regime or embarrasses the U.S. State Department.

Senator SMATHERS laid some cold, hard facts on the line when he said that the United States should recall its Ambassador from Cuba, reduce Cuban sugar quotas and adopt a get-tough policy toward the Castro government. Not only would this policy "put Mr. Castro in such economic difficulty" that the Cuban people "would have all legitimate right to get rid of Castro," SMATHERS said, but also "the one thing Latins respect and admire above everything else is decisiveness and firmness." In that, we are sure our neighbors to the south are no different than us. And like them, we are sure that the average American is completely bewildered by this soft attitude which the U.S. Government has adopted toward Castro.

A good case in point is the recent agreement concluded between Soviet Russia and Cuba, under which the former is to buy 5 million tons of Cuban sugar over a 5-year period. As Senator BRIDGES so ably pointed out in a ringing address recently delivered in the Senate, only 200,000 of this will be paid for in cash, the rest by barter for Soviet-manufactured goods—at Soviet-fixed prices. But what is more important, the Kremlin will pay only the world price for the sugar—a few cents under $3 a hundredweight—while the United States subsidizes Cuba to the tune of $5.50 per hundredweight.

All the while, friendly neighbors to the south are afflicted with great quantities of surplus sugar which they are eager to sell us, but which we refuse to buy in order to pander to Castro. The latter, in return, not only lashes us verbally but also economically. As one case in point, Cuban imports from the United States last year dropped $110 million—Castro's way of saying thank you for the more than $1 million worth of food from the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation distributed in Cuba during the last 6 months by the Protestant Church World Service and the Catholic Relief Service.

Senator SMATHERS, Senator BRIDGES, and a handful of other Senators and Congressmen provide one of the few links the American people have to the realities of the Cuban situation. Given the facts, we do not believe the people will long tolerate the official policy of appeasement of Castro and his Communist henchmen.

Pennsylvania's 12th District of American Legion Calls for Immediate Release of Bishop James E. Walsh Now Imprisoned in Red Communist Chinese Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the savage and unconscionable sentence recently meted out to Bishop James E. Walsh by the Chinese Reds is a clear demonstration of that Government's unwillingness to accept honest and decent standards of conduct and its further disdain of the rights of the individual human being.

The incarceration of Bishop Walsh calls for the marshaling of every conceivable force at our command in an effort to free him from the abominable situation in which he has been placed by ruthless and implacable enemies of the civilized world.

The Government of Red China should be made to understand in unmistakable terms that our Government will not sit idly by while our nationalists are jailed on trumped-up and unbelievable charges. The record of the Red Chinese Government in this area over the years has been a horrendous one—one that shocks the conscience of good and decent people everywhere.

One organization that has forcefully gotten behind this effort to free Bishop Walsh has been the 12th District of the American Legion in Pennsylvania. It has called upon the Members of Congress and the executive department to intercede in behalf of Bishop Walsh with the Red Chinese government calling for his immediate release from jail and almost certain death if he remains incarcerated.

So that Members of Congress and others may be apprised of the American Legion's position in this grave matter, I include as part of my remarks a letter of transmittal from Mr. Louis J. Greco, coordinator, 12th district Americanism committee, with which he forwards a copy of a resolution adopted by the delegates of the 12th district:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, Pa., April 4, 1960.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: By direction of 150 delegates of 40 American Legion posts, representing some 12,000 legionnaires in Luzerne County, I am sending you copy of resolution concerning Bishop James E. Walsh, now imprisoned in Red Communist Chinese jail.

It is the desire of the 12th district American Legion delegates that you join us in calling upon the Secretary of State to press the Chinese Communists for the immediate release of Bishop Walsh.

May I hear from you soon? Your communication and action will be relayed to the 12th district Legion delegates at the next district meeting of April 24, 1960.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS J. GRECO,
Coordinator, 12th District Americanism, the American Legion.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Red Chinese Communist courts have seen fit to imprison Bishop James E. Walsh, M.M., former superior general of Maryknoll Fathers, and prominent clergyman of Pennsylvania, for what the Chinese Communists call espionage, treason, and spying; and

Whereas Bishop Walsh, an American citizen, was condemned to 20 years in a Chinese Communist jail; and

Whereas any proof the Communist Chinese could submit would hardly fall within the category of "fair play" and "honest jurisprudence" as judged by American standards: Therefore, be it

Resolved, By the delegates from 40 American Legion posts representing some 12,000 legionnaires in the 12th district, Luzerne County, Pa., and organized under the fundamental belief—"For God and Country"—do hereby brand the jailing of Bishop James E. Walsh a mockery on justice; another demonstration of the unwillingness of Communist Chinese to accept honest standards and live with the rest of the world in peace and in justice; be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion call upon the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, Washington, D.C., to press the Chinese Communists for immediate release of Bishop James E. Walsh, an American citizen, before his health is injured irreparably; and for a guarantee that no American citizen will ever be tried or sentenced without a fair public trial; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State; Senators HUGH SCOTT, JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania; also a copy be sent to Representa-

tive DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th Congressional District, Luzerne County, Pa.

LOUIS J. GRECO,
Coordinator, 12th District Americanism Committee, the American Legion.
JOHN R. GALLAGHER,
Commander, 12th District, Luzerne County, the American Legion.

Mail to Alaska Via the Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, historically mail destined for my State of Alaska has been handled by steamship from the west coast port of Seattle. In recent years the infrequent sailings of steamers means that parcel post and other surface mail is sometimes weeks, a month, or even longer, in reaching its destination.

Since the Alaska Highway is now kept open on a year-round basis, Alaska residents individually and through civic organizations have attempted to persuade the Post Office Department that surface mail be shipped to Alaska by truck over the highway. These efforts have uniformly failed as the Department holds firm to its contention the time saving would be negligible and the cost too great.

An article in the March 20 issue of the Seattle Times concerning trucking over the highway is not only interesting in all its aspects but tells of the comparative ease with which scheduled trucking service is maintained on the Alaska Highway. Surely, this faster means of transportation should be employed in sending mail to Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALASKA HIGHWAY IS THEIR "HOME"—OR SO IT MAY SEEM TO THESE TRUCKERS FROM LYNDEN, WHO SPEND A LARGE SHARE OF THEIR DAYS ON THE LONG RUN TO FAIRBANKS

(By Dolly Connelly)

Six years ago, when tractor-trailer rigs of Lynden Transfer, Inc., first set out at Lynden, in Whatcom County, on regularly scheduled runs from Washington to Fairbanks, Alaska, farewells were quite a thing.

Children were taken out of school to see the intrepid diesel truck drivers on their way. Wives, some holding back tears, and company officials, a reporter from the Lynden Tribune, fellow workers, officials of the Lynden Chamber of Commerce—all were on hand, excited and a little fearful, to wish Godspeed to the driver teams and aluminum behemoths of the road.

It was an adventure, traveling the 4,800-mile round trip with nearly 20 tons of payload in the dead of winter. It still is an adventure, but so casually do the 10 steady drivers of the Alaska run accept the hazards of highway pioneering that farewells have become cursory. There's the wave of a strong hand from the high cab of the tractor, and a "So long—Good trip," from the company president as a big shiny rig labeled L.T.I. disappears toward the border crossing at Sumas.

At least two refrigerated tractor-trailer vans—58 feet overall in length, riding on 18 huge wheels, carrying 38,000 pounds at 8½ to 10 cents freight rate—leave Seattle and Lynden headquarters of the company each week in winter. The number jumps to as many as five a week in summer, when work and population in Alaska hit a high.

The trailer vans make at least 100 trips in 10 months of the year, stopping only for spring breakup, which closes British Columbia highways to vehicles of their weight. By riding pickaback on railroad flat cars from Vancouver, B.C., to Fort St. John at the upper edge of British Columbia, they will operate throughout the period of thaw this spring for the first time.

The men and the great trucks have carried multiple millions of pounds of fast freight to a hungry, booming Alaska over more than 6 years of regular runs. Theirs still is the only trucking concern operating in routine manner the full length of the Alaska Highway.

Lynden Transfer started the service with meat from Seattle packinghouses, fresh milk concentrate in half-pint containers, eggs, and fresh produce that once traveled to Alaska expensively by air.

Dry freight came in unsolicited, because it travels faster by truck than by ship. Cargo manifests now read 40 percent food, 60 percent freight of the variety of a mail-order house. Iron drums and cigars, cottage cheese and avocados, sides of beef and washing machines, musical instruments and welding supplies, cabbages and hams, dress goods and drugs, plastic baby pacifiers and loggers' chain saws—everything and anything rolls over the Alaska Highway behind the big diesel engines.

More interesting than the diversity of cargo or the scenic wonders of frontier road is the character of the men who share the exacting driving task of those long 72 to 80 hours on the roadway. Most are Lynden farm boys, many of them sons of Hollanders who immigrated to Whatcom County one generation back. They're still farmers in the "off" periods between runs.

Many of them raise strawberries or run fine dairy farms with the help of wives and teenage sons. Modest, soft-spoken men with "yes-ma'am" manners, they are skilled at one of the most difficult trucking assignments in the world. The company has the same rural air. Its address is R.F.D. 3, Lynden.

Applicants for driving jobs on the Alaska route come from the crews operating another Lynden Transfer activity, the "Milky Way" run. Tractor tank trucks, called "milk trains," haul fresh milk throughout Washington in this service.

Lynden Transfer was founded in 1924 by W. E. Austin to freight agricultural products of the Lynden area to Seattle markets. In 1946, Henry Jansen then a driver for the company, took over controlling interest and expanded operations.

Jansen, primarily a fast mover of food, became interested in the peculiar problems of supplying the interior of Alaska. The traditional route, by sea and railroad, was slow for fresh foods. Airfreight was one answer, but costs were high. He believed that the Alaska Highway, improved after the Second World War, would provide the solution. Glen Kok, a driver, was sent on a survey in the winter of 1953.

Kok's belief that regular schedules could be maintained, with a truck out of Seattle each Thursday night and due at the unloading platform in Fairbanks the next Monday morning, began the venture.

Jansen would welcome a new service to Alaska for his L.T.I. trucks. Alaskans long have complained of the tardiness of regular mail service from the 48 States.

When Alaska became a State, the cry for faster mail service was taken up strongly by the Fairbanks News-Miner, which pointed out that the people of the North, if they wish fast mail service, are forced to pay air-mail rates on everything but checks to the local laundry.

In an arrangement between the Chambers of Commerce of Fairbanks and Tacoma, twin letters were posted at Tacoma at exactly the same time by regular ship-delivered mail and by Lynden Transfer truck. The truck delivered its letter to Fairbanks in 3 days, less than helf the time required by steamship and train. The demonstration that the mail could be speeded up stimulated Alaskans to apply pressure for a change in the present system.

On the Alaska Highway, speeds to 50 miles an hour are safe in some stretches. Maintenance camps, placed each 100 miles, have done much to improve the highway. Barrel-stave culverts no longer crumble under spring floods. Something has been done about the fist-sized "gravel" that once ripped tough truck tires after a few hours' service, and regularly smashed through windshields.

The read still asks the best efforts of men of character and multiple talents, however—and there are no stoplights for 2,000 miles.

The men drive straight through, with brief stops every two or three hours to check the rig, and for coffee and meal breaks. Each driver takes a 300-mile shift, driving 8 to 10 hours while his partner may sleep in the berth behind him or keep him company.

There is no such thing as an uneventful trip. L.T.I. drivers rescue the stranded, pull automobiles out of ditches, effect emergency repairs at 40 degress below zero, and may have to change as many as 35 flat tires on a summer trip.

They know a temperature variation of almost 170 degress—79 degrees below zero in the winter, when a breakdown could be fatal, and heat of 90 degrees in summer. Vans, refrigerated in summer, are heated in winter to 28 or 36 degrees by propane furnaces, controlled from the complicated 50-dial panel of the cab.

Cabs are heated comfortably in winter. If ever heat goes out, the men bundle up like Eskimos. Over the years, veteran drivers, some with as many as 130 runs in their records, have learned to take with them the tools for emergencies.

"We turn the rigs into homes away from home," explained Bert Sheets and his driving partner, Bud Wilson. "We have a small emergency heater that can be removed from the truck, down-filled parkas and pants and thick felt boots. You get turned out of your rig up there by an accident, and you're on your own. Maybe there won't be anybody along for 24 hours."

The men applied fresh machinist's tape to each minute screwhead and bolt hole in the cab.

"The wind coming through these at 60° below cuts like a knife," said Sheets.

Sheets and Wilson, scheduled to roll that night, checked through reserve supplies: Two hundred gallons of diesel oil in the emergency tank, complete repair toolbox, ax, shovel, extra fan belts, canned foods, first-aid kit, down-filled sleeping bags, heavy chains for each of the 18 wheels, four spare wheels, spare tires and tubes, and a towline.

The tremendous vibration when all 18 wheels are chained works fastenings and bolts loose at such a clip that men check the rig every hour. Chains on all wheels, including front wheels, help to prevent disastrous side-slip of the 19-ton load on ice.

Typical versatility of the pair was displayed on a recent trip when a broken radia-

tor hose flushed away all engine water and antifreeze. They replaced the hose and built a big fire in the middle of the road in minus 30 weather to melt snow. For a receptacle they used a large oil tray.

Trucks are given a complete overhaul at Lynden at the end of each round trip, and a check at the Fairbanks terminus. En route, if a rig is forced to stop, the drivers' motto is: "We can't say here, we'll have to do something."

Each season has its particular truckers' nightmare.

"In spring, it's the mud, soft muskeg, and melting snow pouring hub-deep over the highway," said Marvin Stuurmans, dairy farmer and driver. "In summer, it's flats and the great mushroom clouds of dust. And squadrons of mosquitoes that feed on you while you're changing tires. In fall, we watch for ice. In early freezeups, the road is covered with a sheath of ice.

"There's always danger of a spinout, over which the driver has little control," Stuurmans said. "It's never happened to us—L.T.I. has a wonderful safety record—but its happened to other drivers. On a steep rise you start to slide. Your wheels spin, and the tremendous weight behind you begins to pull you back down off the mountain, maybe to a 1,000-foot dropoff. Then, in winter, you push snow over the bumpers or fight slides on a slick surface."

Stuurmans looked at his truck with a shy smile, finished in a different key.

"It's a fine run, always something different," he said. "We've helped hundreds of persons on the road. You never pass anybody up without offering aid. It's a long trip, but it gives you a real sense of accomplishment each time you make it safely, on time, with your cargo in good shape. You can take pride in it."

Winter is preferred driving time, because the roadbed smooths out under snow.

The highway's highest point is reached in a 50-mile climb to 4,200 feet on Steamboat Mountain.

Stuurmans, with Kok as his partner, held up at Destruction Bay by a washout on the road on one trip, attended Indian funeral services for a drowned child.

"You get to know everybody in Alaska," Stuurmans stated. "You learn a lot of different things about different people."

The drivers see wildlife in plenty, some of it none to friendly. Long ago, after one cab was bashed in, all tractors were equipped with "moose guards," heavy steel gratings over the radiator to repulse the attack of an occasional enraged bull moose, which resents the coming of the mechanical age to the wilderness.

A grizzly sow once put two drivers "right back in the cab." The L.T.I. drivers, spotting a grizzly cub alone on the road, stopped to get acquainted and were charged by a roaring half ton of maternal emotion.

"We see changes and growth every trip north as the country opens up," said Bert Sheets. "Some of our trips now are unscheduled runs. We've delivered a load of refinery equipment far out on the Kenai Peninsula, building materials to radar sites close to the Arctic Circle in midwinter, and once took mining equipment, way above timberline beyond Mount McKinley National Park.

"That was the finest trip we ever made," Sheets said. "We hit it just right, for weather. Clear as a bell, wildlife everywhere, and that great white mountain rising 20,000 feet against a deep-blue sky. I'll never forget it."

At the southern end, the company's plane, flown by Jansen or by a commercial pilot, is on hand at Lynden for quick emergency service. The small plane has set down on a smooth stretch of highway far in the wilderness with a needed engine part, guided by the sight of the 50-foot truck stopped on the road.

The trucks are more often rescuers than rescued. Once L.T.I. drivers picked up a family in great peril, its car wrecked, no shelter at hand against the cold. There wasn't room for all the members of the family on the seat, so the numerous children were shoved into the sleeping compartment. That's a trip the men won't forget soon. By the time the family was deposited safely in the next town, the kids had torn up most of the comforts of the sleeping compartment.

Trailers often are fully loaded for the return trip with scrap metals, furniture and personal effects of Army families, and automobiles.

In winter, drivers get a week's respite between runs. In summer, when Alaska is bustling, they may make "turn-arounds," as many as 11 in a row, seeing their families only briefly. In 1 month, Sheets and Wilson spent 29 out of 31 days in the rig. Alaska drivers earn $9,000 to $10,000 a year.

With all the hardships, drivers get a far-away look in their eyes when they talk of the beauty of it all—the magnificent mountains thrusting peaks into a cold blue sky, silent forests, rushing rivers. They know that they are dependent upon their own proud resourcefulness as few men are in this age.

Best proof that these men feel a thrill in their role as suppliers of the new frontier is the fact that they carry cameras.

Behind the driver's seat in almost any cab, you'll find a camera, loaded and ready to picture a moose and her calf, clouds rising from a mountain mass, a wild ram silhouetted against the sunset, or simply an L.T.I. truck on the lonely road.

"Traffic Court" Seen by Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the television program produced here in Washington, "Traffic Court," is certainly an effective manner of bringing highway safety to the attention of the public.

Recently, this program was seen by those attending the American Bar Association's Traffic Court Conference at the Yale Law School at New Haven, Conn., March 28 through April 1.

Municipal Court Judge George D. Neilson who appeared on the first 10 TV "Traffic Court" programs and who has taken a keen interest in traffic problems for many years and the program producer Lou Brott were invited by the bar association to introduce and present a recent kinescope of "Traffic Court" and explain how the program has served to mold and support community interest in traffic safety on a Washington metropolitan areawide basis.

Format of "Traffic Court" is the reenactment of previously decided cases taken from the official files of the District of Columbia, and nearby Maryland and Virginia.

Participating in the broadcasts on a rotating basis—with "Juvenile Court" seen every fourth week—are the police, judges, and prosecutors of Alexandria, Arlington, District of Columbia, Falls Church, Fairfax County, Montgomery County, and Prince Georges County.

It is now sponsored by the Metropolitan Area Traffic Council as an important part of the Council's traffic safety education efforts of the jurisdictions in the District, Maryland and Virginia.

It is estimated that current audience ratings of the "Traffic Court" period give the program a weekly audience of over 200,000 persons in the WRC–TV viewing area.

Frank Dobie on Libraries; A Bold Free Mind Comments on a Facet of Our Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, J. Frank Dobie, known to all his friends in the Southwest as "Don Pancho," called by some the Carl Sandburg of the cow country, is more than a successful author, university English teacher, folklorist, naturalist, and historian of the cattle country, though he is all of those.

He is a philosopher, free thinker, and a free man. His sharp pen stabs the servile conformity of our times, bids men to think, and calls on them to be intellectually free.

Last week, at the opening of National Library Week, J. Frank Dobie, in his own individual way, commented on the "Human Mind and Libraries." I think his comments worthy of wider distribution than they have yet received.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD J. Frank Dobie's article entitled "Human Mind and Libraries" from the Austin (Tex.) American Statesman of April 3, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN MIND AND LIBRARIES

(By J. Frank Dobie)

The 1960–61 issues of that ponderous volume, "Who's Who in America," will contain in its back pages a citation representing, perhaps for the first time, Texas. Every 2 years "Who's Who in America" summarizes examples of "Educational Philanthropy" and "Exceptional Gifts to Libraries."

The forthcoming citation is to Mrs. Emilie Wheelock Howson, who died in Austin, 1957, at the age of 96, leaving $110,000 without strings to the Austin Public Library and $100,000 to the Carver Branch of the Austin Public Library for the purchase of books. A branch of the library is now being built that will bear the name of Emilie Wheelock Howson.

Exceptional gifts to libraries as listed biannually by "Who's Who in America" express something more than density of population and bank deposits. In volume 30, for instance, there are 13 citations, including 1 for Ontario, Canada. Massachusetts and

New York have two citations each. Vermont, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have one each. North Carolina and West Virginia are the nearest there are to the Deep South, with its fear of ideas. The Middle West is not represented at all. The West is represented by Oregon and California. Without having much more wealth than Texas, California has from Bancroft's time on through the time of Huntington, of Huntington Library fame, and clear up to our own times, had many benefactors to libraries and universities. I knew an old cowman a long time ago before cattle were shipped by trucks who judged a railroad town by its shipping pens. Bookstores exist where there are demands for books. Nowhere in the Nation, I suppose, is the support of public libraries anywhere commensurate with the support for more and wider and faster highways.

EMERSON'S COMMENT

Many centers of population that give strong support for churches, hospitals, United Funds, and all sorts of charities, dispense only a pittance to public libraries and museums—to institutions expressive of intellect and taste. Emerson said something about this in one of his essays. "I give the dollar to charity," he says, "but it is a wicked dollar. Tomorrow I shall have courage to refuse it and to give it to the enlightenment of man." To give for enlightenment, for civilization, for the beautiful is not to deny the claims of charity but is to assert the wholeness of man. Nine-tenths of the candidates for public office assert their allegiance to churches, United Funds, Boy Scouts, hospitals and even to such an antidemocracy and antiintellectual organization as the American legion. It's always safe, and maybe popular, to be for God and babies, but I'd like to vote for some candidate who's been a strong crusader for libraries and art museums. Philanthropy takes many desirable forms. What American philanthropist has done the most good with money may not be asserted categorically, but I should consider Andrew Carnegie. When I think of the libraries the Carnegie fund has brought into existence and aided throughout the English-speaking world, I feel like saluting tight old Andrew Carnegie.

A few weeks ago I experienced a joy still retained in going through the Marion Koogler McNay Art Institute in San Antonio. Mrs. McNay, a woman of wealth and a patron during her lifetime of the arts, left the building and extension grounds, many pictures and funds for enlarging and keeping up the museum now named for her. It is fresh and strong and green and growing like the spring leaves coming onto sturdy live oaks right now. The direction of the McNay and the Howson moneys contrasts strongly with millions left in foundations by individuals with no idea or desire for spending the millions.

Public libraries used to be places for quiet study and reading. What picture galleries of human countenances the newspaper rooms in libraries in big cities still are. Nowadays the public library is something of a community center with emphasis on wholesome amusement for children, usually in the form of reading and pictures. I myself don't ask anything better than silence and books for libraries, but I'm for everything that public libraries have been and are becoming. One of their functions have not changed an iota—that is, to provide materials for enlarging and freeing the human mind. They are at the opposite pole from all censors of books and all restrictors of ideas, whether the censor-restrictor is theological or merely greedy against taxes. The idea of the public library is the opposite of the ideal of the dictator who suppresses newspapers and books in the hope of suppressing opposition.

ONE OF THE BRAVE

As I compose this salute to the public libraries and the public librarians of America, I'm looking at a book just published by the University of Chicago Press. It is "Their Majesties the Mob," by John W. Caughey of the University of California. He was one of the brave who a few years ago refused to sign a loyalty oath later declared unconstitutional and who won out. "Their Majesties the Mob," consists of between 50 and 60 accounts of vigilante action in America from the days of California vigilantes to the days of McCarthy and the House Committee on Un-American Activities vigilantism. It was during the frightened fifties that female and male vigilantes alike tried to censor books on shelves in many public libraries and even in some cities to burn them. The libraries stood against such barbarism and enlightened newspapers, which do not include all newspapers by any means, stood behind the librarians. One of the vivid accounts in "Their Majesties the Mob," is by Ralph S. O'Leary of the Houston Post on the Minute Women of Houston who called every man and every idea they did not agree with communistic and blackened reputations of some fine individuals.

The title of one piece in this book sends the spirits up like sight of a flaming comet across a black sky. The title is: "Mr. Justice Holmes Dissents." Despite all book burners, despite all fundamentalist opposition to free minds, the public libraries remain depositories for the bravery and wisdom and foolishness, too, of dissenters. It's the dissenters and not the assenters who have brought mankind as far as it has evolved from the jungle. I stand tiptoe to salute those preserves and carriers of the torches of truth—the public libraries and their librarians.

Harry Van Arsdale, Progressive Labor Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Harry Van Arsdale is a labor leader with vision. As head of local 3 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in New York he is the leader of 29,000 workers in the electrical industry of this great city. He is a forward-looking man, who has the interests of his people at heart, and provides them with able leadership. He is very popular not only with the people of his union, but with many people in New York who know him personally and admire his ability and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article from the New York Mirror of April 11, 1960, written by the noted columnist Columnist Victor Riesel in his column "Inside Labor." The article is devoted to Harry Van Arsdale and his planning for the future. I call it to the attention of all my colleagues because it deals with matters which are of great interest to all of us and will affect our lives and the lives of our children. The article reads as follows:

UNION SEES FUTURE STRANGER THAN FICTION

(By Victor Riesel)

Some day "soon" the phone will ring and at the other end the caller will speak in Swahili and you will hear him in English through the nuclear automatic translator.

Some day "soon" great urban centers such as "New York, London and the Ruhr" will have been dispersed and we will live in small communities grouped around nuclear power plants. No science fiction, this. No esoteric college seminar.

They are just a few of the observations of practical men to other practical men. They were made at a unique and sobering labor-management search into the future by leaders of New York's International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 3, labor's avant-garde, and the city's electrical industry with a yearly payroll of $75 million.

Some time ago, the union's indefatigable leader, Harry Van Arsdale—he who never sleeps—took a long look at the electronic magic being wrought by his 29,000 followers and the businessmen who employ them. He and his counterparts in the Joint Industry Board of the Electrical Industry of New York decided to hear about that magic's impact on the future—of their business, their homes, their working conditions, their nation and the world.

They decided to do this jointly, as they have all other projects which have made the New York Electrical Workers about the highest paid and the industry one of the finest profit groups, in the land.

Soon some 40 employers and 40 union officials began meeting at eight a.m. each Thursday in the Cooper Union library to hear from Academy of Science, Pentagon and university scientists what will happen when the era of plentiful nuclear power arrives. They asked tough questions: "Will they (union leaders, workers and businessmen) be liberated? Will they be automated and made obsolete? Will they be struck down by leukemia?"

I sat with Van Arsdale and Efrem Kahn, the industry leader and Harold Webster, head of the National Electric Contractors Association, the other morning. We heard that the chances of being hurt by Strontium 90 in the blue yonder were exactly 1 million to 1.

As Dr. Merril Eisenbud, professor of Industrial Medicine at Bellevue Medical Center, explained, this means anywhere from zero to 3,000 people of the world's three billion.

During previous breakfast sessions there had been Dr. Boris Pregel, chairman of the board of trustees of the New York Academy of Sciences. It was he who said, "The existence of manufacture and of communications by sea and rail have until now determined the concentrations of populations such as New York, London, and the Ruhr. I forsee the gradual dissolution of these big centers and the establishment of small communities built around nuclear reactors."

Dr. Pregel warned that when machines take over the jobs of clerical workers and those of the old skilled production workers who are among our most highly paid today, "This group will be downgraded to the status of unskilled labor."

With hundreds of thousands who may be thus affected in big cities, their loss of status and income would make them susceptible to violent political moods.

To forestall chaos, there must be planning and retraining now. Labor leader Van Arsdale and his colleagues in industry have seen the future. They'll do something about it—together.

Mr. Murphy a Democrat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few, if any, great newspapers have adopted a more independent, nonpartisan approach than the Milwaukee Journal to all political questions, and particularly to appointments to the quasi-judicial agencies of our Federal Government.

But the Milwaukee Journal's sense of fairness was offended by the recent nomination by the President of a man who seconded the nomination of Vice President NIXON at the Republican convention in 1956 as the new Democratic member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

How Republican can a man be? What a travesty on the whole idea of bipartisan commissions. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Mr. Murphy a Democrat?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MURPHY A DEMOCRAT?

The law requires that there be no more than six members of one party on the Interstate Commerce Commission. There are now six Republicans. One of the five seats allotted to Democrats is vacant. To that seat President Eisenhower has named Timothy J. Murphy, a Boston attorney.

Murphy calls himself a Democrat. But members of that party are doubtful. In 1956, Murphy says, he supported Eisenhower. So, of course, did many Democrats. But Murphy also went to the Republican convention in San Francisco and gave a seconding speech nominating RICHARD NIXON as vice-presidential candidate on the Republican ticket.

Democratic Senators consider this strange conduct for a member of their party. So they're planning a stiff fight on the nomination. "Would the Dodgers allow the Braves to direct their base runners?" they ask in effect.

Better Future for the Aged Through Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, medical research will undoubtedly improve the health and well-being of all of us in our later years. Some of the prospects are discussed by Dr. James A. Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health, in the ninth and last of a series of columns written for Ray Henry which appeared in over a hundred papers throughout the country during January and February.

The improvements in medical well-being that he notes are all the more reason for modifying our social security retirement policies so as to permit and encourage those older persons, who are able and willing to work and who want to work, to be free to accept employment including part-time employment.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act at this session along these lines:

BETTER FUTURE FOR THE AGED THROUGH MEDICAL RESEARCH

(By Dr. James A. Shannon, Director, National Institutes of Health)

The prospects of better health and health care in the future, particularly for the aged, are the brightest in man's history.

Scientists put new medical knowledge in the physician's hands every day. And, they will continue to do so at an increasing pace.

The past is an example. After all, the significant progress in medical research and the growth of our population in the last 20 years are not unrelated coincidences.

Much of the increase in population is a direct result of new medical knowledge. The knowledge comes from sustained and imaginative study by many scientists. Their work is supported by the public through research foundations, voluntary agencies, Government programs and public-spirited private citizens.

Population growth has been particularly evident at the extremes of the life span. This mainly has resulted from the giant strides which have been made against the infectious diseases and the vast improvements in all kinds of medical care, as well as progress in such related fields as housing, nutrition, and sanitation.

But most important of all has been research aimed at finding more knowledge which is useful in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease.

Today, our national medical research effort is focused upon the challenge of chronic disease which affects large numbers of the general population and constitutes the major threat to all of our lives as we pass middle age.

Let us take a brief sampling of some of the additions to medical knowledge in recent years and some of the major accomplishments which our top scientists believe we will see in the next 10 years.

Since man's view of the future has always been very limited, we can be sure there will be many more developments than this. Very probably they will be even more exciting.

In the general area of gerontology, the study of aging, science is steadily uncovering the hidden characteristics of the aging process.

We now know as people grow older, they not only shrink in stature, but their organs also decrease in size and vital capacity.

For example: Older hearts can pump less blood with each heartbeat than when they were younger, a fact which partially explains our decline in energy as we grow older.

Although body functions make certain definite changes when growth ceases, aging is not necessarily connected with the deterioration of the body by disease.

Contrary to public belief, body cells of older people can and do perform practically the identical functions as they do in younger people. But the rate of function gradually declines.

Developing fields of science, still unfamiliar to the general public, are of the utmost importance in wresting from nature some of her more complex medical secrets.

One of these is epidemiology, the science of mass phenomena and disease. Such studies, using the rigid tools of the biometrician—a kind of health statistician—to supplement skills of keen laboratory and clinical observers, are clarifying the problems of cardiovascular disease and throwing light into the dark areas of neurological diseases and cancer.

The increasing depth of medical research is making it possible for us to examine the cell and its systems and to extend these findings to the whole man.

Such depths are reachd through modern advances in scientific research like those in biochemistry aided by extensive use of radioactive isotope techniques.

With continuing biochemical approaches to the study of therapeutic agents, we can expect to see an array of new drugs for the attack on killing and disabling diseases.

Deeper penetration into the life processes of the cell will also result from physical biology as physicists, physical chemists, and mathematicians turn their instruments of precisions and models of thought to studies of biological entities and processes. We will soon gain understanding of the nature of reactions within the body cells and how specific proteins are reproduced.

In the field of collagen diseases, such as arthritis, we are rapidly gaining physical as well as chemical understanding of the changes which lead to suffering and disability.

We are approaching a solution to the questions of just what viruses are, how they multiply, and what roles they play in the development of cancer.

Physical biology will also help us to learn how to produce highly potent, purified and perhaps modified viral antigens for use in preventing a host of viral diseases.

Striking changes will appear in the practice of medicine as physicians apply new knowledge now being acquired in the field of mental health.

Important to these and perhaps even greater future gains will be both an expansion and a change in training people to use newly developed precision instruments and techniques.

Despite the current growing shortage of trained manpower, medical science is meeting the challenge of chronic disease more successfully than ever before.

We are solving fundamental problems which have baffled medical men in all previous history because we do have, today, the most advanced methods and the most highly trained scientists the world has ever seen.

Mary Lasker: Crusader for More Beautiful Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of America's great and unique women, Mrs. Mary Lasker of New York City, has in recent years launched a magnificent crusade to beautify our cities. With remarkable success, resulting from her perseverence and winning ways, she has sold the idea that our urban centers should regard beauty as a public service. She has demonstrated in New York City

that flowers can play a vital role in revitalizing America's downtowns, and other cities all over the country are emulating that city's example.

Anyone who has visited New York City recently must have been struck by the profusion of tulips on Park Avenue, for example. Some 30 blocks of blooms now testify eloquently to the success of Mrs. Lasker's great experiment.

Mrs. Lasker's pioneering work in this field comes as no surprise to those of us who have long admired her dedication to such vital causes as medical research, education and the progress of the underdeveloped countries of the world. It is certainly heartening that this woman, who is undoubtedly one of America's busiest ladies, can take time to spearhead the drive to make our cities more attractive.

I certainly hope the example Mrs. Lasker and her coworkers have provided in New York City will be emulated far and wide in our land. In this connection, an interesting article in the Apirl 10, 1960, issue of This Week magazine catalogs much of the progress which has been made. I ask unanimous consent that this article, which salutes the incomparable Mrs. Lasker and her work, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW AMERICAN LOOK: CITIES IN BLOOM

(By Samuel Grafton)

A new kind of street scene has been observed recently in many American cities: A pedestrian, on his way home, deep in his problems, happens to glance at a street as familiar to him as his hand. His mouth opens. In extreme cases his eyes pop as he sees something brand new among the familiar darkening stones and flickering neons—generous, even staggering, masses of flowers, and long lines of trees.

In New Orleans, these may take the form of palms and azaleas on the center mall of Canal Street.

Seattle's new look is the result of tree plantings.

Flower-banked tubs gladden hearts in St. Paul.

In New York, where the most startling changes have been taking place, strollers will be gaping in another month at 150,000 tulips in bloom, almost 30 blocks of flowers marching gloriously right down the center of Park Avenue.

When city experts discuss this invasion by beauty which is engulfing one American street after another, their conversation most often gets around to a New York woman, Mrs. Mary Lasker.

A few years ago these questions occurred to Mrs. Lasker: How could our American cities be made more attractive and livable? Where should one start? Mrs. Lasker started in the simplest possible way. She put flowers around in the streets, masses of them, after obtaining municipal permission.

It was an artless, almost naive action, but it shone like a good deed in a naughty world. Maybe we need more such simple solutions for problems we think are complicated, because the exciting thing is that Mary Lasker's flowers have won the day. They are spreading, east side, west side, all around the town. And all around the country.

Mrs. Lasker had what was needed to do the job. She is wealthy, winning and attractive, and determined. But, on points, she was about the last person who could have been expected to notice the increasing desolation of our downtown streets, and to do something about them, because she is one of the busiest women in America.

A LADY WITH LOTS OF INTERESTS

Her interests are so extensive that only her closest friends are aware of their number and complexity, and even they may miss on a few. As the widow of Albert D. Lasker, pioneer American advertising man, she has for years devoted herself, as he did, to furthering medical research. Some of the very feminine and dainty rooms of her house are piled high with medical journals, and she is famous for her "steel file" mind; she can bring up, from memory, the date of a medical advance, of a piece of experimentation on research, or a statement made at an important conference, while others are looking in the records for the answer.

Don't ticket her, though, as a lady of science; you'll trap only one small aspect of Mary Lasker that way. As a young girl, from Watertown, Wis., she studied art at Radcliffe (later she was a post-graduate student at Oxford in England).

Her house is filled with paintings, many of them in impressionist masters. Mary Lasker frankly loves beauty, and her house, decorated in what can only be described as many shades of white, is of a fascinating unity throughout, dominated everywhere, in hall, on stairs and in living quarters, by the paintings. (Characteristically, she likes the outside to be beautiful, too, and every year has her gardeners come in from the country and plant bulbs around her neighbors' trees.)

A typical party at her house will find present half a dozen Ambassadors, the heads of a couple of broadcasting networks, perhaps Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Madame Pandit of India. She is deeply interested in furthering education, particularly in underdeveloped countries. And somewhere she finds time to see every good play and to hear most good concerts in New York.

She spends many hours a day at the offices of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, which administers her health and education grants. Unlike many executive types, she is quiet, pretty, and rather retiring. She admits candidly that she likes to spend a number of hours a week at a beauty salon.

FLOWERS FOR EVERYBODY

It was this outstanding lady of New York who decided a few years back that the streets of the town needed beauty. (She had previously set up great chrysanthemum plantings in Central Park, in memory of her mother, but these were off the streets. Now she wanted flowers where people were.)

Although today nobody will come out and say it, when Mary Lasker first made known her modest desires she was met with what might be called well-entrenched scepticism from the city.

What ensued wasn't really a knock-down drag-out political battle. Rather, it was one of those polite but steel-firm controversies.

On one side was Mrs. Lasker, who kept insisting that flowers in a city are like lipstick on a woman. You have to have some color.

And ranging on the other side were experts of the city parks department, who had been battling soot and grime and fumes for years. Quite understandably, the experts had long given up on trying to nurture flowers in an area where flowers weren't expected to grow. The experts stuck to their trees—a lot simpler, they insisted, and better equipped by nature to deal with the unnaturelike surroundings of the metropolis.

SET FOR A STRUGGLE

Mrs. Lasker, in preparing for a struggle with the city over her flowers, enlisted the aid of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, the former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense, and together the two of them set out to do battle with the who-needs-it? spirit of the city.

It ought to be noted that Mrs. Lasker doesn't argue, she merely remarks in a ladylike way that it's a pity not to have more joy in our lives, which are being made longer by medical research.

Finally, after many long hours of meetings and conferences, the experts heaved a collective sigh and said in effect: "Go plant your flowers. Just remember we told you so."

So, in 1956, New York City settled back and watched Mrs. Lasker with a detached but amused eye. (After all, it was her money, wasn't it?). And Mary Lasker proceeded with her plan. She felt that tulips had a chance to survive; she counted on the waxy leaves and petals to withstand dirt, and the small amount of sun that is required to sustain flowering spring bulbs. She began with four bleak blocks on Park Avenue.

The rest, of course, is floral history. The tulips flourished; the parks department was stunned.

In 1957 the city, still recovering from shock at the whole thing, gave her permission to plant 22 blocks on Park Avenue. And that year the city, still amazed but by now visibly pleased, took over at her suggestion the program, appropriating $309,500 for plantings, and started the "Salute to Seasons" program. Mrs. Rosenberg and Richard C. Patterson, Jr., commissioner of the department of commerce and public events, are cochairmen of the project. Changes of the seasons are acknowledged not only with flowers but with special entertainments

"I just gave a little seed money at the beginning to get things rolling," says Mary Lasker.

Things are indeed rolling. Mrs. Lasker and her associates think that there are three elements which can be used to bring beauty into our lives: Flowers, trees, and lighting. By late spring of this year all the main avenues of midtown New York will be tree lined, like the avenues of Paris.

A FAIRYLAND BY NIGHT

At night nowadays 10 blocks of the east face of Central Park, along Fifth Avenue from 60th Street up, are elaborately lighted. This used to be an area of cavernous dark. Now it has been changed into a series of pictures in light, glens carved out of the darkness by astutely concealed lighting. One hesitates to use the child's word "fairyland" to describe it, but let's call it fairyland. That's what it is.

The park lighting is paid for by a New York real estate corporation. Banks have taken over the financing of individuals blocks of the Park Avenue displays. Mary Lasker's seed money has produced quite a crop: Plans for new office buildings in midtown New York now include areas for plantings as a matter of course, plus reflecting pools, and colonnaded walks. Tight-fisted businessmen have discovered there is something very practical in beauty; it gives distinction to a building, a street, a neighborhood. New York had suddenly realized that 500,000 tourists go to Washington every spring just to see the cherry trees bloom. Business leaders who had never thought of flowers before except on Mother's Day now feel they have a weapon with which to fight the flight to the suburbs, the decline in downtown shopping.

The businessmen are realizing that when Mary Lasker says, "It's an important in dollars and cents for a city to establish a pleasant image of itself," she truly knows of what she speaks.

One dreary New York City area, the famous Worth Street textile district downtown, has been transformed; plantings have been set out, a great repainting program has been completed, with the result that a dis-

trict which was declining has seen values shoot up, and a new lease on life won.

Amazingly, the plantings seem inviolate. Incredulous authorities say they don't have a single authenticated case of plant stealing. There was a mixup in 1957, when the first Fifth Avenue plantings happened to coincide with Queen Elizabeth's visit to New York. Some people, assuming the flowers had been put out to welcome the Queen picked them and took them home. Since it has been explained that the displays are permanent, they have been left untouched.

YOU NEED A FEW ZEALOTS

Any city that wants to beautify itself will find, however, that it has to work hard to do it. You'll have to sell the idea, and you'll find that people will need time to think it over, and get used to the notion of beauty as a public service. "You need some zealots to get it going," says Mrs. Lasker. "But it's one of the ways to a better America. Let's remember that we live by joy, not by bread alone."

In arranging plantings, you'll have to be practical. "Don't kill the idea by trying to plant petunias where there's no sun," says Mary Lasker. "Call the local nurseryman, and ask him what thrives in the area. He will know. In crowded northern city streets, we find that gingko trees and plane trees do well. So do spring bulbs, begonias and mums. Farther south, you can use azaleas and rhododendrons. Crabapples are useful in many places.

"Try to start with a specific project. Have your group make a firm offer to your park department, and then call the mayor, and work with him. There's a good chance that people will pitch in, not only for the joy of it, but because it makes your town a nicer place to live in, work in and visit, and brings an increase of activity."

Or, as Mrs. Rosenberg, also a busy woman who has found time for municipal beauty, puts it: "It's vital to do things that make folks feel better. When you watch people walk down a street, and spot the flowers, you can actually see them relax. It gives them a different feeling about their city, a touching kind of pride. It's a sign of maturity that we're finding the courage to respond to beauty."

SOME U.S. CITIES THAT HAVE JOINED THE CRUSADE

Here's a partial list of cities now engaged in plantings and revitalization:

Birmingham has a beautification board in charge of placing large concrete urns filled with growing plants in the downtown area.

Boston is giving more eye appeal to its historic Common, the oldest public park in the United States. New shrubs and masonry are going in.

Chicago, through its city bureau of forestry, has placed trees and shrubs downtown and has encouraged new lighting in the area.

Neosho, Mo., is an example of what a small city can do. Each year the Flower-Box City distributes dirt-fertilizer mixture as a free service to citizens and business firms.

Norfolk has recently undertaken a project of flowering plants and displays in downtown streets.

Omaha has made its main effort embellishing a major highway which connects the central business district with the city's municipal airport.

Philadelphia has been engaged in setting plantings and floral arrangements in the heart of the business and finance district.

Portland, Ore., has placed over 500 potted trees and flowers downtown.

Rochester, N.Y., long known as the Flower City, cultivates lilacs not only in private gardens but in public parks as well.

Washington has the annual Cherry Blossom Festival, the Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens, and the National Capital Parks System, but beyond all this the city emphasizes beautification around its more than 85 statues and memorials.

What can you do? To find out specific varieties of plants, trees, and shrubs suitable to your community's climate conditions, you should consult your State university's botany department or agricultural unit, or local botanical gardens. Your agricultural county agent may also provide information.

Cutting the Fire Toll in the U.S. Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, containing funds for the Forest Service, is now in conference. I hope the conferees will heed the many pleas to provide adequate funds for forest fire prevention. This is far better economy than spending emergency funds on forest firefighting, as we have to do every dry year in California.

The point is very well stated in an editorial in the San Francisco Examiner of March 29 entitled "Cut the Fire Toll in U.S. Forests." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT THE FIRE TOLL IN U.S FORESTS

Great forest fires take a tragic toll each year in this country's 181 million acres of national forest preserves scattered across three-fourths of the 50 States. No less tragic is the fact that much more can be done to prevent these fires, but is not being done.

An effective fire-prevention program is pending in Congress. Unless it is approved, the country can expect ever worse repetitions of the huge fires that last year, in the national forests within California alone, raged over 178,000 acres. The flames not only destroyed timber and wildlife; they did lasting damage to watershed, recreational, and scenic values.

This destruction will increase in magnitude simply because the Nation's population expansion is pushing civilization ever closer to the national forests.

Under the existing system, Congress each year gives a flat sum to the U.S. Forest Service for routine forest protection. Then, when great fires occur in a dry year, funds are dished out on a wasteful emergency basis to fight the flames and their consequences. These funds generally exceed the amounts spent on protection.

Under the proposed program, additional funds would be supplied specifically to prevent fires by reducing fire hazards. This prevention would take the form of controlled burning, more fire trails, more brush cutting, more firefighting equipment, more employment of key men on a year-around instead of seasonal basis.

In effect, part of the emergency funds now wastefully spent to fight fires would be spent before the fires to keep those fires from occurring, or to minimize the damage they could do. There would be a substantial dollar saving. More important, vast acreages of our forest resources would be saved from destruction.

This is a sound and prudent prevention program conceived by men who know their business. It is supported by prominent lay experts serving as advisers to the Forest Service. We urge Congress to put it into effect before the new season of forest fire destruction is upon the country.

The President's and Vice President's Statements in Connection With National Library Week, April 3–9, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a democracy such as ours, it is important that the people be up-to-date in all of their information about this great country of ours and the operation of its government. That is why our libraries and their services are so essential and why we must do everything we can to see that these services be made available to more people.

In Iowa I take special pride in the role I played in the expansion of library services within the State. I was the author of many bills which brought the great world of books and the printed word to more of our citizens. The literacy rate in Iowa is among the highest in the Nation.

During National Library Week—April 3–9—I was impressed by the statements of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring these statements to the attention of my colleagues.

The President's statement was made in a letter to Benjamin E. Powell, president of the American Library Association. The President said:

During National Library Week, our people have the opportunity to renew their interest in, and support for, the libraries of America. These libraries contribute much to the pleasure and intellectual growth of us all. Unfortunately, many citizens have no access to library. This handicaps the minds of both young and old. I am glad that the programs of National Library Week will emphasize the need to broaden the availability of books for a better-read, better-informed America. I wish every success to these efforts.

Vice President NIXON's statement was printed in the April 3 edition of This Week magazine. It is as follows:

BE READY! BE LUCKY!

(By RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States)

At our house, as in the homes of millions of other American families, we enjoy a good television program. However, we sometimes find it too easy to spend more time than we should just watching. Stimulating as television can be, we realize afterwards that there are other spare time activities which make for a rich and interesting life and have more permanent value.

Take reading as an example. I think our young people in particular miss a great deal when they deny themselves the opportunity of reading in their spare time. Reading is not only fun—but through it we have at our fingertips the whole of Western civilization.

And reading has an added attraction. When someone handles a difficult situation well, you often hear it said that he is lucky. There is no question but that the breaks do play an important part in life.

Generally, however, you will find that what seems to be luck comes to those who have done their homework.

The phrase "he is lucky" more often than not applies to a person who has prepared himself to take advantage of the breaks when they come his way.

Words are not simply things in themselves but keys to ideas. Every word and every sentence you read is a tool for unlocking your mind. And once the mind is unlocked, it becomes the doorway to ever-widening vistas of knowledge. With ideas and opinions in your mind, you can be prepared for any eventuality.

Jonathan Swift once referred to the "artillery of words." This phrase has vital meaning for us today. The Communists are waging an all-out war for men's minds. We must counter their barrages of words with meaningful ideas of our own.

To win a battle in which words are artillery and ideas have the impact of missiles, we need minds of broad caliber and depths of intellect. People are not born with minds like this; but they can develop them. The reading you do when you are young disciplines your mind and increases your capacity for understanding of the problems of the future.

For this reason reading, study, and the intellectual discipline in an atmosphere of freedom in the long run will be the major strengths in the free world arsenal. And today's young Americans, who tomorrow will have to assume leadership in this battle, must be prepared to meet the challenge.

Knowledge is no luxury. It is the key to survival.

Young Northerner Takes a Look at South's Stand on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the State of Georgia's leading daily newspapers, the Macon Telegraph, on Thursday, April 7, 1960, published on its editorial page the text of the address which won first place in the recent Albion College oratorical contest in Michigan. The speech was on the subject of civil rights legislation and was delivered by a young premedical student, Mac Briggs of Scottville, Mich.

Mr. Briggs, who prefaced his remarks with the assertion that neither he nor his family had any ties with the South, undertook to speak in defense of the South and, in so doing, eloquently pointed out the hypocrisy with which many Americans outside the South approach the issue of human relations. While I disagree with some of Mr. Briggs' opinions on the theory of race relations, I do wholeheartedly agree with the editor of the Telegraph in his comment that "it is heartening that there are those in other sections of the country with understanding of and sympathy for our position."

I commend Mr. Briggs for his sound logic and intellectual honesty and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his prize-winning speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG NORTHERNER TAKES A LOOK AT SOUTH'S STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In these trying times for the South, it is heartening that there are those in other sections of the country with understanding of and sympathy for our position. One of those is a young premedical student at Albion College in Michigan. His name is Mac Briggs of Scottville, Mich., and his speech on the civil rights bill, which we are pleased to print, recently won him an oratorical contest sponsored by Albion College.)

I was born in northern Michigan. My great-grandfather never marched under the Bonny Blue Flag, the Stars and the Bars of the Confederacy. He had nothing to do with that magnificent grey line that was Pickett's Charge at Gettysburg. No, not one of my ancestors came from south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Yet, today I have been moved to say a word in defense of the South. At first, however, I must deal with a simple difficulty that we all have, our own tendencies to react emotionally, forgetting reason. It is very difficult for us, I think, to be objective about issues involving human emotion because, after all, we are all creatures of emotion. Yet we are also creatures of reason, and it is reason with which I intended to proceed from this point.

Now, 95 years have passed since that gallant soldier, Robert E. Lee, surrendered to General Grant at Appomattox Court House, yet we of the North are still rubbing salt into the ugly and slow-healing wounds of "our vanquished South." We are still treating the South as stubborn, stupid, prejudiced stepbrothers. But the trouble with the North is that we still don't know what the War Between the States really proved. To the North, the war simply served to prove to the southerner that he was wrong. What the North refuses to understand time after time is that the Civil War really proved that the South will go to any length, yes, even that fatal and already doomed one before it will allow change of its way of life by mere force of law.

The South was relatively happy with its continued condition of separation that had always existed between the Negroes and whites, after all, people with similar interests like to be together, and they tried to live up to the 14th amendment after the war by setting up separate but equal schools. The Plessy versus Ferguson Act, as far back as 1896, proposed to provide for separate but equal transportation for the Negroes of the South. Later, this principle was applied to education (at least on paper) as the courts attempted to abide by the 14th amendment. They attempted to make the Negro equal but they still preferred to be separate. Well, this looked good on paper, but in practice, it just didn't work. In the first place, separating the Negro automatically inferred that he was inferior, and in the second place, the school administrators, being white or predominantly white, neglected Negro schools. In effect, even in the most ideal cases the Negro schools were never provided for equally.

After a considerable number of complaints of inequality of education issued, the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.*, was debated in 1954 and the Supreme Court concluded that "in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. "Therefore," they stated, "segregation necessarily deprives the Negro of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment." Later in 1954, the Supreme Court implemented decrees to carry out this decision saying that "all schools must be integrated immediately, or in good faith with all deliberate speed."

They apparently had no idea whatsoever what the social repercussions to such a drastice order would be. Friction, bitterness, extreme antagonism, and Little Rock resulted. Today, after 6 years, there are no schools integrated in the South.

Now, the North has self-righteously proceeded to crack down on the South again for her resistance to put into practice the civil rights of the Negro. According to the February 5, 1960, issue of U.S. News, the White House has now proposed a new twist to something that was tried right after the Civil War: A plan to police elections forcing the South to protect the rights of Negro voters. It didn't work then, and it won't work now; human nature doesn't change. Who among you here complies without rebuttal when someone orders you to change immediately and completely an attitude that you have held all your life? No matter how wrong you know you may be, you naturally react strongly against such brutal treatment of your emotional values, don't you?

Last Sunday's Detroit Free Press has revealed that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has announced that he would hold around-the-clock sessions, putting southern Senators through a grueling day and night test of physical endurance in order to force the civil rights bill through. The southern legislators have immediately retaliated, stating most emphatically that they will use every means and power they can muster to defeat the bill. Said Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, a Democrat, from Georgia: "We desire to know whether it is proposed to boil us in oil, burn us at the stake, or simply burn inches off our bodies." Today the filibuster of the 16 southern Senators continues. Here are 16 men trying to represent their people while 84 Senators proceed to let them shout themselves to exhaustion and then force something upon them that has no relevance to the States represented by the 84. And we talk about maltreatment of minorities. How blaring does hypocrisy have to get before the North will recognize it in themselves?

Now don't misunderstand me; I have never thought that slavery was right. Segregation is unfair, undemocratic, no matter where you have it, but integration is a step that can only be accomplished by patience, understanding, and education. However, whether segregation is fair or not is beside the point here. My point is that we of the North have rejected cultural integration, just as much as the South. We stand pointing our finger at the South as enlighened champions of democracy apprehending democracy's betrayers. We of the North must protect the Negro of the South; but what about the Negro of the North? Let's just see what happens to the northern Negro.

Maybe you have noticed that, in buying a home in the North, the Negro is invariably at the mercy of the real estate agents. If a Negro is not forbidden to buy into a new area altogether, he can expect to pay about $1,500 more for a home than a white person is asked for the identical structure.

In Westchester, N.Y., a fashionable all-white neighborhood, a survey was conducted to get the opinions concerning Negroes of these residents. It was found that over 75 percent agreed that better housing facilities should be made available for the Negroes; but, when asked whether or not they would mind having a Negro live next door, about 80 percent said, "Yes; they would mind."

In Detroit there are patches of ugly shacks, which represent in some cases, the results of just such housing discrimination. Most of the shacks are studded with "for rent" signs, you see kerosene burners tucked into the corners of dark, dismal rooms. You smell the pungent, musty stench. You hear parents talk of their children being bitten by rats. There are at least 35,000 of these wretched structures in Detroit, and over three-fourths of them are occupied by Negroes.

We are forcing the South to integrate—the very thing we in the North reject; and we don't even seem to be aware of our hypocrisy. Look at what happened at Grand Rapids Central High School. A few years ago the school was all white. Then the Negroes, expanding into the school district, began attending the school. [Our "model" Northern laws state that anyone of any race living within the school district can attend the district school regardless of race.] So what do the whites do? Well, in Grand Rapids they promptly rejected the principle of integration and moved out of the district so their children wouldn't have to attend the same school and live in the same neighborhood as the Negroes. This pattern of school geographic segregation can be observed in every major city in the North from Brooklyn to Seattle.

What right do we have to be "cracking down" on the South? If the North chooses to segregate their neighborhoods into all-white and all-Negro districts, does the South ask us to go into long dissertations to justify our actions?

If we do favor integration why don't we stop crucifying the South and integrate ourselves?

What does it take to make a people more conscious of their own shortcomings than of their brothers? Will the time proven maxium, "actions speak louder than words," go forever unheeded in the North? Or will we go on treating the South in such a way that they may continue to sneer back at us, "What you do speaks so loudly that I can't hear what you say?"

We will not integrate our schools. [We'll gerrymander first.]

We will not live next to our Negroes.

We will not give them equal opportunities.

We will not accept any blame for segregation problems.

We will lash the South with our tongues.

We will criticize their way of life.

We will force them to do something that in effect we refuse to do.

Are we prepared to force upon the South the unfortunate days of the Reconstruction all over again? Then let he who is guiltless cast the first stone against the South.

Georgetown's Rhodes Scholar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article which appeared in the Georgetown University Alumni Magazine about a young Texan, George P. Giard, Jr.

When we hear so much about the failures of our age and the shortcomings of youth, I think it is inspiring for all of us to read such accounts as this of young men with such a vision and such a healthy and vigorous sense of civic responsibility.

The article follows:

GEORGETOWN'S RHODES SCHOLAR

(By Harriet Griffiths)

A young man with a traditional Texan's large view of life is George P. Giard, Jr.

The 21-year-old senior and president of the Yard at Georgetown University will be off across the ocean next fall to take up the study of law at England's Oxford University.

Awarded a coveted Rhodes scholarship, he plans to spend the next 2 years and possibly a third studying in Britain for the profession of his choice. After a try at the British bar examinations, he hopes to return and take an American law degree.

A lawyer educated in Europe and in America will have a distinct advantage in the wide scope of legal affairs of the future, George believes.

Such infant fields as space law, he says at the risk of understatement, will take lawyers interested in civic affairs on a big scale.

George is majoring in philosophy at Georgetown, not only for its own interest but as a good background for a lawyer.

He credits the honors study program he is taking at Georgetown with much of his success in winning the Rhodes scholarship. Two of the important concepts of the course, he explains, are very small classes with top professors, and an emphasis on studying from original texts, rather that textbooks.

George, nicknamed "Peppy," has shown unusual leadership ability at the university. He was president of both his sophomore and junior classes.

As president of the yard, he heads the college student council. He is the representative of the college to outsiders as well as of the students to the school administration. He presides at athletic pep rallies and as master of ceremonies for various events.

With the yard office annexed to his dormitory room, his suite is a focal point for students with activity planning assignments or problems.

"It's kind of like having your cot in your office," he says.

George's voice already is being heard beyond the campus. He is a member of a panel of eight area students holding a series of discussions for broadcast overseas by the Voice of America.

A firm advocate of participation in civic affairs, George says he has tried during his school years to interest as many people as possible in student government, and extend the area of student participation.

One of his most admired public figures is a fellow Texan, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. He also has a deep respect for President Woodrow Wilson because he brought so much to his office.

George's family goes back 100 years in Texas, he says, but happen stance made him a "naturalized Texan." He was born in San Francisco while his mother was visiting there.

After finishing at Georgetown, he says, he probably will go back to his usual summer job teaching water safety in Dallas before leaving for England.

He believes in taking the long view of swimming safety, too. It is important to cultivate foresight rather than merely to act after the fact, he says. This means being alert for signs of potential trouble before it happens—an obviously uncertain swimmer, a bather hugging the ropes, or a youngster who jumps into the pool straight from lunch.

He looks at his intended legal career in the same light. Foresight, he maintains, comes with a thorough background. He plans to get a good one.

United Neighborhood Houses—60 Years of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 1960 marks the 60th anniversary year of United Neighborhood Houses of New York, an organization dedicated to improving conditions in the Nation's largest city. Through its dedicated pioneering efforts, United Neighborhood Houses has made New York City a better place in which to live and has shown groups all over America the manner in which private initiative can contribute substantially to improving urban conditions.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute all who have made United Neighborhood Houses such a significant part of life in New York City and to wish this fine organization best wishes and Godspeed in the days ahead. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in this morning's New York Times, paying tribute to United Neighborhood Houses, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1960]

SIXTY YEARS YOUNG

To endure 60 years is in itself no mean achievement. But United Neighborhood Houses of New York, Inc., 114 East 32d Street, New York, has done far more than just exist since it was founded at the turn of the century. Over the years its efforts have sparked such reforms as the creation of the City Housing Authority and the outlawing of old-law tenements.

Just this past year the United Neighborhood Houses has won city sponsorship of a settlement-initiated neighborhood conservation program, has improved liaison between settlements and the police in the continuing fight against neighborhood crime and corruption, and has worked with State officials to obtain youth guidance and vocational counselors in 15 settlements to aid teenagers.

A special United Neighborhood Houses grant of money will expand citywide summer programs with teenagers to prevent what have become characteristic hot weather outbreaks of juvenile violence here in the city. Funds are needed by this organization in its 60th anniversary year to enable it to continue its program of vital services to the settlements, the city, and all our neighbors.

Report on Nature of Distressed Labor Markets in New England and Northeastern States, February 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, unemployment has been rising in the New England and Northeastern States. Conditions within the distressed areas have deteriorated. A number of labor markets in which employment had previously improved have been forced back into chronic labor surplus areas.

Unemployment in several of these States now exceed the 6 percent mark: In February 1960, Maine reported an unemployment rate of 8 percent and Massachusetts, 6.2 percent. In January 1960, the latest month for which data are available: New Jersey reported an unemployment rate of 7.3 percent; New York State, 6.9 percent and Pennsylvania of 8.2 percent.

In the 9 New England and Middle Atlantic States 94 labor markets had substantial labor surpluses and among these 80 labor markets were chronic labor surpluses, indicating that unemployment had exceeded 6 percent during at least 18 of the last 24 months and in most these substantial surpluses had persisted for more than 2 continuous years.

Twenty-eight of the forty-one labor markets in this region of the country suffered from chronic labor surpluses. These included: Bridgeport and New Britain, Conn.; Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester, Mass.; Providence, R.I.; Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Trenton, and Camden, N.J.; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, New York City and environs, Utica, Rome, N.Y.; and Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and York, Pa.

The following table highlights the conditions in these areas:

Northeastern States	Labor surplus markets	Total	Distressed and chronic labor surplus labor markets		
			Large	Small	Smaller
Region	94	80	28	41	11
New England	44	34	10	13	11
Connecticut	12	10	2	8	----
Maine	5	4	0	2	2
Massachusetts	22	18	7	3	8
Rhode Island	1	1	1	0	0
Vermont	4	1	0	0	1
Middle Atlantic	50	46	18	28	0
New Jersey	10	9	5	4	----
New York	15	13	4	9	----
Pennsylvania	25	24	9	15	----

Also as part of my remarks, I include Fact Sheet No. 38 E, part I, which shows employment and unemployment in surplus labor markets in New England and in the Northeastern States, February 1960:

Fact sheet No. 38E

PART I. EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN SURPLUS LABOR MARKETS, NEW ENGLAND AND NORTHEASTERN STATES, FEBRUARY 1960

Region, State, labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Months surplus in last 24 months (March 1958–February 1960)	Distressed area [1]	Most recent date of start of substantial labor surplus
New England:							
Connecticut	February 1960	1,064,200	61,500	5.8	16	----	
Major:							
Bridgeport	do	138,400	9,100	6.6	20	X	November 1957.
New Britain	do	48,100	3,000	6.2	23	X	December 1957.
Waterbury	do	79,800	5,200	6.5	16	----	
Smaller:							
Ansonia	do	20,800	1,700	8.2	24	X	August 1957.
Bristol	do	20,100	2,200	10.9	24	X	July 1957.
Danbury	do	31,800	1,900	6.0	14	----	
Danielson	do	16,800	1,300	7.7	24	X	March 1955.
Meriden	do	40,300	3,000	7.4	20	X	October 1957.
Middletown	do	33,700	2,300	6.8	20	X	December 1957.
Norwich	do	23,200	2,200	9.5	24	X	Do.
Thompsonville	do	27,400	2,200	8.0	23	X	November 1957.
Torrington	do	27,000	2,100	7.8	20	X	Do.
Maine (entire State)	do	300,600	28,700	8.0	18	----	
Major:							
Portland	do	61,400	5,000	8.1	17	----	Do.
Smaller:							
Biddeford-Sanford	do	24,300	3,200	13.2	24	X	March 1954.
Lewiston-Auburn	do	33,200	2,600	8.0	20	X	January 1957.
Very small:							
Calais	do	2,400	330	13.8	24	X	Pre-1958.
Eastport	do	3,400	1,100	32.4	24	X	Do.
Massachusetts (entire State)	do	2,144,460	[2] 13,300	6.2	----	----	
Major:							
Brockton	do	56,630	[2] 4,983	8.8	20	X	December 1957.
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	do	58,050	[2] 5,631	9.7	24	X	January 1957.
Lawrence	do	58,680	[2] 3,691	6.3	21	X	January 1952.
Lowell	do	51,140	[2] 4,961	9.7	24	X	Do.
New Bedford	do	70,080	[2] 7,008	10.0	24	X	November 1957.
Springfield-Holyoke	do	196,320	[2] 14,724	7.5	19	X	January 1958.
Worcester	do	125,460	[2] 8,657	6.9	19	X	Do.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Fact sheet No. 38E—Continued

PART I. EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN SURPLUS LABOR MARKETS, NEW ENGLAND AND NORTHEASTERN STATES, FEBRUARY 1960—Continued

Region, State, labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Months surplus in last 24 months (March 1958–February 1960)	Distressed area [1]	Most recent date of start of substantial labor surplus
New England—Continued							
Massachusetts—Continued							
Smaller:							
Newburyport	February 1960	14,200	[2] 1,363	9.6	20	X	November 1957.
North Adams	do	16,510	[2] 1,882	11.4	24	X	Do.
Southbridge-Webster	do	22,680	[2] 1,973	8.7	21	X	Do.
Very small:							
Athol	do	12,280	[2] 528	6.3			Pre-1958.
Gloucester	do	11,730	[2] 2,393	20.4	19	X	September 1957.
Greenfield	do	16,370	[2] 1,326	8.1	18	X	Pre-1957.
Haverhill	do	21,620	[2] 1,362	6.3	19	X	November 1957.
Hyannis	do	14,410	[2] 1,960	13.6	12		Pre-1957.
Lynn	do	55,080	[2] 3,525	6.4			
Marlboro	do	20,610	[2] 1,237	6.0	15		Do.
Milford	do	24,820	[2] 1,862	7.5	21	X	Do.
Very small:							
Pittsfield	do	37,090	[2] 2,448	6.6	16	X	Do.
Plymouth	do	7,620	[2] 1,090	14.3	21	X	Do.
Taunton	do	27,050	[2] 1,948	7.2	16	X	Do.
Ware	do	15,050	[2] 1,008	6.7	16	X	January 1958.
Rhode Island:							
Major:							
Providence	January 1960	337,900	28,100	8.3	23	X	July 1951.
Vermont:							
Very small:							
Bennington	do	9,848	1,650	6.6	1		
Middlebury	do	7,432	550	7.4	2		
Newport	do	8,125	650	8.0	12		
St. Johnsbury	do	[2] 10,000	1,050	10.5	18	X	Pre-1957.
Middle Atlantic States:							
New Jersey	do	2,377,600	172,400	7.3	18		
Major:							
Atlantic City	do	65,400	9,800	15.0	20	X	November 1951.
Newark	do	894,900	59,100	6.6	20	X	January 1958.
Paterson	do	510,400	36,500	7.2	20	X	Do.
Perth Amboy-New Brunswick	do	140,700	9,700	6.9	16		Do.
Trenton	do	168,500	11,400	6.8	18	X	Do.
Camden	do	172,000	11,500	6.7	18	X	November 1957.
Smaller:							
Bridgeton	do	49,200	5,600	11.4	22	X	March 1955.
Long Branch	do	123,600	13,400	10.8	22	X	November 1957.
Salem	do	20,900	1,400	6.7	13		January 1959.
Wildwood	do	18,100	2,400	18.3	22	X	March 1955.
New York State	do	7,576,000	526,000	6.9			
Major:							
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	do	269,000	20,500	7.6	24	X	January 1958.
Binghamton	February 1960	94,500	5,900	6.2	12		
Buffalo	January 1960	526,600	47,000	8.9	24	X	Do.
New York City	do	5,367,600	333,100	6.6	19	X	Do.
Syracuse	do	225,700	13,900	6.2			
Utica-Rome	February 1960	134,500	13,000	9.7	24	X	November 1957.
Smaller:							
Amsterdam	December 1959	22,700	2,300	10.1	24	X	January 1955.
Auburn	October 1959	25,700	2,150	8.4	24	X	Do.
Elmira	February 1960	40,600	2,800	6.8	22	X	November 1957.
Gloversville	December 1959	22,400	2,900	12.9	24	X	January 1955.
Jamestown-Dunkirk	September 1959	63,100	4,800	7.6	24	X	January 1958.
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon	November 1959	76,400	6,200	8.1	24	X	June 1957.
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone	December 1959	54,700	7,600	13.9	24	X	Pre-1958.
Plattsburgh	February 1960	20,810	3,100	14.7	24	X	Do.
Wellsville	October 1960	14,500	900	6.2	24	X	March 1958.
Pennsylvania	January 1960	4,571,500	377,000	8.2	4		
Major:							
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton	February 1960	215,800	13,700	6.3	16		
Major:							
Altoona	January 1960	53,700	4,800	8.9	24	X	January 1952.
Erie	do	97,600	10,600	10.9	24	X	January 1957.
Johnstown	do	95,300	10,900	11.4	24	X	July 1953.
Philadelphia	February 1960	1,806,000	11,415	6.3	19	X	January 1958.
Pittsburgh	do	942,400	73,600	7.8	24	X	Do.
Scranton	January 1960	100,900	14,100	14.0	24	X	January 1952.
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	do	137,100	21,800	15.9	24	X	Do.
York	do	103,600	6,400	6.2	20	X	January 1958.
Smaller:							
Berwick-Bloomsburg	do	21,700	2,500	11.5	24	X	May 1957.
Butler	do	34,800	3,100	8.9	24	X	January 1958.
Clearfield-DuBois	do	35,400	4,600	13.0	24	X	November 1952.
Indiana	do	21,800	2,000	9.2	24	X	Pre-1957.
Kittanning-Ford City	do	20,900	2,900	13.9	24	X	Do.
Lewiston	do	22,200	2,000	9.0	24	X	November 1957.
Meadville	do	23,200	2,900	12.5	24	X	Pre-1957.
New Castle	do	34,000	3,300	9.7	24	X	November 1957.
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville	do	29,600	2,500	8.4	24	X	January 1957.
Pottsville	do	79,100	13,300	17.0	24	X	January 1952.
St. Mary's	do	17,800	1,600	9.0	24	X	Pre-1957.
Sayre-Athens-Towanda	do	19,400	1,700	8.8	24	X	November 1957.
Sharon-Farrell	November 1959	247,300	15,800	6.4	14		
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel	January 1960	63,300	6,800	10.7	24	X	November 1952.
Uniontown-Connellsville	do	43,600	8,000	18.3	24	X	Pre-1957.
Williamsport	do	43,900	3,200	7.3	24	X	March 1957.

[1] X indicates area has been a surplus labor market in at least 18 of the past 24 months and would therefore be eligible for assistance under area redevelopment bill (S. 722).
[2] Estimated.

Source: State Employment Security Agencies.

Visit Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an article in the Elks magazine for April entitled "To Alaska" by Horace Stellar, told of the great land a traveler to my State will find and detailed many of the delights which await the tourist. From Ketchikan to Barrow, Alaska offers magnificent scenery, wonderful fishing and hunting, and many other diversions. The welcome sign is always raised, and the visitor will find Alaska's greatest product to be its friendly people.

For the benefit of my colleagues and all those who read the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have the article mentioned printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO ALASKA

(By Horace Sutton)

If there's one thing that the admission of Alaska has forced, it is a retreat by the Texans. No longer can those lone starry-eyed citizens talk long and loud of having the largest State. What they are saying down there now is that Texas is the largest State in the Union without a glacier.

Gold and cold are what Alaska is noted for, but neither is likely to be discovered by the tourist who comes in summer. Probably it would be more likely for one to find gold before cold, especially if one were to venture north in July and August when most parts of the new State are no frostier than the upper reaches of the United States and Canada.

Aleuts, Indians, and Eskimos are the three indigenous types of people who have inhabited Alaska and still do, albeit in diminishing numbers. Alaska itself is an Aleut word, "Al-ay-eshka," which means Great Big Land.

Travelers who are intrigued by Alaskan history and Alaskan culture—and there is plenty of both—will find the new State awesome, appealing, rugged, expensive, and unlike almost any other place in the world. There are remnants of the Russian days in the names like Sitka, Wrangel, and Petersburg—not to mention the onion-topped churches that still exist in the panhandle. There are still Indians in the panhandle, where the towns have names like Ketchikan and Metlakahtla, still Aleuts in the Aleutians at places called Umnak and Unimak, still Eskimos at Point Barrow and Kotzebue. And everywhere there are the pioneering Americans who live a life that is utterly different.

One can explore Alaska gingerly by boat or by plane up the panhandle. The nearest town of size is Ketchikan, the first stop of the inland-passage steamers that cruise up in sight of land all the way, gliding through the tall green country and the lower glacier lands. Ketchikan, which is also reachable by plane—they set you down at nearby Annette Island and Ellis Airlines brings in passengers by its small flying boats—likes to be known as the salmon capital of the world. There are camps within a few miles of the center of town, a town incidentally that is vastly occupied with cleaning, chopping, storing, and canning halibut and salmon. "How far do you have to go to catch a salmon?" I asked a camp manager last summer. "Just right out in front of the dock," he told me, and in an hour I proved he was right.

Ketchikan is also full of totem poles, Swedish lumberjacks, Filipino fish handlers, and more Swedish lumberjacks. It has a big new mill, and a small, old, but very pleasant hotel, the Ingersoll, and it has a few fur shops where the prices are about as low as they are anywhere in the State.

Next up the line is the State capital at Juneau, which has lots of tourists, and a fairly good but overworked hotel called the Baranof (or Baranov) and lofty, fir-covered mountains that rise up right out of the town. Its single biggest attraction is the Mendenhall Glacier, a few miles out of town, which all but rings the entire settlement. It used to be great sport to export glacial ice to the States for parties, but they are having trouble getting types who will cut it. And the bars in town that used to float it in their drinks now have ice machines. The most famous is the Red Dog Saloon, which is gotten up to look like a gold rush tavern, and is worth a visit. The salmon are a sight in late July, swimming upstream.

The real frontier begins up in Fairbanks, which is real interior Alaska, just south of the 65th parallel, but on the permafrost all the same. There are still log cabins on the back streets of Fairbanks, but there are modest-size skyscrapers, too. From the skyscraping apartments, on the edge of the river, one can look across the water and watch the beavers at work. An afternoon excursion on an old sternwheeler along the rivers to see the Indian fishwheels is a fat sawbuck. A double room in the motel comes to about $18, not far out of line with prices in many of the other States.

Shee fish and Alaska king crab are the big local dishes, and both of them are a gourmet's delight. One of the best places to get them is at Cripple Creek Resort, a spa, Alaska style, where everybody eats family style, dines on reindeer steak and sourdough biscuits. You can pan for gold near the Ready Bullion mine by day, watch the Eskimo dancers after dark.

Fairbanks is the northern limit of the farthest north railroad in the United States, and a sign near the dead-end bumper attests to the fact. Being so far from downstate railroads, it has the least grumpy, most affable trainmen in the land. The train rolls on all day long, south to Anchorage and on farther still to Seward. The prime stop en route is Mount McKinley National Park, which encloses giant Mount McKinley as well as untold elk, moose, grizzlies, and small game. There is a lodge on the grounds not 5 minutes from the railroad station, and for $15 the management will take you out in the wee hours of the morning for a chancy look, if the weather is right, at the mountain and a moose, an elk, or two.

If Fairbanks, on the permafrost is frontier, Anchorage, on the inlet, is a flourishing midwestern town. Neat suburban houses cover the surrounding hills with lovely flowers burgeoning in the gardens. Like Fairbanks, it has some frontiersy-looking shops with all sorts of fur-trimmed parkas which would make good raiment for anyone living in frosty lands or practicing skiing on the cultivated slopes of the south. Anchorage has a pair of 14-story buildings, after all. It has no Indians nor Eskimos to speak of, and it doesn't go back in history to the Russians. But it has private airplanes by the score upon score—so many in fact that two lakes have had to be joined together to provide enough parking space and a big enough runway. Alaska Airlines, however, takes off from dry land. Its big Westward Hotel is a full-fledged inn with handsome dining salons such as one might expect in Seattle, but never this far north. Yet this is only the beginning, for Anchorage is building more. Northwest Orient Airlines brings tourists in to Anchorage, and Pan American lands at Fairbanks.

For those who would drive to Alaska, the celebrated highway built during the war is a two-lane road with a clay topping over a gravel base, much of it curling its way through lands bereft of man or moose. Lodges and gas stations are ordinarily 20 to 30 miles apart, but there is one stretch of 70 miles unencumbered by any sort of civilization. It gets dusty in summer and the mosquitoes fly in relentless waves. Automobile travelers are well advised to cover the gas tank with a rubber mat as a protection not from the mosquitoes but from bouncing gravel. And a shield over the headlights is good insurance too. In any case I wouldn't move a block in the direction of the highway without a careful reading of the American Automobile Association's booklet on the subject, "Alaska and the Alaska Highway."

The Gray Line, incidentally, will take away your worries and do the driving for you between Anchorage and Fairbanks via Valdez (which is pronounced val-deez). The tab is $40 plus $4 tax. Out of Anchorage there are tours of the Matanuska Valley where the giant cabbages grow, and a full-day excursion from Anchorage to Portage Glacier which covers the Eimendorf vase and a view of the Cook Inlet and a far-off peek at Mount McKinley. A 2-day bus tour between Anchorage and Valdez puts in at Copper Center Lodge for the night and visits Worthington Glacier.

Virtually all the many airlines operating in Alaska have worked out tours of their own. Not the least adventurous of them is Alaska Airlines' float trip, on which participants drift on river rafts along the Yukon River amid the wildflowers, the sandhill cranes, the ducks, geese, and moose. Salmon waters, gold land, mineral baths, and a look at Amundsen's cabin are all on the schedule. Figure $250 per person including the air fare between Fairbanks and Dawson. Wien Alaska Airlines has 2- and 3-day tours of the Arctic Coast and a 1-day tour of the Yukon Valley, as well as its so-called Top of the World Tours to Point Barrow. Any number of combination trips can be worked out, linking ships, buses, and trains, covering the Vancouver-to-Juneau leg by the SS *Glacier Queen* or the SS *Yukon Star*, both of which offer all first-class all outside rooms. Some superior accommodations with private baths are available if you apply early. Canadian Pacific offers Princess cruises to Alaska sailing from Seattle and Victoria, and covering a 2,000 mile voyage in about 7½ days. You can fly one way. There probably is no other vacationland offering as many means of transportation for seeing it, and if I were you I would turn myself in to the nearest travel agent and say, "Mush."

The Interest Rate Ceiling Hinders Treasury Debt Financing Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in this calendar year the Secretary of the Treasury will be required to refinance $80 billion in maturing public debt obligations of the United States.

Unless the Congress acts on legislation removing the stringent shackles of the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling,

that refinancing will have to be done in the short-term money market. The only other escape from the ceiling limitation trap would be an economic downturn.

On April 9, 1960, I issued a statement reiterating a call for immediate legislative action to repeal the archaic 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling. I pointed out the fact that a Treasury offering of up to $1.5 billion of 4¼-percent, 25-year bonds received public subscriptions only to the extent of $370 million. This recent Treasury experience in unsuccessfully seeking to extend the maturity of the public debt forcefully demonstrates the need for removal of the ceiling.

Crisis seldom is the proper motivation for sound legislative action nor should it be considered a prerequisite to such action. Despite the fact that projections of budgetary surpluses for fiscal years 1960 and 1961 have served to ease somewhat Treasury financing problems we still are confronted with the need to maintain the $290 billion existing public debt as economically as possible. By avoiding future budgetary deficits we have bolstered confidence in our Government's determination to avoid inflation. However, Congress has the obligation to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the tools for proper debt management so that his authority will be commensurate with his responsibilities in this area. The removal of the ceiling would provide flexibility to the Treasury in its debt operations; the removal would not cause interest rates to go up or down. The Treasury would still finance the debt at minimum possible cost.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include at this point in the RECORD the text of the statement I issued on April 9 and also an article from the April 8, 1960, issue of Business Week captioned "Rate Ceiling Compromise":

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

The public subscriptions for only $370 million of the Treasury's offering of up to $1.5 billion of 4¼-percent, 25-year bonds conclusively prove the urgency of removing the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling as requested by the administration 10 months ago. The disappointing results make poor prophets indeed of the self-designated experts in the Congress who have been proclaiming in recent weeks that the Treasury could sell substantial amounts of long-term bonds within the limit of the ceiling.

The Treasury is in a trap—a trap blindly insisted on by the majority party in the Congress which apparently believes that the Secretary of the Treasury should bear the responsibility, but not have the authority, for proper debt management. It is a sorry spectacle for our great Government to have to conduct important public debt operations, with all that the success of these operations mean to the people of America, within the straitjacket of a senseless and an inflationary restriction. The interest rate ceiling has not kept interest rates down and the removal of the ceiling would not cause interest rates to go up.

Certain would-be congressional monetary experts erroneously construed recent bond market conditions, in which outstanding Government bonds were yielding less than 4¼ percent to mean that the Treasury could now sell "substantial amounts" of bonds within the stringent limitations of the ceiling. The Treasury cautioned and the facts proved that the Government bond market had been so inactive that the market quotations were misleading. The facts also proved that these self-appointed congressional oracles on monetary matters were wrong.

The prevailing market conditions and the continued existence of the ceiling prevented the Treasury from selling any marketable bonds for a year. There was no way to gage the strength of the market demand at 4¼ percent. The Treasury took the logical course of testing the market with a 4¼-percent bond issue. The results of the test are in; the results are conclusive. The ceiling continues to bar the Treasury from proper and efficient debt management practices.

Unless this Congress is to sit idly by while our huge Government debt grows shorter and shorter in maturity, with possible severe damage to our domestic economy and impairment of public confidence, the archaic 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling must be removed once and for all without delay.

[From Business Week, Apr. 8, 1960]

THE FINANCE PATTERN—RATE CEILING COMPROMISE

For almost 2 years, the U.S. Treasury has been unable to sell any new long-term bonds. This was because outstanding long-term Treasury issues sold to yield more than 4¼ percent, the legal maximum that can be placed on any new Government issue with a maturity longer than 5 years. The Treasury could have marketed bonds at a discount, but it chose not to take this back door out. Instead, the administration requested Congress to raise the ceiling.

This week, without the help of Congress, Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson was able to sell a long-term issue, priced at 4¼ percent, because of a sharp drop in outstanding interest rates. Undoubtedly, Anderson recognized that Congress may take this move as an excuse to maintain the ceiling, but he had pledged that the Treasury would sell long-term bonds whenever economic conditions—and the market—permitted, and he lived up to his word.

LITTLE CHOICE

Debt management has not been a very useful weapon over the past few years. With the ceiling in effect, the Treasury has been unable to use the debt in true contracyclical fashion. This job has been done solely by the Federal Reserve, and while monetary policy has been extremely useful at times, even the money managers say that they cannot do it all.

A case, in fact, can be made that monetary policy must be tighter than conditions call for as long as debt management is of no real use. This suggests that if debt management can be utilized effectively, monetary policy could be eased somewhat.

DEMOCRATIC VIEW

This possibility escapes the Democratic opposition in Congress who refused to yield on the ceiling. They argue that the public has been saved millions of dollars in payments on the debt by their efforts. And they say that the administration's request should be buried because interest rates are now back to normal.

This I-told-you-so attitude is both premature and harmful. The Treasury still needs maximum freedom if it is to manage the national debt with any effectiveness. Over the past year, the interest rate ceiling has forced Anderson to market short-term obligations at increasingly higher interest rates and in an atmosphere of near crisis. This was not only expensive but also posed a threat of inflation. And there is no assurance that we will not see a return of those conditions.

ACADEMIC BARRIER

The opposition refuses to consider this possibility. They insist that there will be no return to higher rates or, if there is, that the Treasury will be able to scrape through again.

But if rates were artificially high, then there should be no logical objection to raising the ceiling. For the Treasury naturally wants to do its financing as cheaply as it can.

POSSIBLE COMPROMISE

Last summer, Congress would have been willing to lift the ceiling if the administration had agreed to a resolution suggesting that the Federal Reserve follow a more flexible monetary policy. Anderson—and Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin—felt that Federal Reserve policy should not have been an issue and considered the resolution too high a price to pay. Congress retaliated by keeping the ceiling on interest rates. But Anderson is now ready to accept a compromise deal—one that would allow the Treasury to exceed the ceiling for some, but not all, of its financing.

Certainly it would be wrong to wait for another crisis. Legislation adopted under crisis conditions often needs repairing once the worst is over. Congress now has an opportunity to reexamine the situation without the pressure of a crisis. If it uses this opportunity, it will realize that debt management cannot be effective as a stabilizing weapon so long as it is hampered by an archaic and unrealistic barrier.

Our Government's Concern With Health of Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the most pressing issues facing the Congress today—that of medical aid for our senior citizens—is the subject of a recent column written by James W. Tucker, which appeared in the Hampton (N.H.) Union.

The column, entitled "Our Governments Concern With Health of Aged," presents a very penetrating analysis of this problem, which is of great concern to every Member of Congress.

Mr. Tucker points to six stumbling blocks in the path of any paternalistic legislation in this field, such as the Forand bill, which was recently rejected by the House Ways and Means Committee.

This is a very interesting and informative commentary, Mr. President, which is worthy of the attention of every member of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hampton Union, Apr. 7, 1960]

OUR GOVERNMENT'S CONCERN WITH HEALTH OF AGED

(By James W. Tucker)

The Nation is concerned with the problems of the aged and we who are aged certainly have problems. In connection with us old folks, words have come into general

usage that formerly were not found in the average person's vocabulary nor in most dictionaries—geratology, geriatrics and gerontology.

A POPULAR SCIENCE

Geratology has to do with the study of the decline of life as in old age or in animals approaching extinction. Geriatrics is the science of the medical and hygienic care of old age and its diseases. Gerontology is the science that treats of the decline of life. As a matter of fact, gerontology has become a right popular science of late—the subject of countless projects.

OLD-AGE PROJECTS

The New Hamsphire Federation of Women's Clubs adopted such a project and doubtless has accomplished a world of good in making life easier and happier for old people. Among the objectives of Kiwanis International for 1960 is this one: "Organize and support effective programs for senior citizens." We'll have to get, or try to get, our fellow clubmen in Hampton busy on that one. And where women and service clubs lead, the State, the Federal Government—and labor unions—will not be far behind. Everyone is getting into the gerontology act.

GERIATRIC SUBJECTS

"It is not by the gray of the hair that one knows the age of the heart," as a certain philosopher has said, yet in the rush to aid the senior citizens it's "the gray of the hair" that is mostly used for classification purposes. Gray hair is obvious. The "age of the heart" is a little more difficult to determine. So we are all lumped together as geriatric subjects, which in one way is most fortunate. If it were otherwise those in real need of this kind of help might never get it under existing circumstances.

NEGLECTING FUNDAMENTALS

Unfortunately, in our headlong rush toward materialism we are deserting many of the fundamental philosophies of our fathers. For instance, the idea of insurance by the Government of cradle-to-grave security causes us to lean less on individual self-reliance, heretofore considered a virtue. Unemployment compensation, job insurance and monthly social security checks tend to undermine that need of solidarity which knit family groups into strong, cohesive units, each looking with courage and pride after the welfare of all its members.

LONG-EVIDENT TREND

Responsibilities of individuals, families, and even of communities are too rapidly being delegated to county, State, and Federal Governments. These are the circumstances which today make gerontology a popular and useful science. These are the circumstances which make these heretofore unused 50-cent words commonplace. A half century ago, our wise friend and mentor, the late Dr. George Cook, referred to the trend, even then evident, as "public paternalism." If he were living today that wonderful gentleman, founder of a nationwide medical fraternity and the trusted counsellor of youth spread across the entire country, might be tempted to say, "I told you so."

THE FORAND BILL

And were he living today, Dr. Cook would undoubtedly be actively opposing the Forand bill, a plan for Government-supported medical care of the aged. His opposition probably would be indicated by his advocacy of a constructive plan to accomplish the same result by private, not public, means. He wouldn't need to be prodded in the manner Senator STYLES BRIDGES recently prodded the alumni of the Tufts University School of Medicine to offer an alternative to the Forand bill. "I have faith," said our senior Senator, "that if we put our minds to it we can come up with a better solution than socialized medicine."

BRIDGES' OBJECTION

In making known his opposition to the Forand bill for Government medical aid to persons on social security, Senator BRIDGES warned the medical alumni diners at the Somerset Hotel in Boston on the evening of March 30 that any alternative to the bill, to be acceptable, must be better than the bill itself. He told his audience that unless the insurance companies and the medical profession moved fast the Federal Government will most certainly take over medical care of the aged. Mere opposition on the part of the American Medical Association is not enough, if we interpret correctly the Senator's frank warning. Action of a constructive nature is absolutely essential.

FORAND BILL POPULAR

Although the House Ways and Means Committee has voted against the Forand bill, its author, Representative AIME J. FORAND, 64, Democrat, of Rhode Island, will not lessen his effort to obtain action on this controversial measure which has attracted more attention and more mail than any other bill before Congress. It is by far the most popular of many measures introduced into both Senate and House, calling for medical subsidies to the aged. Both HUMPHREY and KENNEDY, the two Senators who are presidential aspirants, are sponsoring bills of this type. The subject will undoubtedly be put forward by the Democrats as a national campaign issue.

FIFTEEN MILLION ELIGIBLE

Under the Forand bill, the Government would pay medical and surgical benefits, together with 120 days' combined hospitalization and nursing-home care per year, for the 13.5 million people now drawing social security checks. An additional 1.5 million would be eligible if they stopped working. To finance the plan employers and workers would each pay one-fourth of 1 percent tax on the first $4,800 of wages and salaries, per year.

REASONS BEHIND IDEA

The rising costs of medical care, plus the recent investigation of drug prices, together with insurance statistics tending to show that in a recent year, half a million families had medical bills larger than their total incomes for that year, are some of the reasons for political demands for action along lines indicated by the Forand bill. The Senate Subcommittee on Aged and Aging has produced statistics to prove that these problems bear hardest on old people, who have to spend much more on medical care, for obvious reasons. Consequently, the demands are made on Congress by old people and families of old people responsible for their medical expenses.

PRACTICAL OBSTACLES

In the midst of this agitation, mostly on the part of Democrats and the AFL–CIO for tax-supported medical care of the aged, some very practical obstacles arise: (1) a serious shortage of hospitals would result, (2) instead of a $1 billion cost, it might be 2 billions the first year and 7.5 billions annually by 1970, (3) inflation, temporarily checked, might again begin to spiral upwards by reason of the heavy taxes involved, (4) a government medical program of this sort would inevitably lead to socialized medicine and this would mean the same deterioration of medical service that has characterized similar programs in other countries, (5) no protection is furnished the four million aged persons not covered by social security and, (6) in general, the Forand bill and similar measures are paternalistic and discriminatory.

ALTERNATIVE IDEA

A couple of weeks ago, following a discussion among Republicans at the President's weekly session with legislative leaders, Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made it known that the administration opposes compulsory plans such as are embraced in the Forand bill, and after studying the problem will submit an alternative idea, founded perhaps on a voluntary basis and making use of the Nation's comprehensive private facilities for health insurance. Here may be an opportunity for the cooperation on the part of insurance and medical authorities suggested by Senator BRIDGES.

COUNTING YEARS

If our government refused to count a man's years until that man had nothing else left to count, then our Government would be less paternalistic and there might be considerably less demand for national, State and local projects of a geriatric nature.

Civil Rights and Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND INTIMIDATION—NORTHERN MOTEL OWNER CALLS SELF DEFENSELESS IN RACIAL CASE

(By David Lawrence)

Do the various candidates who aspire to the presidency really practice what they preach?

This is a question raised by a reader who feels that, since free speech is being rather broadly interpreted nowadays by the Supreme Court to include the distribution of anonymous handbills, a citizen has the right to direct a few anonymous queries to the candidates. From a reader in a city in Michigan come these three questions:

"Do the children of the candidates invite playmates into their homes regardless of race, creed or color?

"Do these candidates entertain Negroes in their home at the same time and on the same level as their white friends?

"In other words, do they practice what they preach?"

The letter then goes on to discuss the background against which the questions are asked:

"I want to be sure that my vote will not help put a man in office who is secretly dedicated to wrecking my way of life. I resent anyone trying to tell me the person or persons I should associate with, just because the courts say he is my social equal. I have always been the judge of that, and I want to go on being the judge of it. I cannot vote for anyone who says I am not.

"I am enclosing an article from one of our newspapers which points up what 'civil rights' have brought to us in Michigan. I refer to the case against some motel owners who have been declared by the office of the State Attorney General to be 'in violation' of the State's 'civil rights' statutes. Under this ruling, the State Tourists council has notified the West Michigan Tourists and Resort Association that it will not distribute the booklets of that association or its annual guide if they carry the listing of the persons who are accused of violating the statutes."

The clipping, which was from an article in the Grand Rapids Press, says:

"This has amounted to making the West Michigan Association the punitive 'club' to carry out the ruling of the attorney general.

"Members of the executive committee of the West Michigan Tourist and Resort Association feel very strongly that it is an American principle that no person may be deemed guilty without his day in court. This the defendants have not had. No complainant to the attorney general's office has brought suit, and the attorney general's office has arbitrarily declared them to be 'in violation' without a court hearing of any kind."

The Michigan reader's letter continues:

"My understanding is that the only 'crime' these people committed was circulating calendars with a Negro's picture on them, the same having been ordered before the State's 'civil rights' bill was passed.

"We, too, own a motel, and according to our 'civil rights' laws, if a Negro comes in and we are full up and cannot give him a room, he can go away and report us as having refused him. We can then be held 'in violation,' without any complaint being lodged against us or without our even knowing that we have been reported. We would have no opportunity to present our side. The penalty is a $10,000 fine or 1 year in jail, or both. So, you see, we have no 'civil rights.'

"As you will note, the court has been asked to allow any interested parties to intervene, but I am sure none will. Public opinion is so much against us that no one dares raise his voice. I must ask you, if you should see fit to use any part of this letter or the clipping, not to make my name public. I could ruin our business. We could be picketed or have a sit-down demonstration, and we would have no redress.

"We've always held our standards high in our motel. Yet now Negroes come in and they sit outside and shout back and forth, play ball or do anything to attract attention, while white people drive past without stopping, and then our motel stands half empty. So you see, the problem is economic as well as social. Again I ask where are our 'civil rights'?

"We are elderly people. We have put our life's savings in this motel. If we lose it because of racial trouble, we are too old to start over."

The foregoing is similar to many other letters that have been received in which people express the opinion that social customs are private customs and that every business should have the right to select its own customers. Former President Harry Truman, commenting on the "sit-in" demonstrations, has publicly stated that "if someone came into my store and tried to stop business, I'd throw him out." Boycotts have been undertaken as a means of intimidating individuals who believe they have a right to run their own business.

This problem is not confined to the South. Mail received by this correspondent indicates there are plenty of instances in northern cities where the civil rights issue now has become an agitation for the invasion of private rights.

Historic Legal Decision Relating to Jurisdiction in Atomic Energy Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1960, Judge John F. McCarthy of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the county of Los Angeles rendered a historic decision relating to the respective jurisdiction of the Federal Government and other governments on matters relating to atomic energy. In this field, in which so little law has been made, Judge McCarthy has pioneered in his usual capable manner. The decision in the case of *Boswell* v. *City of Long Beach*, So. C.–206, is as follows:

The Atomic Energy Commission of the United States licensed plaintiff to collect, package and dispose of radioactive waste by dumping it at sea. All of plaintiff's operations are conducted under the supervision of the Commission. Plaintiff has contracted with two licensed atomic energy laboratories in northern California thus to dispose of their radioactive wastes.

On September 4, 1959, plaintiff applied to the Long Beach City Tax Collector for a license to engage in the business of radioactive waste disposal on certain property located in the M–2–A zone. Land in this zone is subject to less restriction as to its use than any other in the city. The nature of plaintiff's business was disclosed to the tax collector and to all other interested departments of the city. The police, fire, health, and building and safety departments each investigated the application. On September 29, 1959, a meeting was held with officers of these and other city departments for the express purpose of considering all phases of plaintiff's business. This meeting was also attended by representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, the State health department, the Los Angeles County Health Department, the California Fish and Game Commission and the U.S. Coast Guard. The nature of plaintiff's proposed operation was fully explored. Thereafter, all of the affected city departments approved plaintiff's license application, except that the health department gave its approval on the form which it usually used for food establishments.

In January of 1960, more than 4 months after plaintiff's application was filed with the tax collector, and more than 3 months after the September 29 meeting, the first shipments of radioactive wastes arrived at plaintiff's place of business. Up to that time no one connected with the city government had questioned his right so to engage in business, the city had retained his license fee, and he assumed that all requirements had been met. The arrival of the first shipments was announced in the press. Promptly thereafter the city caused the police to prevent further unloading of radioactive waste at plaintiff's place of business. The city health department withdrew its previously given approval and destroyed the document evidencing that action. The city tax collector then refunded plaintiff's license fee and ordered him to discontinue his operations without a license. The city caused plaintiff to be criminally prosecuted for engaging in his said business without a city license.

Rightly believing that he is the victim of gross unfairness and inefficiency at the hands of the city, plaintiff brought this action to restrain the city and its various officers and departments from unlawfully interfering with the conduct of his business. Though plaintiff sought a license to engage in the business of collecting, packaging and disposing of radioactive waste, and all the affected city departments so regarded his application, the city now belatedly defends on the ground that plaintiff operates a junk business. The significance of this is that the city's zoning ordinance prohibits the operation of a junkyard in an M–2–A zone or elsewhere in the city without a non-conforming-use permit from the city planning commission, and another ordinance forbids the issuance of a business license at any location zoned against the particular kind of business sought to be licensed, and if plaintiff operates a junkyard, he is not entitled to a business license. The fiordinance imposes on the building and safety department the duty of determining, in connection with every business license application, whether or not the site of the business is zoned for the intended use. In this case such an administrative determination was made in plaintiff's favor, i.e., that his business could be conducted in an M–2–A zone.

At the time the city stopped plaintiff's operations he had done everything required of him for the issuance of a business license to engage in radioactive waste disposal. The city had made every determination and had done everything required of it except the ministerial act of writing the license document. Such being the case, plaintiff was in fact duly licensed. The city had no power arbitrarily to revoke that license or to interfere with the conduct of such licensed business without just cause or without notice and hearing.

Whether or not plaintiff's operation can be classed as a junk business as defined in the zoning ordinance is doubtful. That question need not be decided because even if plaintiff's work is defined as the junk business, the city is without power to stop his operation by zoning or any other exercise of its police power.

The disposal of radioactive waste is an indispensable part of both the peacetime and defense uses of atomic energy. It is well known that dangerous waste products are created in the processing, development, and use of nuclear fuels, and cannot safely be permitted to accumulate in populated areas. Radioactive wastes are an extreme hazard to health if not promptly and effectively disposed of. Without a continuous and speedy waste disposal program all atomic energy research and production, both for peaceful and defense purposes, would stop. The problem is not one of purely local concern if only for the reason that radioactive wastes must be transported long distances and through many communities to reach proper disposal areas. This necessarily involves interstate and foreign commerce, particularly as in this case where the final dumping ground is far at sea. The regulation of radioactive waste disposal is clearly within the sphere of Federal jurisdiction either as an exercise of the war powers or of the power over interstate and foreign commerce.

The city claims the right to prohibit plaintiff's business as an exercise of its power to protect the public health. It has such power if the State or Federal Governments have not already fully occupied that field of legislation. If the State or Federal Governments have fully occupied that field, in a matter of general concern such as this, the city's power is limited to such regulation as does not unreasonably interfere with State or Federal action.

The U.S. Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C.A. 2011 et. seq.), covers the entire field of atomic energy legislation, including protection of public health and disposal of radioactive wastes. The Atomic Energy Commission has been granted full power and sole responsibility for regulating the disposition of radioactive waste and protection of the public health thereby (42 U.S.C.A. 2051). Congress has decreed that the Commission may not delegate regulation of such waste disposal even to a State. Section 2021 explicitly says: "* * * the Commission shall retain authority and responsibility with respect to the regulation of * * * the disposal into the ocean or sea of * * * special nuclear waste material * * *" and "the disposal of such other product, source or special nuclear material as the Commission determines by regulation or order should, because of the hazards or potential hazards

thereof, not be so disposed of without a license from the Commission." Plaintiff is licensed by the Commission and all of his operations are conducted under its supervision.

A careful study of the Atomic Energy Act discloses that it covers the entire field of atomic energy in great detail and particularly the matter of radioactive waste disposal and the public health problems incident thereto. Therefore, the city of Long Beach is without power unreasonably to interfere with those activities of plaintiff for which he is licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. The attempted absolute prohibition of plaintiff's work in the city's least restricted zone is clearly unreasonable.

This does not mean that the people of Long Beach are without protection against radiation hazards. It merely means that such protection must be, as it presently is, afforded by the Atomic Energy Commission. Likewise, a license from the Atomic Energy Commission does not exempt plaintiff from all non-Federal regulation generally applicable to others. State and municipal agencies may regulate the activities of a licensee of the Atomic Energy Commission to such extent as does not unreasonably interfere with or frustrate the national objectives committed to the exclusive jurisdiction of that Commission. But State and local agencies are without power to prohibit the performance of such functions as are necessary to the welfare of the entire Nation. Here, the city seeks absolutely to forbid the performance of all work for which plaintiff has been licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. This it cannot do.

Accordingly, an injunction shall issue restraining defendants from preventing plaintiff from engaging in the business of collecting, packaging, and disposing of radioactive waste material from the premises in question in accordance with the terms and conditions of his license from the Atomic Energy Commission, upon repayment or tender by plaintiff of a license fee of $21 to the city tax collector and upon giving bond in the sum of $5,000 surety or $10,000 personal.

Dated March 21, 1960.

JOHN F. McCARTHY,
Judge of the Superior Court.

Mrs. Norma Studley Currier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an article which was published recently in the Rochester (N.H.) Courier, pays tribute to a New Hampshire woman who has devoted much of her life to the affairs of her community, her State and the Nation.

The subject of the article is Mrs. Norma Studley Currier of Rochester, whom I have known and respected for many years. I believe this article is a well-deserved tribute to an outstanding public-spirited citizen and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Courier, Apr. 7, 1960]

Some years ago, along about election time, a down-the-line Democrat sat in a restaurant on the square discussing the candidates. As he orated about the fine Democrats, a friend tapped him on the shoulder. "When you get in that election booth," he said, "don't forget to put a cross against our little girl's name." The Democrat looked around in astonishment. "What in the world made you think I wouldn't?" he asked. "She's a Republican worthy of any Democrat's vote."

The "little girl," a term used with affectionate respect by members of both parties, is Mrs. Norma Studley Currier, who isn't really a "little girl" but a gracious, womanly person, one good to know. .

Winter winds wailed down Wakefield Street (actually, it was a bitter, late March afternoon) as the Courier man turned left at the sign, "Studley Greenhouses," and walked into warmth on Wakefield Street. The warmth was the warm personality of Norma Studley Currier, who was the first woman this reporter had ever interviewed. He has been missing something.

Mrs. Currier is a person easy to know but as difficult for this writer to describe as, say, the color of her hair. Is it auburn, rusty, chestnut or just plain red? It is the same with her pictures. Even the latest one does not do her justice. You just have to meet her.

"I was a year ahead of Norma at Simmons College," said Marion Holmes of the First National Bank, "but of course we'd known each other all our lives." The Courier man was noseying around to find something in Mrs. Currier's life that would give a "This Is Your Life" surprise to her as she returns from the eighth annual Republican Women's Conference in Washington, today, and (we hope) reads these lines. "No," mused Marion Holmes, "Norma was—just Norma. Lots of fun, nice to get along with. Being a year ahead of her at Simmons, I don't even know what her marks were."

Her marks are very high, personally, publicly, politically, in Rochester, in the State and in the Nation. She is the Republican National committeewoman, and has served five terms at the New Hampshire General Court, from ward 5.

How did she get into politics? "I saw a good man lose," she told this interviewer, simply. "I was very young and politically naive at the time. I went home, after the election returns, and thought, "Can such things be? That a man with ideals and hopes of good government should be defeated? Not," she explained, "that the winning candidate was not a good man. Just, I believed, that the man who lost had more to offer the people."

We were moving through the Studley greenhouses, among the lovely Easter lilies, the mums, the carnations, all the spring blooms. Now we went into the living room of the Currier's Dutch colonial home. Two sleek, enormous cats came in, one orange-barred, one gray, and silently pleaded for a place on Mrs. Currier's lap. The gray won.

On the wall were personally, sincerely autographed photos of men who have added to the greatness of New Hampshire. The room and the house have a comfortable, lived-in look. In another room are books and books and books, and the titles show Mrs. Currier's interest in our State's history and politics, past and present. "But don't say just that," she protested. "I like to entertain, and I like food, especially steak, and ice cream, especially butter crunch, and I love TV westerns, especially 'Maverick,' especially James Garner. And I love people."

And she likes good government. Back in 1930, she drove a Nash (yes, they made them then) for former Gov. Huntley Spaulding as he campaigned for the governorship. She claims she was old enough to vote when women's suffrage came in, but that's hard to believe.

Proud moments? One was when, in 1955, she held the chair at a joint session of the New Hampshire court held outdoors in the statehouse plaza to greet President Eisenhower. Another was when she was one of Ike's guests for breakfast at the White House.

She holds and has held many important positions. Among others, she is a member of the 1960 Federal Assay Commission that decides if our new coins conform. She showed us beautiful mint condition samples (which cost her more than their face value) and explained her work in this department.

We had to leave; Mrs. Currier had important commitments, and we had this to write. We thought: When a girl on the threshold of womanhood saw, quite a number of years ago, that nice guys with ideals don't always win, either in baseball or politics, she made up her determined young mind. She became a political idealist and the wind can be very cutting and cold when you stand up there. Norma Studley Currier still stands there.

The Courier man went out into the cold March wind, but he felt heart warmed.

The Davenport Institute of Grand Rapids, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Davenport Institute of Grand Rapids, Mich., is one of the outstanding private schools of business in the United States. It is prensently headed by Mr. Robert W. Sneden who is also the current president of the National Association and Council of Business Schools. We in Grand Rapids are proud of Davenport Institute and Bob Sneden. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief history and statement of purpose of Davenport Institute:

DAVENPORT INSTITUTE

Davenport Institute and its antecedents have a history dating back to 1866, making it one of the oldest institutions of its kind in America. It has a record of nearly 100 years of continuous service as an institution devoted to the training of young men and young women for responsible positions in the offices of business, professions, and government.

From the beginning and all through its history, it has operated as a free-enterprise arm of organized education. It has always paid its own way, depending for its income on tuitions received for educational services rendered to people who preferred to get their business education at this school. Even today, although it has been granted a charter by the State of Michigan as a nonprofit educational institution, it continues to pay some State taxes and all local real estate and personal property taxes. In addition, it renders a valuable educational service to western Michigan.

Evidence of the soundness of the educational program of Davenport Institute is found in the thousands of its alumni who

occupy positions of responsibility throughout America generally and in Grand Rapids and west Michigan particularly. Furthermore, many of its students, who decided, upon completion of their work at Davenport, to continue their education at degree-granting institutions of higher learning, found that the credits earned here were readily transferable to certain colleges and universities.

Although the progress of this institution can be traced by a general upward curve, certain dates in its history had a particular impact on its development. In 1910 M. E. Davenport entered the scene when he took a position as a teacher in what was then known as the Grand Rapids Business Institute. He soon discovered that this was a failing enterprise and, upon the sudden departure of its owner, Mr. Davenport was faced with the decision of whether to follow suit and desert the sinking ship or to respond to the pleas of the few remaining students to stay at least long enough to help them complete their courses. He decided to stay. This meant borrowing money to meet expenses, but it was the only choice he could make because a high sense of educational responsibility was already a compelling force in his makeup—even though he was still a young man.

So, at 25, M. E. Davenport found himself in the school business through one of the accidents that often mark the careers of great men; and M. E. Davenport was one of the great men in this field, as his next 50 years would reveal.

The 15 years that followed M. E. Davenport's accidental introduction into the independent business school field were not easy ones. It took him 5 of those years to get out of debt, but he continued to move his institution forward.

The year 1924 was the next significant date. That was the year he acquired the McLachlan Business University which enjoyed the reputation as one of America's leading business schools. Mr. McLachlan had died and there was no one to carry on, so M. E. Davenport acquired the school and formed a merger known as Davenport-McLachlan Institute. He then applied for and was granted a corporation charter by the State of Michigan to operate as a class "A" college with power to grant degrees in business. Davenport Institute does not now grant degrees because the agency by which it is accredited is still in the process of refining its criteria to provide for the granting of degrees. The college still has State authority to do so, but it is not exercising that right.

The period from 1924 to 1952 was a stormy one. Prosperity, depressions, wars, and recessions produced dramatic ups and downs; but still the general growth pattern continued. In 1945, for example, following World War II, there were fewer than 100 students in school. By 1947 there were over 400 enrolled—partially because of the GI bill, and partially because of reduced demands upon our youth by the Armed Forces.

During the years immediately following World War II, Mr. Davenport gave extensive consideration to what could be done to make the institution less dependent upon tuition receipts for its finances and how reserves could be created that would carry it through periods of low enrollment. Of the many alternatives that were considered, the following two moves were decided upon.

1. In 1948 it was decided to construct a dual purpose building that would provide first-class accommodations for the school and also be attractive as a commercial rental unit. So the building the college now occupies was completed. Part of it is leased and the rest used for classrooms and administrative offices. The theory was that, in the event of reduced enrollments, space not needed for classrooms would become available for lease and the income from leases would help finance the college program. The soundness of this aproach was clearly demonstrated during the Korean war. When the war began there were about 400 students in school. Within a few months, because of the draft and unlimited employment opportunities, the enrollment was reduced to slightly more than half that number. Immediately, classroom space not needed was converted to office space and leased. Davenport Institute rode out the storm nicely, while other private colleges of all kinds were forced to close their doors. As conditions returned to normal after the war and enrollments increased, the leased space was reclaimed for classroom purposes.

2. Traditionally, practically all institutions of this type operate as proprietary or profitmaking corporate institutions. Davenport Institute was among that group. Consequently, it paid taxes just as did any type of business organized for profit. Dividends, if any, could be paid, and there were no restrictions on what was done with any profits earned. This was fine in years that schools enjoyed prosperity, but because of long-range commitments to students and faculty, a year when enrollments were down was disastrous. Unlike manufacturing or retailing or certain types of service businesses, personnel couldn't be laid off in order to reduce expenses without seriously compromising the educational program. It was clear that reserves had to be established to carry the college over difficult times. Because of Federal taxes on income, it was difficult to create reserves. So in 1952 Mr. Davenport decided to apply for nonprofit status. In 1954 the Bureau of Internal Revenue approved the application, and Davenport Institute embarked on a new era.

This action reflected the kind of attitude that characterized Mr. Davenport's whole life—an unselfish eagerness to do the things that would strengthen his school. From that time on he and his family would not benefit personally from any gains made by the school. They even included their substantial equity in the former corporation and all its assets in the new nonprofit corporation. This means that only through dissolution and liquidation of the corporation can they recover their original investment, and they can never share in any gains that have been made since 1952 and will be made in the future.

Substantial gains have been made since 1952. The assets of Davenport Institute, Inc., now total nearly $2 million, and its present net worth is nearly $1 million. All of this has been done without grants or endowments or legislative appropriations of any kind. All of this has been done through the application of good sound business principles that characterize the free-enterprise system—modified, of course, by the unselfish devotion of a man to an ideal.

Starting in 1951, an extensive expansion program was undertaken. Since that time schools in Lansing, Bay City, Saginaw, and Kalamazoo were brought into the organization, and an affiliation was established with Detroit Business Institute in Detroit. Combined enrollment in all departments of these institutions exceeds 3,000 students.

In 1958 a residence for out-of-town women students was acquired. The beautiful former residence of the well-known Sligh family, located at 455 East Fulton, is now serving approximately 100 young women in attractively furnished apartment-type accommodations. Low-cost, supervised, and highly desirable residence facilities add considerably to the total program.

In January 1959, with its record of achievement the highest in its history, Davenport Institute suffered the loss of its leader through the passing of M. E. Davenport, who had served this institution for nearly 50 years. Ordinarily a loss such as this would deal a serious blow to an organization of this type because, traditionally, business schools are very dependent upon the leadership of one man. It is a tribute to M. E. Davenport's executive ability and eloquent testimony to the organizational structure he developed that Davenport Institute was able quickly to adjust and continue to move ahead. This speaks well for the long-term future of the school.

Davenport Institute has always maintained high educational standards. Liberal granting of credit to transfer students by colleges and universities who know the college best is evidence of these standards.

Further evidence is found in the records of its graduates in positions of responsibility. One of the most clear-cut records is the one established by its alumni in the CPA field. It is generally accepted that a person who is awarded the CPA has demonstrated his fitness to perform at professional level. In a recent announcement of successful candidates for the CPA, which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press, five of the eight who were certified were Davenport trained. An investigation revealed that during the past 3 years, of those awarded the CPA in the Grand Rapids area, 40 percent were Davenport trained.

Davenport Institute is a member of the leading State and national organizations that deal with business education.

Davenport Institute is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Washington, D.C., which is recognized by the U.S. Office of Education.

The future prospects of this institution are excellent. It has a rich heritage of tradition and performance on which it can draw. It is soundly financed and competently led. Its organizational structure is such that it does not depend entirely upon any one individual for its leadership. A board of directors of highly competent men and women directs its overall policies. It will continue to serve its traditional role in the total education picture and will broaden its services to include new programs and activities as they are developed to meet new needs.

Dr. Willis Tate of Southern Methodist University Warns of Anti-Intellectualism and the Penalties Inflicted on Thinkers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Willis M. Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, presides over a university that probably has more academic freedom than any other major institution of higher learning in Texas. He was recently Honors Day speaker at the University of Texas. Though only a small portion of his remarks were printed in the news accounts of his speech, that portion is worthy of wide distribution because it points out the danger of loss of creativity and expression because of the public distrust of thinkers among our people, and the pressures for conformity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the wise and perceptive comments by Dr. Tate, as printed in the Dallas (Tex.)

Morning News for April 3, 1960, under the caption "Dr. Tate Cautions University of Texas Honor Students."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. TATE CAUTIONS UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HONOR STUDENTS

AUSTIN, TEX.—University of Texas honor students were warned Saturday by Dr. Willis M. Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, of dangers of pseudo-intellectuality, arrogance, and isolation.

The Honors Day speaker counseled the students that "the test for every man, regardless of the limitations or brilliance of his intellect, is how responsibly he made his decisions."

Whatever decision is made, he said, "Each of you is responsible for bringing to society your particular contribution and intellectual commitment."

He stressed "the deep satisfactions of a continued life of intellectual endeavor." But he cautioned against disillusionment in the face of roadblocks placed in your path by unthinking people.

"While our world desperately needs and depends upon the trained mind, I cannot say our culture loves the intellectual," Dr. Tate said. "In fact, the opposite is true. The thinker is always a threat to the way things are or used to be. He is castigated, distrusted, and feared. There is no honors day down the road. Great pressure is built up to make the thinker conform."

Such pressure brings a danger of loss of creativity and expression, he pointed out. Nevertheless, "the limitations our world places upon you does not excuse you—for you, being who you are, must seek the full limits of reason in every area of life."

In his introduction of Dr. Tate, University of Texas President Logan Wilson spoke of his "unusual combination of educational statesmanship and personal courage. Since becoming president of SMU in 1954 Dr. Tate has won the admiration of his fellow educators and the public at large," Dr. Wilson said.

Dr. Wilson commended the honor students who distinguished themselves in academic areas which extend alphabetically from accounting to zoology.

"Fortunately, the time has long since passed when high-ranking students were falsely regarded by some as 'greasy grinds' and the pinnacle of undergraduate social respectability was represented by the 'Gentleman's C'," Dr. Wilson said.

Honors Day is an annual feature of roundup at the university. It publicly recognizes outstanding achievement in learning and teaching.

A Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, passed by the Independent Farmers of Ohio, Inc., is worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY INDEPENDENT FARMERS OF OHIO, INC., JANUARY 21, 1960

Be it resolved that Independent Farmers of Ohio go on record in favor of legislation forbidding the practice of monopoly in any field—whether industry, labor, or education.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Whereas we feel that our best government is that of the people. Be it resolved that Independent Farmers of Ohio go on record that the power of reciprocal trade be returned to the Congress. Also that our monetary system be returned to the Congress as provided for in the Federal Reserve Act.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Whereas in every country in which the medical profession has become socialized medical standards have deteriorated and medical progress has been stifled. Therefore the Independent Farmers of Ohio resolved that further Government intervention in the field of medicine cease and that medical research and practice remain in the hands of private institutions and individuals.

WORLD COURT

Whereas the President has asked for the repeal of the Connally amendment, and whereas the repeal of the Connolly amendment would destroy our national sovereignty and invalidate our U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights; and

Whereas our legislators under oath have sworn to uphold our Constitution and with sole legislative powers would have their duties jeopardized by transferring judicial authority from our constitutionally and established courts to a world court over which we have no control. Be it resolved that the Independent Farmers of Ohio go on record that the Connally amendment be retained to safeguard our individual freedoms.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Whereas, the social security program has placed an economic burden upon the taxpayer and removed our Christian responsibilities of caring for our elders directly; and

Whereas those participating, many of whom are objectors, while certain groups are given freedom of choice to their participation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Independent Farmers of Ohio go on record that the social security program be made compulsory and those wishing to participate be allowed to do so.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Whereas the field of public education is an area of government, in which the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to act, such powers being reserved to our States and our people in articles of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas, under the present dangerous doctrine advanced by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Wickard* v. *Filburn* case that the Government may regulate that which it subsidizes it becomes inevitable that Federal usurpation of authority in the field of public education must inevitably lead to the Federal regulation; and

Whereas, Federal regulation with the consequential concentration in Washington of powers over the minds and bodies of the American youth raises the grave possibility of the same authoritarian thought controls and intervention as has been employed in the totalitarian governments of our time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all Federal intervention in the field of public education cease forthwith.

FEDERAL AID

Independent Farmers of Ohio are unalterably opposed to foreign aid of any kind.

FARM PROBLEM

Whereas the present so-called farm problem is coming to be generally recognized as largely Government-created and not as the result of free economic forces; and

Whereas the exorbitant cost of the present socialistic or communistic farm policy of the Federal Government is unprecedented by any peacetime department of Government, and has added materially to the already staggering burden of the American taxpayer, and

Whereas under present farm policy the American farmer has already been reduced to the status of virtual serfdom under the Department of Agriculture, deprived of his constitutional rights of property, rights to due process of law in the established courts, and his rights, liberties, and security in his private domain;

Whereas present farm policy as implemented by the AAA Act, its amendments, and related acts has virtually nullified the Constitution of the United States through the violation of articles 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10 of the Bill of Rights, and through the usurpation of power by the Federal Government with the consent of the Congress, the judiciary, and the executive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Independent Farmers of Ohio, That the Agriculture Adjustment Act as amended be repealed and that simultaneously the accounts of the CCC be frozen pending the orderly liquidation of the corporation.

Respectfully,

MRS. INEZ MUSSER,
Secretary.

MARSHALLVILLE, OHIO.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of April 9, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

How to compromise differences in viewpoints without abandoning one's own principles is a problem often confronting every conscientious officeholder. A Member of Congress, for example, has moral obligations to (1) himself and his own set of values, (2) the Nation as a whole, (3) his constituents, whom he is charged to represent, and (4) his political party. More often than not, these responsibilities parallel one another and are easily discharged. But the possibility for conflict is pretty obvious. Any single controversial piece of legislation—any burning issue—may pose a real dilemma.

It was with all these thoughts in mind that I paid a visit to Vice President NIXON the other day. For myself, I felt a duty in conscience to share with him some accumulated hopes and concerns. Too, I wanted to pass on the views of many constituents who have told me personally and by mail what course they believe the Vice President should adopt, both in his present office and in his candidacy for the White House. As for our party, I hoped to express and bolster the more conservative viewpoint about which we hear a good deal less in today's press.

It was the newspaper image of DICK NIXON becoming more liberal—an image at variance with his long voting record—which had disturbed many, including me. If there were any truth in that picture, it seemed to me most important that the Vice President realize the tremendous underlying voting strength of conservatives. True, the conservatives are not as vocal, nor as well organized, as are the so-called liberals and some

of the minority pressure groups, but I'm convinced that a great reservoir of political strength is there, awaiting only adequate leadership.

Due to their lack of organization—their failure to unite and campaign effectively—all too many candidates have felt no need to appeal to the great body of conservatives, and they have stayed away from the polls in alarming numbers, losing by default. However, the conservative—the fellow who believes in a balanced budget for his Government as he believes in one for his family, who believes in paying down our debts and in preserving a sound dollar, who believes in protecting and strengthening individual freedom and who rejects the bureaucratic regimentation so dear to the self-styled "liberals", is today opening his political eyes. He is orgainzing, and winning, in certain Congressional Districts already. He needs and wants a leader he can follow.

So I pointed out to the Vice President that to the degree his own course might move to the left, or that others might successfully picture him as having moved left, he would lose political strength. A Republican Presidential aspirant can win only as a conservative. The Democrats have the "liberal" votes sewed up. By appearing to woo these groups, a Republican can only discourage and lose support among the conservative majority. As I see it, DICK NIXON has only to encourage and inspire action by the commonsense and conservative majority. He can best do this by stressing his own dedicated convictions on the role of Federal Government in our lives, as demonstrated by his own voting record.

Without quoting the Vice President, I can at least relate my own very clear impressions of some points he made, and with which I agree. (1) Politically, he'd be foolish indeed to come out with a lot of flatfooted pronouncements on any and all issues until his opponent in the race is determined; meantime, though, he's admittedly vulnerable to attack by liberal columnists and members of the press who choose to misrepresent or misinterpret his views. (2) He has a responsibility as Vice President, to be a spokesman for administration positions, at this time. (3) The campaign against the Democrat nominee, when known, will permit a clear differentiation of viewpoints that will be encouraging to conservatives. (4) There is, and must always be, room for honest difference of opinion between members of the same party.

It is my hope that conservatives will remember that it isn't enough to complain. Political action is what counts. And political action backing bed-rock, constitutional principles, aimed at limiting the role of the Government in our lives, can win out, hands down. True, demagogery and political expediency have won elections in the past. This year, I believe, will be the year for aroused conservatives. DICK NIXON can be their leader.

Identical Bidding to Chattanooga Electric Power Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Nashville Tennesseean by Lois Laycook, Washington correspondent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEFAUVER PROBE CHANGES BIDS
(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Antitrust Committee's recent price-fixing investigation has stopped the practice of identical bidding by electrical equipment manufacturers to the Chattanooga Electric Power board.

S. R. Finley, general manager of the board, notified Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, committee chairman, yesterday that the probe has paid off in huge savings to the board.

A Federal grand jury in Philadelphia recently indicted 18 equipment manufacturers on antitrust violations following the investigation.

In a letter to KEFAUVER, Finley said recent bids received by the Chattanooga board on major power equipment varied from 2 to 37½ percent. In previous years, Finley said, bids from various manufacturers on the same equipment have been similar or identical.

Finley said the board recently advertised for bids on a large order of heavy equipment, including circuit breakers, transformers, and regulators for delivery in the fiscal year beginning June 30.

"For instance," Finley said, "the orders placed in February covering network equipment, power transformers, regulators, and unit substations had a combined total published price of $382,448. The equipment was purchased for $278,640, reflecting a savings to the board of $103,806, or approximately 27 percent."

Finley said the results of the bidding "undoubtedly stem from the activities of the subcommittee."

KEFAUVER's subcommittee held extensive hearings on electrical equipment price fixing at Knoxville last fall. The Federal grand jury indictments of several manufacturers followed shortly thereafter in Philadelphia.

KEFAUVER said he was very happy to receive Finley's report.

"The evidence of identical bids which the subcommittee heard in Knoxville last fall raised many questions in my mind," the Senator said. "The savings that have just accrued to the Chattanooga power board is good evidence of the savings to the public when competitive bidding takes the place of price fixing in an industry."

Positive Action Needed To Save Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to include in my remarks the full text of a speech delivered recently by the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, before the annual convention of the National Independent Dairy Association.

Mr. ROOSEVELT has served as a member of my special subcommittee on dairy problems since its inception. In addition, his own subcommittee's work in the full industry and the gasoline price war problem of the Nation have given him an unusually broad introduction to some of our most distressful economic problems of our times.

I especially commend his comment on remedies that are available by this Congress to all my colleagues. I heartily endorse his views on these matters.

The text follows:

POSITIVE ACTION NEEDED TO SAVE SMALL BUSINESS

(Speech of Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT before the National Independent Dairies Association, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, April 5, 1960)

It is a pleasure to attend and participate with you in this third annual convention of the National Independent Dairies Association. You are to be congratulated on the fact that you have taken positive action in organizing and sustaining a trade association, through which Members of Congress are enabled to learn about your problems and to ascertain your views on what should be done to help save small business. Also, you are to be complimented on your selection of the leaders of your association. Mr. Stovall, your president, and Mr. Daniel, your counsel, have demonstrated that they are alert to small business problems in the dairy industry, and have been quick to act in requesting Members of Congress to give these problems appropriate consideration.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee's Subcommittee No. 5, I have learned much about small business problems. However, it has been a revelation to sit as a member of the special subcommittee under the chairmanship of our colleague, the Hon. TOM STEED, and hear about your problems. In hearing about the small business problems in the dairy industry, we have learned that there are more troublesome problems than the milking of cows in the dairy industry. We have learned that small and independent processors and distributors of dairy products are subjected to the trials and tribulations incident to ruthless price wars and various other practices, which weaken small business concerns and tend to eliminate competition. I know I could spend several hours reciting to you what I have learned about your problems, but why do that? I suspect that you not only want to get rid of your problems, but that you would like to be free from hearing about them.

It has been suggested that I devote some of my time before you today to a discussion of H.R. 9898, a bill I introduced on January 25, 1960. That bill, as you know, is designed to prevent the integration of food distribution through the operations of large chain retail food organizations with the processing and production of food items.

The bill would accomplish this objective by making it unlawful for anyone engaged in the retail sale of merchandise in any more than one market area, through food or grocery stores, to engage in the manufacturing, processing, or preparation of any such merchandise. This would be done through an amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The amendment would make it unlawful and an unfair act and practice in commerce within the meaning of section 5 of this act, for any person, partnership, or corporation, engaged in the retail sale of merchandise, or the distribution for retail sale of merchandise in or affecting commerce, to engage in the manufacturing processing, or preparation of any such merchandise, where the effect of integrating the retailing of such merchandise with such manufacturing, processing, or preparation may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

It should be emphasized that the bill would not apply to all integrated processing and retailing operations. Many small business concerns are engaged in processing and retailing food items. For example, the retail bakers prepare bread in the backroom

and retail it in the frontroom of a single establishment. Likewise, small processors and distributors of dairy products operate from a single plant, and frequently deliver the processed dairy products directly to homes in retail lots. The bill would not apply to small business concerns engaged in operations of this kind. I say that because the bill would have application, as I have pointed out, to the integrating of retailing with manufacturing, processing, or preparation of food items only where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition. It is inconceivable that a small, independent processor and distributor of dairy products, who has confined his operations to a single market, would be charged with a violation of the provisions of H.R. 9898 simply because he has integrated his processing and packaging of milk with a few deliveries and sales to homes at retail. Of course, it is clear that the provisions of the bill could not be applied to the operations of small business concerns whose operations could not possibly have the effect of substantially lessening competition or tend to create monopoly in any line of commerce. Instead, the bill would apply to those firms which have integrated their activities to include the manufacturing, processing, preparation, and retailing of food items in such large volume and over such a wide area as to affect competition adversely and substantially. In that respect, the attention would be directed particularly to the multiple-market operators. We know that in the dairy industry we have multiple-market operators with farflung organizations—some extending over the breadth and length of the country. Their activities embrace manufacturing, processing, preparation, and retailing of dairy products. Their integrated activities and pricing practices, when considered in the light of the size of their organization and volume of business, would undoubtedly be considered to be within the purview of H.R. 9898. In other words, it is simply another case where character and size are factors which would require or compel good conduct. Misconduct by a large overgrown evil man usually is more damaging than misconduct by a small innocent child. The provisions of the bill would apply only to those having the size and power to do damage and the use of that size, power, and position in damaging competition.

We did not reach lightly the conclusion that action such as is provided for in H.R. 9898, should be taken. We have made our proposals only after giving much thought and study to the problems of small business in food distribution.

When the program for Subcommittee No. 5 was announced March 17, 1959, we stated that it was the intent and purpose of the subcommittee to review the trade relations and trade practices in the field of food distribution. We noted that in that connection it had been alleged that monopolistic and unfair trade practices were becoming matters of great concern to those who cherish and fight for a free and competitive enterprise system in this country. We were told that the anticompetitive conditions and anticompetitive practices present a threat to those things needed for the growth and survival of a healthy small business community.

Only a short time before we announced our program for the study of small business problems in food distribution by Subcommittee No. 5, the Federal Trade Commission had stated that "There have developed tendencies to concentration of economic power, to collusive price action, and to unfair competitive methods." In that connection, Hon. John W. Gwynne, then Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, in announcing that the Federal Trade Commission would study the situation said:

"We want to know why the industry is getting so tough for the smaller operator. * * * The trend seems to be to eliminate the small man entirely."

We made field investigations and we conducted extensive hearings in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Calif., and in Denver, Colo. We received testimony and considerable additional evidence from scores of witnesses, and accumulated a printed record of approximately 2,000 pages. We heard from the chainstores and the co-ops, from the frozen food people and the poultrymen, from the wholesalers and retailers, and from the farmers. The Government agencies gave us facts on how many retail grocery stores there are and how much money we spend in them. From all of this information we have a broad picture of small business problems in food distribution.

Out of this mass of information emerged the showing of need for legislation to help small business in dealing with some of these problems. For example, in the course of our hearings in Washington, we found that approximately 40 percent of all markets for preserves and jellies have been captured by large chain retailers who are either producing their supplies or have made special long-term arrangements for their supplies. In the face of these facts, small independent producers and packers of jams, jellies, and preserves are under severe handicaps in their efforts to survive.

During the course of our hearings in San Francisco, we were told that a few buyers or large chain food retailers, with offices on or near California Street, San Francisco, were buying 80 percent of the annual output of canned fruits and vegetables produced in that section of the country. Incidentally, California produces almost 50 percent of the national output. We were told that these few buyers for the large chain food retailers are utilizing their combined economic power in such a way as to result in the destruction of countless independent business enterprises.

Our Denver hearings disclosed that large chain food retailers are getting into the production, preparation, and distribution of meat food products. Large food retailers have captured a substantial portion of the total retail market of meat food products. Proceeding from that vantage position, they are integrating backward into the processing, slaughtering, and even the feeding of cattle.

Representatives of small meatpackers, feedlot operators, ranchers and many other businesses testified that the practices of large food retailers in integrating the retailing with the feeding, slaughtering, and packing of meat food products are destroying small and independent business enterprises and competitive markets for those products. It was pointed out that the strongest argument now being put forward by the large packers for relief from the provisions of the meatpacking decree of 1920 is the fact that the large food retailers are integrating backward into the meatpacking business. In that connection, I stated on the record during the course of our hearings in Denver that "If the basic and fundamental principles which brought about that consent decree were sound, and we must believe they were sound—they remained in operation for many, many years, and were therefore in the public interest—it would seem to me a poor excuse to upset them simply because someone else in the other direction was going forward to accomplish the same thing. And my question would be, Would it be unreasonable to think that should the 1920 consent decree be reversed, or be obliterated, that there would also be the great danger that that would be the opening door for an amalgamation of the chainstore and the large packer to accomplish exactly what was prohibited in 1920?"

Through the information we have developed during the course of the hearings before Subcommittee No. 5, and the special subcommittee, regarding small business problems in the dairy industry, we have been impressed with the fact that certain large chain retail food distributors are integrating the processing and packaging of dairy products with their retail operations. Safeway, with its Lucerne brand, and Kroger, with its private brand, on dairy products for a long time, have been engaged in these integrated operations. More recently, we noted during the course of the hearings before the special subcommittee in Boston on February 17, 18, and 19, 1960, that one of the largest retail food chains in that area has integrated or brought under its control the processing and packaging of milk and other dairy products distributed through its retail stores. Information available to us is to the effect that another one of the leading food retail chain organizations in that area is engaged in preparations for integrating the processing, packaging, and distribution of dairy products.

How much these integrated activities will affect the small independent processors and distributors of dairy products remains unanswered. However, we are informed that many independent processors and distributors of dairy products have lost or are in the process of losing their markets as a result of these integrated operations, coupled with the pricing practices involved in the marketing of dairy products in the affected areas. If these effects should rise in their significance to the point of substantially lessening competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, then H.R. 9898, if enacted into law, could be applied to help save small business concerns. In my view, therefore, its enactment could well be positive action taken to save small business. It is hoped that you will study and consider H.R. 9898 and conclude that it has the virtues for saving small business, as we do.

In conclusion, I thank you again for your graciousness in permitting me to attend and participate in this third annual convention of the National Independent Dairies Association.

West Virginia—In Springtime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the past several months there have been many articles written about my State of West Virginia. More often than not these articles have described the destitute conditions prevailing in the coal mining areas of West Virginia. I rise today to thank a writer, Martha P. Haislip, for her ability to go beyond the evident and picture another facet of my State. This writer, whose article appeared in yesterday's New York Times, has depicted the historic value and contrasting beauties that can be seen in West Virginia. The Times' description is centered around the famous area of the Greenbrier Hotel, but may I add that one can find much the same richness in any section of the Mountain State. I ask unanimous consent for yesterday's

article to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so all can enjoy some of the lesser-known facts about West Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA—IN SPRINGTIME—THE STATE'S DIVERSE AREAS OFFER STRIKING CONTRASTS AND HISTORIC SITES

(By Martha P. Haislip)

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA.—The permanent residents of West Virginia sometimes are annoyed by visitors, and more often by the nonvisitors, who wonder out loud what there is to see and do in West Virginia. People know about Virginia and its colonial history and restorations, but mostly they appear to know little about West Virginia, beyond its coal mines and mining towns.

Not many visitors to this part of the State ever seem to be curious to see what lies around the corner from this community, which houses one of the world's largest luxury resort hotels, the Greenbrier. But a few do get curious, and this curiosity always becomes more intense in the spring and summer. Their reward is extremely valuable.

DRAMATIC EXAMPLE

To take one dramatic example, within a short distance of White Sulphur Springs is an area known as the Cranberry Glades, a mile-long section of "misplaced arctic tundra," the likes of which are unknown in the United States outside of Alaska. The area, encircled by high mountains, is crossed by many small streams and bands of rare shrubbery and wild flowers.

The water section, covered with lichen and moss, often to a depth of 10 feet, has a deceptive appearance of movement that lends an eerie aspect to this bog. Needless to say, the glades are just what the botanist and ornithologist ordered.

To arrive at this area, the motorist proceeds to Lewisburg, turns north on U.S. 219 to Mill Point and then west on State route 39 for 6 miles. This leads to the Forest Service access road and a parking lot. From there, the visitor proceeds on a boardwalk that goes directly, as far as it is safe to go, into the glades.

In contrast to the glades is the view of the New River Gorge from the lookout in Grandview Park. An overhanging cliff nearly 1,000 feet high commands an extended panorama of forested mountains and the rushing, horseshoe-shaped New River. The lookout can be reached from White Sulphur Springs by driving west on U.S. 60 and turning south on U.S. 19, then taking a country road that is in excellent condition.

Equally dramatic in appearance is Hawk's Nest at Anstead, also on Route 60. Here, the view of the New River Canyon is said to surpass the famed Royal Gorge. Interesting, too, is the 3-mile-long Hawk's Nest Tunnel, which diverts waters of New River from its 5-mile-long gorge. A mile of the tunnel is through solid rock, and a dam provides a 160-foot-high waterfall for electric power.

Lewisburg, ten miles west of White Sulphur Springs, is a gem of a town. Its lovely old homes are set back on wide lawns along tree-lined streets, on hilltops that command magnificent views or on rolling farmland. These homes and their grounds combine the gracious atmosphere of old Virginia, of which this area once was a part, with the pleasant activities of today.

A MELLOW CHARM

Lewisburg is one of the oldest towns in the State, having survived Indian massacres and Civil War depredation. And it still has a mellow charm, despite the invasion of modern living, countless new homes, a country club, a military academy, a girls' school and thriving cattle and farming businesses.

Many ancient buildings, including some erected in the 1700's, and beautiful old homes (many occupied by descendants of the original owners) are of historic and architectural interest.

Probably the most noted of Lewisburg's landmarks is the Old Stone Church. It was built in 1796, and has the distinction of being the oldest continuously used church west of the Alleghenies. It is simple, yet pure, in its design, which includes handhewn native limestone, a graceful cupola and a beautiful interior. Many of the original features, such as the slave galleries and old pews, have been preserved, and the extensive collection of framed Confederate money on the walls of the vestibule makes the church an important point of interest. In the adjacent churchyard are gravestones bearing quaint epitaphs.

Also distinguished in Lewisburg is the John Wesley Methodist Church. Its thick brick walls and its well-proportioned belfry give the edifice great dignity. The interior retains much of the original appearance, despite damage done by a cannon ball during the Civil War.

The John A. Preston Community House is another fine example of early architecture in Lewisburg. The two-story building is typical of its early-day use, that of a storehouse. The old jail building—it is of uncertain date (probably between 1785 and 1795)—has a grim dungeon.

The Greenbrier County Courthouse is handsome and imposing. It was erected in 1837 after a succession of log and stone buildings, in one of which Patrick Henry once defended a client for murder.

CIVIL WAR RELICS

The Greenbrier County Library and Museum is a "must" for visitors interested in relics of the Civil War. The building was used as a military hospital then, and preserved under glass are pieces of original plaster containing the names of soldier-patients.

But it is the homes, rich in historical associations and warm with continuous occupation by descendants of pioneer families, that fascinate the visitor most often.

That such a peaceful setting as occupied by Hartland should have been the scene of such tragic happenings seems unbelievable. But it was here that the Clendennin massacre occurred.

Chief Cornstalk and a band of Shawnees arrived, apparently with peaceful intent, and were kindly received. After they had dined, they killed 50 of the settlement's white men, ransacked and burned many cabins and returned to their settlement on the Ohio River.

Miraculously, Anne Clendennin escaped, although her young child was killed. Mrs. Clendennin returned after several years, remarried and repossessed the lands of her former home. Although the original cabin is gone, the small log house erected in 1800 by Mrs. Clendennin's second husband, John Rogers, remains as a wing of present-day Hartland. The home is now occupied by a descendant of the Rogers family.

The original part of Stuart Manor (built by Col. John Stuart, often called the Father of Lewis County) dates from 1789 and an addition from 1820. The interior includes beautifully carved mantels, built-in cabinets of aged cherrybood, handmade hardware and an interesting wooden Indian door.

Other early homes worth visiting are the 1796 Totten House, whose thick walls of river stone preserve a steady indoor temperature the year around; North House, dignified in line and distinguished by ornamental woodwork; Montgomery House, which has a concealed room in the attic that served as a hiding place for a Confederate soldier home on leave; Johnson House, which has simple lines of weatherboarding over the original log construction, and Hock House, where such features as hand-carved mantels and hewn beams have been preserved.

Of the more pretentious homes, Elmhurst is one of the most imposing. It contains at least 20 high-ceilinged rooms, and it is ideal for entertaining, for which it was famous in the early 1800's. During the Civil War, the house was hit by shells but it was spared from burning by the enemy because of the critical illness of a member of the family.

Five miles west of Lewisburg is Arbuckle House. The residence stands on a gentle rise from which there is a sweeping view of the surrounding farmland. The house was built of brick burned on the farm, and is a notable example of early architecture. Its perfect proportions, two-story pillared portico and balcony, fan-lighted doorway, hand-carved cornice, and interesting interior details have been admired by countless visitors.

NORTH OF TOWN

Simmons House, 12 miles north of Lewisburg on Spring Creek Road, is fascinating in every detail.

James H. Bowen, who constructed the home in 1822 from locally burned brick, had 12 daughters. To house them and himself comfortably, he built the three-story house with a center partition. Mr. Bowen lived on one side of the partition and his daughters on the other.

Of great beauty in this house are the many carved mantels and interior woodwork, which have been carefully preserved.

The lovely name and effective placement of Tuscawilla (Seminole for two lakes) counterbalances the lack of adjacent water, which the name indicates. A magnificent view of the mountains from this well-proportioned brick house makes the mile-long drive from Route 219 a worthwhile trip.

Montescena, the Boone home, is a perfect example of southern plantation architecture. Its tall white pillars, wide, flagstone-paved porch and graceful balcony above the front door are typical. But the mansion's setting among wide fields and fine old trees shows nothing of the tragic occurrence here during the Civil War.

After the Battle of Droop Mountain, 30 miles to the north of Lewisburg, a Federal soldier attempted to loot the house during the absence of its owner, David Creigh. On reaching the second floor, where Mrs. Creigh was caring for a sick child, the soldier continued his looting and used abusive language to Mrs. Creigh. Her husband returned, surprised the soldier and engaged in a fight in which the soldier was killed.

At the advice of neighbors, the man's body was concealed in an old well. Months later, the incident was disclosed by a runaway slave, with the result that Mr. Creigh was hanged, without a trial, for having defended his own family.

Another imposing old home in the vicinity of Lewisburg is Morlunda. It was built about 1827 of locally burned brick. No expense was spared in the interior finishings, which are of hand-carved solid walnut.

The structure is surrounded by hundreds of acres of rich grazing lands and commands magnificent views of the mountains. Cattle bred on the farm are nationally known for their excellence.

Mountain Home, built about 1830, is still in the possession of the Dickson family. The house is very large, and has enormous rooms, high ceilings, and many intricately carved mantels and elaborate woodwork.

Mountain Home contains true Williamsburg colors—blue-green paint and red putty—and is one of the best-preserved mansions in the area. It is a treasure house of beautiful antique furnishings and Colonial objects of artistic value.

The Dicksons always have been enthusiastic horsemen, and for years have bred and shown fine animals. They also furnish many of the riding horses used by guests at the Greenbrier.

HISTORIC INN

Noteworthy, too, is the architecture of the Colonial Inn, which was built in 1834. Alterations have been made over the years, but the original lines of the building retain their purity. More impressive is the General Lewis Hotel. The east wing is the original structure, built in 1828. Many fine antiques, as well as collections of glass, china, and old prints, are displayed here. Old trees, shrubs, boxwood, and flower borders add much to the charm of this hotel.

Also interesting and worthy of a visit are Greenbrief Military Academy, Greenbrier Junior College for Girls, and the Daywood Gallery. The gallery, once a small, unpretentious dwelling, has been transformed into a charming museum with a lovely boxwood garden, wall fountain, and beautifully landscaped lawns. To be found here are many specimens of antique furniture. Early American glass and Chinese porcelain. The art collection contains paintings by numerous famous artists.

Sport Fishing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there have been many, many occasions during my congressional service for me to speak in the House and the Senate concerning Alaska's commercial fishery. There is another fishery in Alaska which is deserving of attention—our marvelous sport fishery.

Trout of all description are there for the virtual asking, many running as large as salmon. Of course, we have the salmon, which, in addition to being the basis for our commercial fishery, provides a magnificent sport fish. We have, too, the grayling, the big Arctic char and that fish with the incredible name, the shee fish.

The April issue of Elks magazine contains an article, "Fishing Alaska's Big Rivers," by Dan Holland which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Yes," replied the old chief, obviously puzzled that we should ask so foolish a question, "trout are more bigger than salmon." This was the local answer to the rumor we had heard about some of the big rivers of western Alaska. It sounded out of all reason, but we knew enough not to disbelieve any story about Alaskan fishing. Now we could put it to the test. Within an hour of the time we had put our rods together and made the first cast, we found that the rumor was fact. The rainbow trout were actually larger than any salmon which ran on the Alaska Peninsula. My biggest was a 31¾-incher, a pretty fair trout in anyone's pond.

I've been lucky. Starting in 1938, I've reached the far corners and creeks of the great State of Alaska by one means or another. I've fished from Ketchikan to Attu and from there to the very limit of land in the North where piddling little creeks seep out of the frozen tundra directly into the Arctic Ocean—and I've yet to be disappointed. I've seen some fabulous things, such as the rainbows "more bigger than salmon."

And there are the incredible arctic char, or malma trout, in certain streams near Nome, huge 12- and 14-pound things as elaborately colored as an overdecorated Christmas tree. The male fish is green with contrasting livid orange spots, some of them the size and shape of peanuts, and an equally livid orange belly and undershot lower jaw. Even the tip of the upper jaw is orange, as though it had been dipped hastily in paint. The female is slightly more respectable, but unusual in her own right. She is a light, clear blue with white spots and belly. And the size of these fish is as shocking as their color. The good Lord let go all holds when he created that pair.

And the mysterious, wild-eyed shee fish of the north, and the sea trout of southeastern. And grayling. With the Michigan grayling extinct and the Montana grayling on the ropes, Alaska is the only place in the States to enjoy this fishing as it should be. The reputation of the unique grayling is such that it requires no further embellishment, of course, and fortunately it exists over a very wide range in Alaska, from the Kenai to the Arctic Ocean. There are literally hundreds of miles of grayling streams as yet untouched.

The most delightful grayling fishing I ever experienced was a Tanalion Point on the Kenai, the most I ever saw were in the interior tributary streams of the Tanana and the biggest were near Ugashik on the Alaska Peninsula. The poorest as game fish were in the tundra creeks of the Far North. The water there is so extremely cold that none of the fish inhabiting it—grayling, lake trout nor char (as much smaller, slimmer, and more conservative fish than the malma trout)—puts up any battle until he lies on the moss a while and warms up; then he flops around. Not many fishermen are going to be bothered by this problem very soon, though. It is not exactly a place where a person can drive and fish out the car window.

This is one reason that some of the fishing mentioned hastily here will remain good for years to come. A great many fine Alaskan streams are as yet inaccessible. The fish won't be molested, which is fine for them, if not much help to the fisherman.

This is where the salmon comes in. All in all, this is the most exciting, most interesting and most available game fish in Alaska. No matter where the summer traveler happens to be, he can find salmon fishing somewhere in the vicinity.

Owing to the unfortunate visit by an English sportsman many years ago when the then territory of Alaska was young, the full possibilities of the plentiful and varied salmon are not realized yet. "Frightful shame," he reported upon his return. "Those bloody salmon up there won't take a fly."

Obviously, without a gillie to tie on his fly and to pull his boots, the old gentleman never fished at all, but thus errors are born; then they are compounded through the years by men of inaction who parrot whatever they read or hear without investigating for themselves. Soon the statement is accepted as indisputable fact.

Amazingly, this fallacy is still prevalent, although anyone who likes to fish knows that any and all of the five varieties of Alaskan salmon take a fly readily—too readily at times.

When I first visited Alaska, I was young and a disbeliever. I didn't believe that all Pacific salmon die after one visit to the sea and one spawning act; I didn't believe that they all returned to the place of their birth; I didn't believe that they ate nothing after entering fresh water; and I didn't believe that they would refuse a fly.

I was wrong on the first three counts. A king salomn can and does grow to the amazing weight of 60 or 80 pounds in a brief 6-year cycle. A few with good appetites reach a weight of over 100 pounds in this short time. An Atlantic salmon may return to the sea after spawning and live two or three such cycles, but all Pacific salmon die after spawning once. They are like an annual plant in that they grow, mature, spawn their seeds and perish. But I had to see thousands of them dying to be convinced.

The logic of my mind wouldn't accept the fact that an unreasoning creature such as a salmon could drift downstream from its birthplace, no more than half fish and half egg, then return to this exact spot in its old age. Such is the fact, however miraculously.

Neither did it seem credible that a red salmon (sockeye), for instance, could fight an uphill battle against powerful river currents for sometimes 2,000 miles and more without replenishing its energy by feeding. Atlantic salmon often spend almost an entire year in fresh water before returning to the sea. I couldn't believe that they expended the enormous amount of energy necessary to reach their destination and spawn without eating.

After I had opened the stomachs of about a hundred salmon, both Atlantic and Pacific, I finally became convinced that they don't eat in fresh water. The reason obviously is that salmon enter rivers in such hordes—or did, at least, before man fouled things up—that there could not possibly be enough feed in fresh water to accommodate them. Therefore, nature had to give them sufficient energy for the entire procedure before they left the sea.

I had to be proved wrong on these three subjects to my own satisfaction. Now I know and admit that what I originally read on the subject was correct.

But on the fourth point, which after all is the most important to the sportsman, my curiosity proved me right. In spite of what the English gentleman had reported, and in spite of the many people who echoed him, I had the satisfaction of taking all five species of Alaskan salmon the first couple of seasons I fished there. In the 20 years which have since passed, I have done it many times, simply because I like to fish, and simply because a salmon—any salmon—is as fine a game fish as anyone can tangle with.

Try it, anyone who is fortunate to be in Alaska, and find out what a real fish feels like. Fish for the humpback salmon, the smallest of the lot, in a salt chuck or near the mouth of his spawning river. A humpy makes only a short run, and it is one of the freaks of nature that Pacific salmon become grossly distorted as their spawning period approaches. The humpy transforms rapidly since his run is short; therefore, it is necessary to catch him early while he is still a sleek, appealing fish. Then he will not only take a fly readily, but he will jump as though he had a bee on his tail.

One of the surest places to fish for the red salmon is at the very outlet of their particular spawning lake. Their mouths are already hard at this time, so they are difficult to hook, and those hooked don't stick around long, but they never stop jumping.

An example of such a red-salmon fishing spot is the outlet of Upper Russian Lake on the Kenai. When the fish are in, no one can spend a day there with a fly rod and not catch fish.

The dog salmon is the least interesting as a game fish. He takes a fly as readily as the others, but he seldom makes a long run and he doesn't jump. With about 12 pounds of sheer muscle and energy to back him up, it comes down to that or nothing.

The two big fellows among the five Alaska salmon, the silver (coho) and the king (chinook, tyee, spring) are different. Like the Atlantic salmon, they are seldom found in one great mass. They run in larger rivers as a rule, where they are less evident, and they run more or less individually.

Both of these can be taken in salt water on a fly—or spoon or strip of herring as one chooses. The place to fish by casting is along a kelp bed, of which there are thousands in Alaskan coastal waters. A favorite spot, because of its availability, is Tee Harbor outside Juneau.

In fresh water the best place to take a big king salmon is well up one of the large rivers in which they run, near its headwaters, as fishermen who have seen them in the Salmon River of Idaho know. Most such headwaters in Alaska are inaccessible. Those I have taken there were from comparatively large water, fishing blind.

The silver is the finest fish of all in fresh water, much in appearance and actions like the Atlantic salmon or steelhead. He acts like an out-sized rainbow. They are available many places—I took one on a fly as far north as the Snake River outside Nome—but the best luck I ever had with them was in the Situk River, about an hour-and-a-half walk by way of the narrow-gage railroad track from Yakutat. More convenient is Eyak Lake near Cordova.

So much for where. Now, how and why? If salmon don't eat in fresh water, why do they take a fly at all? On the spawning beds it is reasonable to assume that they would strike a spoon or even a fly, mistaking it for a sculpin or other small fish trying to raid the spawn, but why strike a fly otherwise?

There are a lot of things I don't know, and this may be one of them, but I have a theory. It seems to hold.

Salmon strike a fly—Atlantic salmon as well as Pacific salmon—because of a lifetime of responding to certain foods, such as shrimp, smelt, herring, and the like, if the fly reasonably represents that food. Even though they do not swallow such a fly, the instinct to take it is imbedded; they can't resist.

Pacific salmon go to sea when they are so small that they can freed on nothing but microscopic organisms, food too small to be imitated. Their feeding habits as far as the fisherman is concerned are established in the sea. Once they reenter fresh water, they don't encounter herring and shrimp; so this feeding instinct is latent. A fly which imitates these can awaken it.

Accepted steelhead patterns imitate, by accident or otherwise, shrimp or the fish's own roe which it habitually mouths. These steelhead flies and Atlantic salmon flies, which also are a fair facsimile of shrimp, will take any of the Pacific salmon. I have had even better success, however, with a very large streamer fly, which represents a herring. The most consistent luck I ever had with silvers was in the Situk River when it finally occurred to me to use tarpon flies.

Any such salmon, as it enters fresh water, is the most power-packed fish in the world. It has energy stored in its body to run for weeks against the current. Anyone who has tied into a 15- or 20-pound silver knows what such energy feels like on a line.

And there's more, lots more; some known, some unknown. There's a type of angling somewhere to suit the inclinations of anyone—everything from the dainty, acrobatic grayling to the bullheaded heavyweight king salmon. To me, strangely, the fishing with the greatest appeal is about the most accessible of all. This is the variety found among the maze of islands of southeastern Alaska, from Ketchikan to Juneau.

This is the land of the totem pole, the brown bear, the towering Sitka spruce, twisting glaciers and peaks such as Kate's Needle and the Devil's Thumb which can be seen from sea level rising 2 miles into the sky. This is the land of bays, inlets, channels, salt chucks and small, intimate streams, all packed with game fish. The trout are not as huge as those in some of the distant corners, but they are plentiful and colorful. There are sleek, silvery Dolly Vardens, bright cutthroats, and acrobatic rainbows. There are salmon everywhere. And, for a change of pace, there are codfish and halibut to be caught by jigging with a handline out of a boat anywhere. So for the man who thrills to the sound of a reel singing in tune with the run of a trout, or the feel of the surging power of a salmon bending bamboo, or to the sight of a grayling going into his dance, Alaska is a pretty nice place to be.

But it does have a serious drawback. Summer, if a person is far enough north, is the time of the midnight sun. Even in southeastern Alaska it is dark for a few hours only. And as long as the days are, anyone with less than four arms can't find time enough to take advanage of the fishing. This leaves little time for eating and none for sleeping, which is OK for about a week; then a fellow's casting arm begins to lose its snap, and his eyes begin to sink and his fins get a little frayed. He suddenly realize how a spent salmon feels.

The Republican Party and the So-Called Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a lot of political hay is made these days by harvesters in the political field who would have us believe that one, and only one, of the major political parties is concerned with the welfare of what is usually referred to as the common man.

This bill of goods is pretty hard to sell, especially when the people who have been categorized in this manner stop to appraise their prosperity. Then they realize how much more they have under the sound fiscal policies of this administration and they can see through the delusion which is being offered in the guise of welfare and social betterment programs by the deficit-spending crowd who decry fiscal soundness. They—the common man—become aware of the other side of the coin and realize fewer of these programs mean less Government, less spending, less interference, but a lot more prosperity in the long run.

Dr. Kirk Porter of the political science department of the State University of Iowa, made this point quite forcibly in a recent address, and under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all of my colleagues can have the advantage of his comparison.

THE COMMON MAN

Since the time of its origin the Democratic Party has constantly declared its devotion of the common man, the ordinary man on the street, and underprivileged people generally. By contrast they have asserted that the Republican Party is the party of rich people, property owners, and big business. Yet there have been millions of people in the Republican Party who are not rich, who are not big property owners, do not hold great blocks of stocks and bonds, but are people of modest means, connected with very small business establishments. These people have been Republicans not because they are rich, but because they believe the policies of the Republican Party are better for them, and for the whole country, than are the policies of the Democrats.

Republican policies are very definitely designed to serve the interests of the common man. The Republican sees benefits for everybody—rich man, poor man, farmer, laborer, professional men, and people in every walk of life in a sound economy based on free enterprise and private initiative. What the common man needs is a job, a self-respecting job that is well paid, so that he will not need direct help. Business provides jobs. If the businessman prospers he can hire people and pay them well. The farmer will have a market, the professional men will have patients and clients. Literally everybody will benefit. To respond to the impassioned pleas of every organized group that demands immense expenditures in order to benefit themselves is to promote special privileges. It would cause runaway inflation, bankruptcy, and ruination for everybody, the common man included.

Republicans want to safeguard the interests of all the little private business establishments in the land as well as the big ones, and the millions of people who work for them. That is the way to promote prosperity for everybody, the common man and every other kind of man, north, south, east, west, farmer, laboring man, banker, rich and poor alike.

It is shocking mockery to deceive vast numbers of humble people into thinking that huge appropriations labeled for their benefit will do anything but bring grief to them and everybody else. The Republican Party is for a sound dollar and fiscal responsibility. To spend great sums beyond one's income is to invite disaster. The humblest man who ever struggled with a household budget or the finances of his small business knows that full well. Millions of small businessmen, homeowners, workers, and professional men know it, and that is why they are Republicans. For the Government to spend billions it does not have is much like any common man spending dollars he does not possess. The Government does not go bankrupt as would the private citizen. Instead of that the insidious process of melting away the substance of anyone who possesses anything at all steadily goes forward. The common man pays more for a common sack of groceries or a common pair of shoes. His rent goes up, or the cost of maintaining his common little house goes up. The value of his life insurance goes down. If he has a modest investment in bonds, or a savings account, he sees that go down too. This process hits the common man the hardest of all, for even that which he has melts away before his eyes.

Thus the Republican Party, standing firm against proposed grandiose expenditures for all manner of things, is in truth the party of the common man, the man who has modest possessions and does not want their value to be destroyed.

To demand expenditures and to take no account of income is just as bad as to advocate printing-press money. There is no issue here as between the rich and the poor. The principle is the same whether it is applied to a Wall Street financier, to the Government, or to a small boy with a two-bit allowance. Many small boys understand it thoroughly. They are destined to be Republicans.

The Republican Party does not appeal to any one segment of the population. The

Republican Party appeals to every man, in whatever walk of life, at every economic level, and wherever he may live. One of the basic themes in the Party program is fiscal responsibility and a sound dollar, opposition to rising prices and deficit spending.

Ceremonies Honoring the Memory of Andrew Furuseth, the Abraham Lincoln of the Sea, on His 106th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am very happy to note that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is presiding over the Senate, and that prior thereto the Presiding Officer was the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. What I am going to talk about has to do with the winning of the West.

Mr. President, Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, director of Friends of Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association, has sent me a copy of some of the worthy tributes paid to Andrew Furuseth on the anniversary of his 106th birthday, by people who knew of his devotion to the cause of the seamen of the world.

Mr. Axtell is a descendant of one of the first Governors of New Mexico, prior to its becoming a State.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the remarks made by Mr. Axtell and by the Reverend Dr. James C. Healey, chaplain to merchant seamen in the port of New York for 42 years—now retired—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. AXTELL. "We have been given a 15-minute period over the New York City broadcasting station through the courtesy of Mr. Seymour Siegel, director for many years. But today we are going to tell you again about Andrew Furuseth, the Abraham Lincoln of the sea, on this 106th birthday.

"A symposium was published in 1947 concerning this great leader of labor and spokesman for humanity, because he devised a way to free thousands of seamen without bloodshed or violence.

"I am authorized to read to you a communication from John L. Lewis, one of our greatest of Americans, who has done so much to improve the living and working conditions of the coal miners of the United States. Mr. Lewis in his letter of February 17 says:

" 'While a young man, just turned 30, I was assisting with the legislative work of the American Federation of Labor in Washington, and was domiciled at the old National Hotel. Mr. Andrew Furuseth was a more or less permanent guest at the same hotel, and was similarly engaged in seeking legislation in behalf of seamen.

" 'I was never formally presented nor introduced to Mr. Furuseth, and naturally regarded him through the eyes of a young man, gazing with awe at a person of great renown. Gradually, however, he took notice of my presence in the hotel and would speak to me on occasion, and later would engage me in more or less extended conversation in the evenings, in the spacious lobby of the hotel. I learned something of his personality, and came to have the greatest admiration for his analytical mind, his tenacity and perseverance, the dedication of his purpose, and the austerity of his life.

" 'Subsequently, as I attended the convention of the American Federation of Labor, I recognized his influence and power in its councils, and the respect given him by the elder statesmen of that organization. In debate, he was a redoubtable opponent, and not many of the leaders in the Federation would undertake to measure swords with him in the convention discussions.

" 'I came also to learn of the respect and esteem in which he was held by many of the more liberal-minded Senators and Representatives in the National Congress, and gradually through the years he moved closer and closer to his goal of achieving freedom and emancipation for the seafarers of the Nation. His final success, when the Congress enacted the legislation in question, caused President Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labor to issue his famous statement, "The last of the bondsmen are free."

" 'Not only the seamen, but the citizenry of our Nation as a whole, have cause to revere his memory and to acclaim his personal achievement in establishing the principles of freedom in the maritime industry, after many years of intense legislative effort.

" 'The memory of Andrew Furuseth should be enshrined in the hearts and minds of the millions of America's workers, and the ceremonies to be held on March 12, honoring his memory and achievements, are most fitting.' "

On May 4, 1948, in the Symposium on Andrew Furuseth which this Organization sent to libraries all over the world, Mr. Lewis said:

"Andrew Furuseth possessed one of the really great minds of the century. His genius of thought and expression was devoted solely to the benefit of seafaring men and others who toil. Living a life of self-deprivation and Spartan simplicity, he was freed from the intellectual impedimenta that burdens and slows the pace of inferior minds. He was unaffected by the commendation or disapproval of other men. He broke new ground for the underprivileged in the realm of economic and social freedom. He achieved national recognition of certain fundamental principles.

"These achievements, which constitute the consummation of Andrew Furuseth's monumental task, should be preserved and protected in the interest of future generations."

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., on January 24, 1938, said:

"Andrew Furuseth was one of the truly great men I have known. I first met him as a boy when he enlisted my father in the struggle to make the sailor a freeman. From that time until his illness he came every Sunday to our house for breakfast.

"I have known many scholars, men with many degrees, but I have never known a man who made greater use of his knowledge than did Andrew Furuseth. To him history was not a study of civilization which had crumbled into dust, but it was rather an instrument to be utilized in the daily work of life. He had a rare intimacy with the literature of the past and present. He was familiar with law. His interests were narrow, but as wide as humanity.

"He was a living justification of the principle upon which democracy rests. Sprung from the masses, he devoted his great intellect and indomitable courage to the advancement of their cause.

"On this occasion I wish to read a tribute written by one who knew him best."

Then Mr. Robert M. La Follette, Jr., quoting from the speech of his father, Robert M. La Follette, the progressive Senator from Wisconsin, said:

"One morning in December 1909 there came into my office in the Capitol Building, a tall, bony, slightly stooped man, with a face bespeaking superior intelligence and lofty character. It was Andrew Furuseth.

"He wanted to interest me in the cause of the American sailor. He was a sailor himself, he said, and he wanted to 'be free.' I did not know what he meant. I questioned him. Surely there were no slaves under the American flag. Bondsmen there were—but Lincoln changed all that. And it had been written in the amended Constitution. 'Yes,' he said, 'but not for the sailor. All other men are free. But when the amendments were framed, they passed us by. The sailor was forgotten.' "

A person that you all respect who knew Furuseth was Fiorello LaGuardia. On March 10, 1946, speaking over this station in memory of Andrew Furuseth on his 92d birthday, he said:

"Andrew Furuseth was a great soul. He lived to benefit others. And as long as ships will sail the ocean, flying the American flag, the name of Andrew Furuseth will always be remembered."

I have a letter from Gerrit Vanderstaay, former official of the Seamen's Union:

"Again you're doing me the honor and ask about our mutual friend, Andrew Furuseth.

"Both you Mr. Axtell and Andrew Furuseth should forever be remembered by not only the seamen but also by the workers all over the world.

"I am remembering the mark of Andy on the Maguire bill, the White Act and finally the Seaman's Act introduced by LaFollette making all seamen free in U.S. ports.

"Some years ago while a representative of the I.S.U. at Savannah, Ga., I negotiated and signed the first agreement with the South Atlantic Mail Steamship Co., and am proud that the remains of Andy were buried on the high seas from one of that company's ships. May he rest in peace for work well done.

"Due to the freedom of the seamen I came to the United States and remained here, am married, have two children, am a U.S. citizen, a member of the International Union of Operating Engineers No. 37, member of Moose, Masonic Lodge, Scottish Rite, and a Shriner of Boumi Temple.

"All this improvement of myself a former seaman because you and Andrew worked and worked sometimes under impossible conditions to make the seamen free.

"To work is to worship.

"I remain your friend who as a former Hollander appreciated what Andy the Norwegian did to free us."

John P. Frey said:

"His services to the American trade union movement were so great that they never can be fully measured. His moral courage, impressed the younger men in the movement, as well as the leaders. His purpose in life was to secure beneficial results for others instead of getting something for himself.

"Norseland never produced a more glorious warrior or a more kindly heart."

Judge Denman, late senior circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, said:

"Furuseth was one of the world's great men who did not whine because the men, to whom his life was a service, often failed to understand him."

Andy sought my advice on one of the legal questions involved in his seaman's bill. When it finally reached the White House, President Wilson sent for me to aid him in analyzing some of its provisions. The conference was not long. What impressed the President most was my statement that the bill removed the last vestige of congressional peonage in repealing the imprison-

ment provision of the former desertion statute.

The next speaker is Patricia Lynch, graduate of the University of Washington and assistant to her brother, Carl Lynch, secretary to the Sailors Union of the Pacific during the maritime strike in 1934 and editor of the American Seaman which did so much to prevent the Communists from taking over the Seaman's Union. Miss Lynch says:

"We pay tribute today to Andrew Furuseth, the Abraham Lincoln of the sea, on this, the 105th anniversary of his birth.

"With the increasing demand that we examine charges of corruption on the part of those who now inhabit labor's house, it is only fair that we should also examine the record of those who built labor's house. A record of sacrifice and integrity without which labor never could have made the gains it now enjoys. Outstanding in the small group of selfless leaders who built labor's house is Andrew Furuseth.

"Furuseth was a sailor. He sailed under the flags of Norway, Sweden, Germany, England, and America, in turn, trying to find humane conditions under which he could follow the calling of his choice. He failed. It is difficult for us today to realize conditions as they were then. Even American seamen, born in the country which had fought a war to end slavery, were regarded as slaves under the law. Flogging and branding were common. A brutal mate or captain could and often did work seamen until they dropped dead. Of these conditions Furuseth said, and I quote: 'I saw men abused, beaten into insensibility. I saw sailors try to escape from brutal masters and from unseaworthy vessels upon which they had been lured to serve. I saw them hunted down and thrown into the ship's hold in chains.' He saw overinsured and undermanned ships go down at sea, with appalling loss of human life, all because owners would not furnish skilled seamen to sail them or provide lifeboats for passengers and crew. He heard no voice lifted in protest, no hand raised to help. On long watches he pondered the cause of these injustices, some way to right these wrongs. The cause, he found, was the law—the laws of every nation. Every country made serfs of its seamen. The only way to right the wrong was to change the law. The only weapon available was to unite the seamen. Then came decision. He would strike the blow for freedom. The next question was, where?

"He told my brother Carl Lynch, another selfless fighter for equal rights for all mankind: 'I chose the United States because this was the first country in the history of the world that dared to declare in a political document that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"In 1883, at the age of 29, he deserted a British barkentine in Tacoma, Wash., to be chased by bloodhounds but not recaptured. A short time later in San Francisco, he started to organize the seamen. He had taken the first step. He did not underestimate the task ahead, a task that appeared hopeless to the body of his men. He educated himself; he familiarized himself with the laws and conditions governing seamen. He was a deep student, a profound thinker. His own integrity gave him faith in the integrity of others. His strength was rooted in his knowledge of the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man. He said, and I quote: "When understood, our idea will make its own way with all forward-looking and liberal-minded men. Let us then sow the seed, leaving it to the God of freedom to supply the growth.' He believed there were aspects of their fight which, if properly presented, would enlist the support of broadminded men and women of the United States and of Europe. He was right.

"He attracted to the fight such men as Senators La Follette and Shipstead, the Honorable James H. Ralston, the Honorable James G. Maguire, attorneys Henry W. Hutton, of San Francisco, B. A. Green, of Portland, Oreg., and Silas Blake Axtell, of New York. These men tossed aside promises of lucrative careers to devote their legal training to the almost penniless cause.

"Test after test was carried to the U.S. Supreme Court. Time and again the Court ruled against the seamen, holding that the 13th amendment to the Constitution was intended to free the Negro slave but that seamen should remain bondmen under the law.

"The fight was hard, tough, and unrelenting, but without bloodshed. Furuseth was selfless and fearless. His reply to the judge when he was threatened with imprisonment for .violation of an injunction during a strike, is carved on a monument to Furuseth in San Francisco, and I quote: 'You can put me in jail. But you cannot give me narrower quarters than as a seaman I have always had. You cannot give me coarser food than I have always eaten. You cannot make me lonelier than I have always been.'

"His vision and integrity attracted other high-minded men to the seamen's cause, and the fight became effective on a national scale. The first notable victory was the abolition of desertion charges against seamen engaged in the coastwise trade. His next great victory was in 1898. Congress passed the White Act which (1) abolished imprisonment for desertion from American vessels in ports of the United States; (2) gave the crew the right to demand a survey of the vessel; (3) totally abolished corporal punishment on American vessels; (4) required the surrender of any subordinate guilty of inflicting corporal punishment; (5) gave seamen the right to draw half wages in any port instead of having to wait to the end of the voyage to draw pay.

"But the bitterest fight was ahead, the fight for safety—both for crews and for the traveling public. The shocking loss of 1,517 lives when the Titanic sank in 1912 swung public opinion behind Furuseth's long fight for adequate and qualified crews, lifeboats, and so forth. In 1912 Congress passed the La Follette Seamen's Act. But safety at sea was a costly project, and there was sufficient pressure from domestic and foreign shipping interests to keep the act from being signed into law. With a change of administration, however, the fight for the Seamen's Act was won. President Wilson signed it into law in 1915. The act freed thousands of men from serfdom—a successful revolution without the loss of a single life. Along with the ensuing amendments and court decisions, it has influenced changes in seamen's working conditions and wages throughout the world, tending to raise them in the direction of parity with American canditions and wages. Many attempts were made to annul the act's provisions. Furuseth fought them all and won. The vision, integrity, and unchanging determination of one penniless sailor led the seamen of the world to freedom.

"Of Furuseth, his friend, adviser, and fellow fighter, Silas Blake Axtell, has said, and I quote: 'Furuseth was great because he eliminated himself. He sought no reward of a material character. He sought no publicity, no fame, no reputation. He was great because he asked no thanks. He was great because he was a son of God who loved as the brother of all men and devoted all his mind and heart to the service of others.'"

Rev. James C. Healey said:

"On this 12th day of March I am honored to be asked to pay tribute to a leader in labor who being dead nevertheless lives because every American seaman is a debtor to his dedication to the task of raising their profession of seafaring to noble heights.

"In the days when Andrew Furuseth sailed the members of the crew labored in a social climate which still clung to ideas inherited from the days of the galley slaves. Dana in his classic Two Years Before the Mast shows with what impunity the masters of vessels could strip a man and flog him. It was there Andy began. He brought to them the right to leave their vessel in a safe port. He gave them the protection of laws to compensate them when injured. All legislation which gives them the rights of collective bargaining derive from his gallant struggles. He was a man of poverty who never aspired to live in a luxury denied to the humblest member of a crew of his day. He loved seamen. He fought those who would oppress them and he endeavored to enact laws guaranteeing noble living under law. We shall not look on his like again. Not a member of any organized church, Andrew Furuseth died a saint and a martyr for a cause greater than himself."

A Tribute to James Madison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the March issue of the American Junior Red Cross Journal written by Irving Brant, an outstanding historian who has long been recognized as an authority on James Madison. The article is particularly timely since Congress only this past week passed a bill to create a James Madison Commission which would plan a memorial for our fourth President, best known as the Father of our Constitution. More than 160,000 copies of this magazine are distributed to boys and girls who participate in the Junior Red Cross program.

The article follows:

THE CONSTITUTION BUILDER

(By Irving Brant)

On a morning early in May 1775, two young men galloped along the red clay road connecting Orange Court House with Charlottesville, Va. At the county line they met a body of armed horsemen, members of a newly organized military company of Albemarle County. Guided by the two youths, the men from Albemarle joined a similar body of Orange County men, and both groups set off for Williamsburg, the capital of what was then the British Colony of Virginia.

The two guides were brothers. The older of them was James Madison, famed today as the principal framer of the Constitution under which our country is governed and fourth President of the United States. It was the intention of the two military companies to force the British royal governor, Lord Dunmore, to restore the Colony's gunpowder, which he had removed from an arsenal and hidden aboard a warship. But on the way they met Patrick Hentry and his Hanover County Independents riding back from the capital. Henry's company, finding the powder out of reach, had compelled the Governor to pay for it.

A few days later, news reached Virginia of the battles fought at Lexington and Concord between British Redcoats and New England farmers. James Madison wrote resolutions for the revolutionary committee of Orange County, headed by his father, declaring that the blow struck by the British in Massachusetts was a hostile attack on Virginia and every other Colony. Thus began the public life of a man who for the next 42 years was hardly ever out of National or State office and who rose to the highest position his country could bestow.

Four generations of Madisons had spent their lives in Virginia when James was born there on March 16, 1751. The Madison family, of English origin, cleared tidewater forests and gradually pushed westward onto the fertile plateau that borders the great Blue Ridge. There James Madison's grandfather acquired several thousand acres and built the estate that became known as Montpelier, the lifelong home of the President.

From his 11th year until he was 15, Madison studied at the Donald Robertson School in Virginia. His course included such books as the Latin of Ovid, John Locke's "On Human Understanding," and the philosophy of Socrates and Plato. Entering Princeton in 1768, he made a special study of the principles of government, and seemed to relish the heavy doses of theology meted out to everybody in that day. By sleeping only 5 hours a night he completed a 4-year course in 2 years, and found time to write satirical verses lampooning the members of a rival literary society.

At Montpelier, after graduation from college, Madison continued his studies of government. Virginia then had a State church and repressive local laws against dissenters. Madison spent much of his time trying to protect minority churches against what he called "that diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution" which raged among a good part of the established clergy and laity. This experience, along with his studies, made him a lifelong opponent of any connection between church and state.

Madison's physical frailty, partly due to overstudy, forced him to drop out of the Orange military company, but his intense devotion to the rights of the colonists put him in the forefront of the independence movement. He was elected to the Virginia revolutionary convention of 1776, which asked the new Continental Congress to declare the independence of the United States. In that convention he wrote the clause on freedom of religion in the Virginia Declaration of Rights. A year later, his refusal to serve whiskey to voters led to his defeat for reelection. The legislature promptly put him on the Governor's council, which directed the State's military operations, and in 1780 he was sent to the Continental Congress.

In that body Madison was underestimated at first. He was only five feet six inches tall, of slight build. His voice was weak. Though he was 30 years old, one member described him as a boy just out of college with all the impertinence of youth. The impertinence consisted of the quiet employment of talents that soon led Congress to entrust him with writing its most important papers.

As a congressional delegate, Madison strongly supported the alliance which brought French help in the struggle for independence. He upheld national rather than State authority, tried in vain to enlarge the taxing power of Congress by amending the Articles of Confederation, and managed the legislation by which the country's public lands were put in Federal instead of State ownership. French Minister Luzerne wrote of him: "He is regarded as the man of the soundest judgment in Congress."

Reentering the Virginia Legislature in 1784, Madison defeated a bill for State support of church schools. Realizing that the National Government was nearing a breakdown because it depended on the States for revenue, he induced the State legislature to invite all States to the Annapolis Convention of 1785, to consider that problem. This gathering led to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 which replaced the weak Articles of Confederation with the far stronger Constitution of the United States of America.

Madison's work in the Philadelphia Convention won him the title of "Father of the Constitution." Three great features of our Government come chiefly from him:

The supremacy of the National Government in matters that affect the national security and welfare, and the retention by the States of authority in State affairs.

The system of checks and balances by which the powers of the Federal Government are distributed among its three branches—the legislative, executive, and judicial—with a further division of power between the two House of Congress. The purpose was to prevent any branch of Government from gaining tyrannical power.

The idea that democratic self-government would be safe and effective when extended over a vast continental area, provided the powers were divided as he proposed. His argument on this point induced the Convention delegates who were in general men of large property interests, to put their trust in Government by the people.

To go into effect, the Constitution had to be ratified by the States. Madison joined Alexander Hamilton and John Jay in explaining it to the Nation in the famous Federalist Papers. He then took the lead in securing ratification by Virginia over the powerful opposition of Patrick Henry. Reason won over oratory.

Elected to the new Congress, Madison proposed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, protecting the rights and liberties of individuals. He and Thomas Jefferson worked together to found the Democratic Party in opposition to Hamilton's Federalists. The Hamiltonian party held power until 1801, when Jefferson was elected President and Madison became his Secretary of State.

In the State Department, Madison played an important role in the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France, doubling the country's area. He helped shape the policies, "short of war," by which President Jefferson, during the Napoleonic conflict, sought to resist the seizures of American ships by both England and France.

When Madison became President in 1809, he sent separate notices to England and France, saying in substance: "If you stop your violations of international law and the other country does not, I will ask Congress to declare war on the other country." Napoleon made a tricky agreement. England refused to yield at all, and stirred deeper anger by continued impressment of American seamen to fight on British warships. On June 18, 1812, war was declared on England.

The War of 1812 produced astonishing victories for the little American Navy, but for 2 years the land forces met with repeated defeats. That was due partly to incompetent generals, partly to the refusal of Federalist New England to help fight the war, partly to past neglect and the refusal of Congress to heed Madison's requests for effective preparation. The President was no trained military leader, but his stubborn fortitude was a great factor in carrying on the conflict.

By the summer of 1814, the average age of generals had dropped 20 years. Brilliant young tacticians like Winfield Scott, Jacob Brown, and Edward P. Gaines led seasoned regulars who held their own against Britain's Napoleonic veterans. This change, combined with England's war weariness and the American wish for peace, resulted in the signing of the Treaty of Ghent in December, 1814. Before the news of it crossed the ocean, Gen. Andrew Jackson won the greatest victory of the war at New Orleans.

The treaty settled almost nothing, but the American naval victories and the successful stand against England's veteran armies raised the country's prestige throughout the world. A sense of the futility of war as a method of settling disputes has converted the Treaty of Ghent into a lasting symbol of Anglo-American friendship.

After leaving the Presidency, Madison and his wife Dolly lived for 19 years at Montpelier before death came to him at the age at 85. In his late years he headed the board that directed the University of Virginia. Voluminous letters and articles came from him, denying the right of States to nullify national law. His dying word was an appeal to his countrymen to cherish the Union.

The marriage of James and Dolly Madison produced no children, but they loved to have their house overrun with successive generations of nieces and nephews. In the eulogies that followed Madison's death, newspapers and public men paid equal tribute to his services to the country and to the purity of his character. Henry Clay regarded him as the greatest American statesman after Washington. It is safe to say that to James Madison, more directly than to any other man, we owe the free government we are now seeking to preserve in a world that knows too little freedom.

Panama Canal Zone Sovereignty: Views of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during recent months distinguished Members of the Congress, disturbed by the worsening of relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama, have made many forthright statements presenting the key angles in the vitally important question of Canal Zone sovereignty.

Regrettably, important elements of the major mass media have failed to enlighten our people on this grave matter. Their silence suggests a control of the press favoring suppression of news about Communist activities, illustrated by those which have occurred on the Isthmus of Panama, and now threaten our continued sovereign control of the Canal Zone.

Securing accurate information and the preparation of it in the form of addresses to the Congress have involved much effort and study on the part of many persons. Among those who have made significant contributions are employees of the Panama Canal Company, Canal Zone Government, and other U.S. agencies in the Canal Zone. Their understanding of the problems involved derived from long residence on the Isthmus and personal observation of repeated incidents of violence has enabled them to render important services in alerting the Congress and the Nation to the real dangers at Panama.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I reflect the overwhelming view of the American peo-

ple when I say they are grateful for what these employees and other Isthmian residents have contributed to public knowledge in this regard. They certainly deserve to be commended for their courage to speak out boldly on the subject of Canal Zone sovereignty at the time when the highest officials of their government, through timidity and a policy of vascillation, decline to take a firm stand in behalf of the just rights of the United States.

One of them is Raymond G. Bush, now department commander of the American Legion in the Panama Canal Zone. In a report presented on March 30, 1960, to the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion in Washington, D.C., Mr. Bush gave an admirable summary of the current crisis at Panama and urged a firm stand by our Government in meeting the current menace.

Another such leader is Arthur J. Wynne, Chairman of the Canal Zone Committee for U.S. Retention of the Panama Canal. Because of his forthright but temperate report on Isthmian conditions, "Yankee, Go Home," which I included in my remarks to the House on January 27, 1960, he has been denounced by Panamanian radicals. These extremists, who seem to formulate the foreign policy of Panama, have insultingly demanded that he be deprived of his employment and driven from the Canal Zone.

This action, Mr. Speaker, should cause our officials to think more realistically. If the Panama Canal should be nationalized by Panama, which is the avowed ultimate objective of radical elements in that country; how long could it be successfully operated under supervision of such men as are heading the fight for Panamanian nationalization?

The above-mentioned Canal Zone leaders know whereof they speak. They realize that there can be no compromise in the fundamental principle of sovereignty. In stark contrast to some who have expressed their views, these leaders treat the subject with a realism that is most refreshing. They know that a crisis has arrived which requires a grave decision be made and that, in the question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, it is "All or Nothing."

In order that Commander Bush's able report may have the widest possible circulation, especially to the Congress and other agencies of Government concerned with Panama Canal questions, I quote it as part of these remarks:

REPORT TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH, 30, 1960

(By Raymond G. Bush, Department Commander, Panama Canal Zone)

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE,
Gatun, C.Z.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion, I am Raymond G. Bush, a U.S. citizen born in the State of New York and a resident of the Panama Canal Zone for the past 20 years. I am employed by the U.S. Governinent and am at present the department commander of the American Legion in the Panama Canal Zone.

I am very appreciative that the National Commander, Mr. Martin B. McKneally and the chairman of this committee invited me to present to this Commission my views of the situation in the Panama area.

In speaking about Panama and its relations with the United States, I am reminded of the Biblical saying that God created the earth in 6 days and rested on the seventh. The United States most certainly did create the Republic of Panama on November 3, 1903, but in its relationship with the youngest of our sister American Republics, it has not had 1 day's rest since that eventful day over 56 years ago.

Since that November day the whole political history of Panama has been an ever ambitious fight to obtain, if not control the Panama Canal Zone. From this comes the problems of the Republic of Panama.

The Panama Canal is a 10- by 50-mile strip of land carrying a marine waterway connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, completely bisecting the Republic of Panama. This narrow strip of land was granted to the United States by the Republic of Panama in 1903 for the purpose of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal to be constructed, as outlined in article II of the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. Based on this part of the treaty, Panama has raised a hue and cry that they have complete jurisdiction and sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Panama in its historical claim for sovereignty ignores that part of the same treaty which states and I quote,

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power and authority within the zone mentioned and described in article II of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said article II which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, powers, or authority."

During the last few years, particularly since the Suez crisis, Panamanian objectives concerning the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone have been developed and extended by the Panama Government, public and private officials, organizations, students, press, and radio. Those objectives and aspirations current in Panama would modify the present exclusive control of the Canal Zone by the United States in varying degrees of basic principle or economic concession, to eventual nationalization of the Canal. They leave little doubt that the mere flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone is not what Panama seeks and that it is but a single step and I repeat, a single step, toward ultimate control.

During the 1955 treaty negotiations, the Panama Government pressed for the following concessions, all of which were rejected by the United States on the basis of the officially reaffirmed position of the United States that no useful purpose would be served in debating the question of sovereignty, that all such matters were resolved by article III of the 1903 convention.

(a) Panamanian flag to be flown as well as the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone, including on all vessels using the canal.

(b) Spanish language to be official in the Canal Zone, along with the English language.

(c) Foreign Consuls in the Canal Zone to be accredited by Panama rather than the United States.

(d) Panamanian citizens before the Canal Zone courts to be tried by mixed tribunals. (American and Panamanian judges.)

(e) Panamanian postage to be used on all mail matter dispatched from the Canal Zone.

(f) United States to wholly recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

In spite of the fact that the question of sovereignty was rejected by the United States, this did not prevent responsible government officials to publicly state that the United States was violating the treaty. As recently as February 17, 1960, in a speech at Honolulu, Hawaii, the Panamanian Foreign Ministr, Miguel Moreno, Jr., said:

"The refusal by the United States to raise the Panamanian flag in the Panama Canal Zone, is one of the several violations by the United States of the treaty under which it controls the Canal Zone."

This was not the first time that Mr. Moreno has put the finger on the United States as not abiding by solemn treaty commitments. On November 28, 1959, while addressing a mass meeting in Panama City celebrating Panama's independence from Spain, Foreign Minister Moreno stated that the time had come to break the chains of servility; that Panama has incontestable sovereignty over the Canal Zone; that Panama would not accept titular sovereignty until the United States with Panama raises the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone; that the canal is Panama's.

In 1923, Secretary of State Hughes declared that the United States would never recede from the position which it had taken and that this Government could not and would not, enter into any discussions affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone under article III of the treaty of 1903 as if it were sovereign of the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama. It is an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it is, any President or Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

There have been numerous other occasions whereon the Department of State has had the occasion to construe and apply article III. It would serve no purpose to quote more of them. The uniform position of the United States has been that the sovereignty over the Canal Zone is not an open or doubtful question and that the language of article III is not obscure or ambiguous and that plain and sensible words should be taken to mean what they say. The Republic of Panama has no right to the exercise of sovereign rights, power or authority in the Canal Zone and no right or privileges of a sovereign in the Canal Zone. Any titular sovereignty which the Republic of Panama may possess in the Canal Zone is wholly barren and dormant, at least so long as the convention of 1903 remains in effect.

If the United States has all the rights and powers in the Canal Zone, what is the question? The 1903 treaty grants all the rights, power, and authority. What is left?

The flag issue is one more concession that Panama is demanding and there will be many more until she really gets what she wants, the Panama Canal.

The only thing that is going to appease and satisfy Panama is the ultimate rescinding of the sovereignty clauses in the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. This will certainly open the door to Panamanian nationalization of the Panama Canal.

It is obvious and make no mistake about it, that Panama in her struggle to have her flag raised on the Canal Zone wishes to erase the false concept of "titular sovereignty" and attain the full recognition of her civil, penal, fiscal, and labor justification in the Canal Zone.

A Panama City newspaper states the objectives of Panama very clearly in the following article:

"November 3 and 28 have passed and will go down in history as the two dates of

patriotism when the people launched themselves to plant the Panamanian flag in Panamanian territory • • • Now there will be December 12, followed by December 22 and so on, until all the Yankees are driven out of the Canal Zone and the canal is nationalized."

The recognition of titular sovereignty is far from what Panamanians think the United States ought to do to remove the differences which brought about the current crisis. A letter drafted by a special committee chosen by spokesmen for 40 organizations in Panama suggested the replacement of existing treaties by an agreement on the following:

(a) Unquestioned sovereignty of Panama over the territory in which the Panama Canal is built.

(b) Replacement of the present grant in perpetuity by one for a fixed period.

(c) Elimination of unfair competition to Panama's industry and commerce.

(d) Elimination of discriminatory practices as to wages, opportunities, work conditions and treatment of Panamanian workers in the Canal Zone.

(e) A fair share for Panama in the gross receipts of the Canal in addition to the present annuity.

(f) Suspension of any judicial, commercial or industrial activity in the Canal Zone which is not connected with the powers of the U.S. authorities in the Canal Zone exclusively for the maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Canal.

(g) Fair interpretation of new treaties.

Following the November 3 incidents of which you are all aware, the Panamanian press and radio carried on an extremely vicious and malicious campaign against the Canal Zone and the United States. With complete disregard for the facts, the press, radio, and officials placed the full blame on the United States for the November 3 riots and waged an unscrupulous campaign to inflame the public to further demonstrations and to exploit the November 3 pressure tactics for concessions from the United States. The press and radio nearly 100 percent politically controlled, also pushed nationalism to extreme limits and made sovereignty in the Canal Zone, including flying the flag there the rallying cry of nearly all Panamanians, most of whom prior to and during the November 3 incidents were indifferent to the political maneuverings which were all that were involved at the time.

In the daily Panama newspapers appeared editorials and cartoons that left little to the imagination. One column called for the removal of the No. 1 enemy of Panama, Gov. William E. Potter, "for on this black Yankee personality falls the responsibility for the bloody acts in Panamanian territory November 3 and 4, 1959."

Still another column says, "By fair means or foul, the United States has acquired since her independence, territory three times greater than most of Europe. This was done with little expense and by killing Indians and taking land from Mexico."

On November 5, 1959, the afternoon newspaper La Hora, depicts the U.S. Army as vicious dogs, some firing machineguns, others with bared bayonets, three tearing with their teeth at a Panamanian holding a Panamanian flag and one with a child between his teeth. A balloon over the head of a sharp-toothed, armed dog wearing a helmet with three stars, says, "Kill, kill the goddam Panamanian patriots."

On the last page of the same newspaper, there was a cartoon of President Eisenhower talking with the Canal Zone Governor, William E. Potter, on the telephone. Both are dressed as devils with fire and smoke coming from their eyes, ears, and mouth. Eisenhower says, "Listen Potter, I have the complete plans for 'Operation Hungary' so that you can follow them to the letter on November 28. It is time that we got ahead of the Russians on something." Governor Potter says, "OK Chief, bullets to these Communists."

The official theme in Panama during this period was that the situation was so bad that the United States must give something big immediately to appease Panama. The United States was officially so notified on several occasions and was under constant pressure to grant concessions, including a recognition of Panamanian sovereignty and the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. The violence of November 3 and the threat of more on November 28 was openly used to persuade the United States to appeasement action.

The bloody rioting that occurred along the Canal Zone boundary was part of a premeditated plan to focus worldwide attention on the plight of Panama. Panamanian leaders felt that with the United States so deeply involved in major crises throughout the world, an incident in the Canal Zone, such as Panamanians being killed by Americans or border disturbances requiring the use of the U.S. Army would cause our Nation to quickly give in to Panama's demand of sovereignty. This supposition was based on the theory that anti-American propaganda branding the United States a "blood crazed" aggressor of small defenseless countries would surely gain sympathetic support throughout Latin American countries and be very embarrassing to the foreign policy of the United States.

Gentlemen, the time has come when we as a Nation should take a closer look at our relaitonship with a country which resorts to diplomatic blackmail to obtain further concessions from our Government. Let us tell our side of the story beginning with Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. We have never denied that Panama has titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone and by the same token never have we relinquished the sovereign authority Panama granted to the United States in the 1903 Convention.

Very few people realize, and Panama completely ignores that in this treaty, we paid $10 million for and received a grant in perpetuity. To put it bluntly, this grant in perpetuity was an outright purchase, not a lease, with no strings attached. Under article II of the 1903 treaty, this grant in perpetuity gave the United States the use, occupation, and control of the land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal Zone. I would like to add that the 10 million paid to Panama was not the only money that the United States paid out when it acquired the rights to build the canal. The unsuccessful French Canal Co. received $40 million, while the Colombian Government received $25 million. In addition, our Government purchased outright all land owned by individuals within the Canal Zone.

This expenditure, in excess of $75 million certainly cannot be construed as a steal particularly when you take into consideration the value of the dollar at that time.

While there have been two major treaty revisions, which greatly modified (in favor of Panama) the original Hay-Bunau Varilla Pact of 1903, in neither of these treaties was there any surrender by the United States of the sovereign rights over the Panama Canal Zone as set forth in the original treaty.

Some of the major revisions that benefited Panama were:

(1) Increase of the annual annuity from $250,000 to $1,930,000.

(2) Gifts of lands and other properties valued at approximately $24 million.

(3) Construction of a high level bridge across the Pacific entrance to the Panama Canal for the convenience of Panama, at an estimated cost of $27 million.

(4) Employment preference over other foreign nationals.

(5) Abolishing of purchase privileges in the Canal Zone commissaries for Panamanians working in the zone but living in Panama.

(6) Preferential purchase of Panama products.

However with these giveaways and many more on the part of the United States, Panama still wants more. She wants the canal and she will get it if we are not alert to the prime purpose behind her persistent demands for sovereignty and the flying of her national flag over the Panama Canal Zone. Giving in on this point will shortly be followed by the replacement of our civil government on the pretext that as a sovereign nation, that foreign governments (in this case the United States), will not be permitted to make or administer laws affecting the territory and nationals of the Republic of Panama. The next step is complete nationalization of the Panama Canal, with the exclusion of all U.S. interests.

There is no question that the United States has complied with its treaty commitments with Panama. However, we are constantly being criticized for noncompliance and many of these complaints center on the question of equal pay for equal work. This was one of the principle subjects that set off the November riots.

Simply stated, the Panama Canal Company is paying the same basic wage for all employees, whether they are Americans or Panamanians. The wage policies are exactly the same in principle as those applied by the Panamanian Government. The local rate is the going rate and if skilled employees have to be imported from a place where a higher rate is paid, that higher rate must be paid, otherwise the employee could not be hired. Business in Panama, pays Panama wage rates generally, but if it needs a foreign expert or skilled employee or executive from another country, it necessarily pays that person what it takes to induce him to leave his country and work overseas. He certainly would not leave his country for less than he could get at home, plus some additional inducement.

Although the minimum Canal Zone wages for employees of the U.S. Government agencies in the Canal Zone is 50 cents an hour (as compared to Panama's 40 cents an hour) only 267 employees in 12,000 full-time positions received less than 58 cents an hour. The current average wage for the total force of full-time non-U.S. citizen employees is 82 cents an hour.

A year ago, before the Canal Zone pay plan was adopted, there were 126 non-U.S. citizens on the U.S. wage base. Such employment has now risen to a total of 240. As non-U.S. citizens become qualified for the U.S. wage base positions, this figure will be augmented monthly. Similarly, in January of 1959 there were 67 U.S. citizens receiving the locality wage in effect at that time. Today nearly 200 U.S. citizens are on the Canal Zone wage base. The above clearly shows the policy of the Canal Zone to make more and more jobs available to Panamanians as vacancies exist and as skills become available.

In recent weeks, Panama has had several important visitors from the United States. Some of them have openly expressed their opinion that they can see no reason why the Panamanian flag should not be flown in the Canal Zone. Shortly thereafter they disappear from the scene and Panama makes political hay out of their statements. One of these very well know visitors went so far as to blame what he called, "An exclusive community of American civilians that has grown up in the zone and has little contact with the friendly people and country around them for the resentment and ill will in Panama." Nothing could be further from the truth. Before the November incidents, American civilians as well as military per-

sonnel always visited in Panama and its interior provinces.

Gentlemen, was this visitor who is so ill informed of existing conditions around when rocks and other debris were being thrown at the Canal Zone Police, Firemen and U.S. Army troops who were guarding the Canal Zone border under very trying and provocative circumstances; when lives of Americans and Government property were in danger; when our U.S. flag was being desecrated at the American Embassy in Panama in full view of Panama's National Guard. (Note: The U.S. flag was not flown at the Embassy after the November 3 riots, until American Legionnaires and other U.S. citizens demanded from the Ambassador that he honor the Father of our country on February 22, a national holiday.) Was this visitor around when the rioting mobs burned Uncle Sam in effigy; when Canal Zone Governor William E. Potter was being named public enemy No. 1; when General Gaither's troops were being called mad dogs, shooting down innocent Panamanian patriots. Do you gentlemen call this the action of a friendly country. Is this the incentive that is needed for the Canal Zone employees to visit and be good neighbors with the Republic of Panama, as they have in the past. My answer is "No."

The time has come for the United States to take a firm stand and make a decision one way or the other what it is going to do. Now all that is left to talk about in our relations with Panama is, all or nothing. Give in to the demands of the agitators and the canal will shortly belong to Panama. The United States must decide on a policy with Panama and stick to it and not be pushed into something that it will regret.

Probably some of you are wondering, what can the United States do now to appease the Republic of Panama. I am of the firm conviction that nothing will ever satisfy her demands, but the canal.

The American Legion should encourage the United States to foster good will in Panama and other Latin American countries and be good neighbors, but at the same time let's stand up and tell Panama that we are going to keep the Panama Canal Zone under one flag, the Stars and Stripes.

National Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter which I addressed to Rev. Roy G. Ross, general secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.:

APRIL 4, 1960.

Rev. ROY G. ROSS,
General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York, N.Y.

DEAR REVEREND ROSS: This acknowledges receipt of the letter dated March 22, 1960, signed by yourself with an appendix signed by a number of other persons.

Under date of February 26, 1960, in response to a telegram which I had received respecting public statements made by myself in regard to the National Council of Churches, I sent a telegram to the National Council of Churches as follows:

"Reurtel do you desire opportunity to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to question the accuracy of the material which came from the committee's files and which appears in the Air Force Manual? If you desire such opportunity, we can arrange a time convenient to yourselves."

May I again ask: Do you desire an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to question the accuracy of the material which came from the committee's files and which appears in the Air Force Manual? If you desire such opportunity we can arrange a time convenient to yourself.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Forests and Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1960, a forestry demonstration was conducted at the Cleveland County Fairgrounds in Shelby, N.C. This demonstration was sponsored by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., together with 14 cooperating local, State, and Federal agencies. It was an outstanding event in every respect and will mean much to the development of the forestry program in the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent.

More than 800 persons from western North Carolina were in attendance. In addition there were visitors from many other States, some coming from as far away as New York City.

In connection with the demonstration there were seven interesting forestry stations illustrating tree growth, planting, and utilization. There were two exhibits which seemed to attract the greatest attention. They were a miniature sawmill and a working model of a lumber dry kiln. Also, there was a very interesting model of a mechanical tree planter in operation. This tree planter was purchased by one of the Shelby banks and donated to the county to be used for the benefit of the farmers of the county for many years to come.

The main address of the day was delivered by Hon. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture and Chairman of the Committee on Rural Development. Mr. Morse spoke on the subject, "Forests and Rural Development." His splendid address was carried throughout the eastern section of the United States on both radio and television.

In the course of his address, Mr. Morse called to the attention of his audience the exhibits of a recently released U.S. Department of Commerce publication entitled, "Forest Industry Opportunities." This publication is of great interest to me, and I would certainly commend it to any of my colleagues whose area is concerned with the growing forestry industry.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the address of Mr. Morse in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks, as follows:

FORESTS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Address by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, and chairman, Committee for Rural Development Program, before Forestry Demonstration sponsored by Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. and 14 cooperating private, State, and Federal agencies, Shelby, N.C., March 31, 1960)

In most of the 1,000 counties of the United States where incomes and levels of living of farm families are unusually low—about one-half or more of the land is in timber. And the forests tend to be neglected or wastefully cut.

Incomes are low because farms are usually small and soils are poor or rocky or on steep hill or mountain sides. Fields tend to be small and irregular.

The farm families are seriously underemployed and often unemployed.

It is an age-old, chronic condition. Only since 1955 has there been an organized and effective attack directed toward helping solve this unconscionable situation.

The rural development program emphasizes timber and forestry and associated industries and activities as major opportunities for area development and improvement of incomes of farm and rural families. State and local leaders are quick to recognize that forests are a great resource that can be made much more productive.

"If you don't have an oil well or gold mine, take a good look at your timber stand" is the advice of one State agricultural college. "A 12-inch pine tree grows to 14 inches in 5 years when properly managed. At that rate, it earns 28 percent interest per year."

Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, in stressing the importance of forests and the rural development program points outs that more than half of all commercial forest land is in small private ownerships. He says:

"By the year 2000—40 years from now—the Nation's population will about double, with twice the present demand for wood products. Productivity of small private forests must be increased to meet the anticipated future demand." This can only be done by the owners of the small forests. Community and area programs will help them and spur them on to achieve more highly productive and profitable forests.

Forests are basic to the progress and well-being of all timbered areas. That means practically all of the areas of the United States most in need of more income.

The challenge and opportunities are shown by striking figures. Timber occupies 86 percent of the land area of Maine; over 60 percent of States like Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia; and more than half of the land in other States where rural development is underway, like Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania and Washington.

Our wood crop occupies more land on farms than any other crop. Trees are a crop and should be grown as such.

Small woodlands are held by over 3 million farmers and some 1 million nonfarm owners. No other land use or crop directly affects the welfare of more landowners. Small woodlands add up to big business.

County and area leaders cannot do an adequate development job if they ignore 40 to 93 percent of their land and the natural renewable resource which it supports. That is the reason that rural development program committees usually establish a forestry commission, or subcommittee, charged with the responsibility of making the timberland more productive and profitable.

Forestry commissions of the rural or area development programs are made up of people who have a financial interest in the timber economy. For example: sawmill operators; pulpmill foresters or operators; owners of timberland or their foresters; private foresters; hardware and implement dealers who sell equipment; representatives of woodworking industries; paper companies, wood-preserving, and other such industries; bankers and lending organizations.

Working with such commissions as advisers and in helping carry out the forestry programs agreed upon are the public agencies—State and Federal—such as: State forest service, U.S. Forest Service, Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and agricultural stabilization and conservation committees.

The Seaboard Air Line Railroad and 14 other private, local, State, and Federal agencies have sponsored this forestry demonstration which illustrates the large number and variety of companies and agencies which have a responsibility for better forestry. They want to be of help on programs that will produce more income.

What to do: An increasingly fine record is being achieved as counties and areas team up on development programs and move into action.

Fire is controlled.

There is better protection against insects and diseases.

Tree farms are established.

Wasteful savage cutting is stopped or reduced.

Woodlands are renovated and weed trees cut.

Seedlings are planted by the millions.

The first thing some of the committees do is to call upon the public agencies for help in finding out approximately how much and what kinds of forest trees they have to work with. They call upon the public agencies, in this case the forest service and the State foresters, to tell them what these kinds of trees are good for.

As a result, new pulpwood loading yards have been established. New charcoal plants, pallet plants, and furniture plants have been constructed and put into operation.

These developments have a twofold advantage. They create jobs which gave the small woodland owner an opportunity to earn ready cash in an off-the-farm job. These jobs are created not only in the mills but in the woods in the form of fallers and skidders, and in the trucking and hauling industry.

But of more importance, they create markets for forest products that didn't exist before, thus giving the landowners a new source of income and permitting them to put their woodlands in better shape for future growth.

Using these new markets as a means of putting the existing woodlands into better growing condition is the most important contribution the county committees can make to the long-time economy of their counties or areas.

Thus new industries are established and small existing operations are expanded by rural development programs. More jobs are created and incomes are increased based on the forests and forest products. As a result farm families and nonfarm families too, have a higher level of living and entire areas are becoming more prosperous.

The Oklahoma Experiment Station (Bull. B-548) found, "on the average, farming paid to a rural family in Cherokee County roughly $300 of net income, while off-farm payments contributed over $2,000 per family." This illustrates why areas all across the Nation are organizing to bring diversified—and new income opportunities to farm families on small and low production farms.

Beautiful and productive forests along with hills, mountains, streams, and lakes provide an attractive countryside for attracting and developing other sources of income.

Outdoor recreation is big business—and will greatly expand. The President and Congress in looking ahead have felt the need will be so great that there has been established a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The chairman is Laurance S. Rockefeller, who refers to "the booming demands on our recreation resources." The Commission is to make recommendations by September 1, 1961, for a program of action.

It is being pointed out that most of the population is concentrated in the Northeast and East where the land is largely privately owned. Timbered areas to the South are in easy reach of most people of the United States. Here is a big opportunity for attractive timbered areas to serve the rapidly growing need and demand for a great variety of outdoor recreation—all the way from camping and hiking to hunting and fishing.

Congress, in enacting Public Law 85-470 that established the Commission, said it is "in order to preserve, develop, and assure accessibility to all American people of present and future generations such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment, and to assure the spiritual, cultural, and physical benefits that such outdoor recreation provides."

The tourist trade is big business and will greatly expand. There will be 80 million more people in just 20 years—and the population is expected to double in the next 40 years.

People want to travel and relax in scenic and attractive rural areas. The tourist business and recreation income are being developed with better accommodations, more parks and more attractive towns and communities and such areas hang out a welcome sign for travelers.

Rural residences are big business. Population centers are "exploding." People are reaching further out into the country for places to live. Families spend much of their income in the areas in which they live. They provide better markets for locally grown farm products—and provide work for farm and nonfarm families.

Retired people increasingly seek attractive rural areas in which to live. They have larger social security and other retirement incomes to spend where they make their homes. This is a rapidly growing business—an increasing number of our people are in the 65-and-over age group.

Thus areas blessed with forests have many income opportunities waiting to be developed.

A new bulletin, "Forest Industry Opportunities in Rural Community Development," is just now available through the work of the U.S. Forest Service. It is a fine new tool for area leadership and rural development committees, to illustrate the great potentials in timber.

It shows "that for every dollar the timber owner gets for his stumpage, an average of $17.60 more value is added to the original worth of the wood by the time it reaches the ultimate consumer.

"These additional dollars go out as wages for workers and income for companies engaged in harvesting, processing, fabricating, transporting, and distributing the forest product. If you don't have the industry in your community to convert your trees into forest products, those extra wood-based jobs never show up and those extra dollars just don't circulate among your people."

Photographs show some 20 examples of how wood is being remanufactured near the place it is growing. It shows how to keep the work at home—and multiply the income. More areas should be cashing in on their timber resources in a much larger way.

W. S. "Bill" Swingler, Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service, who guided the creation of the new bulletin, in a recent speech said, "So I suggest—no, I urge you to go home and think it over. Can a rural development committee help your area? If you think it can, why not start one?

"You will be able to increase the economic benefits that you get from your woodland. And there's something else. You will get a far deeper and more satisfying return—that very special feeling which comes to a man when he has had a part in making his community a better place in which to live."

The Canadian Parliament has had a study made of the rural development program as it is operating in the United States. The methods and results found in this country were convincing.

The Canadian Minister of Agriculture, the Honorable Douglas S. Harkness, in an address prepared for delivery in Des Moines, Iowa, February 20, 1960, stated that one of the five sections of the agricultural program for Canada is "a rural development, or redevelopment program somewhat similar to the one you are carrying on in the United States, designed particularly to deal with the many problems associated with the rural population on small, uneconomic units."

Today, Paul V. Kepner, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Extension Service, is in Ottawa to appear before a special committee of the Canadian Senate at the request of the chariman, Senator A. M. Pearson. He is there to answer questions and explain further how the rural development program works to produce more rapid progress and higher incomes.

North Carolina has been well out in front in rural development. Pioneering work has helped point the way for the program now underway in 30 States and Puerto Rico. Other States are making plans to get started.

Gov. Luther H. Hodges says the people are very appreciative of the program and know what it means to the farmers in this State. In an address at the Industrial Education Center in Burlington he said "the people of North Carolina have demonstrated their faith in themselves and their enthusiasm for the future by endorsing and actively supporting a variety of programs designed to bolster this State's economy and raise its standard of living."

We are deeply grateful for the strong and effective leadership of Dean D. W. Colvard, and Extension Director D. S. "Dave" Weaver. They have not only given leadership here in this State, but national leadership as well.

The meeting is another demonstration of how businesses, industries, utilities and private organizations want to help. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad through the past 15 years has actively promoted forestry through such meetings. Mr. Warner T. White, assistant vice president, has given his active leadership.

In the new rural America that is emerging, forests will play an increasingly important role. Their multiple use will not only supply physical products but the spiritual, cultural, and recreation values to which Congress refers.

Many farm communities and entire rural areas that have been experiencing a decline in population—will soon be hit with a reversal of this trend. Already it has happened to some counties.

Tremendous new opportunities will open up—as rural areas help provide homes and occupations for 80 million people in the next 20 years. The time to plan ahead for such developments is here—now.

Our deep concern is for people—the welfare of farm families and other rural people, too. We must help banish the age old, chronic poverty, low incomes, underemployment and wasted manpower.

The farm and rural families plagued with such conditions must be helped to enjoy the good life that prosperous, progressive America makes possible for our people.

The Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received from the Physicians Forum, Inc., dated April 6, 1960.

The letter follows:

THE PHYSICIANS FORUM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 6, 1960.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: When you consider the discharge petition for the Forand bill, please realize that many thousands of physicians endorse the request of the vast majority of the American people to add health-service benefits to the Federal social security system.

The official spokesmen for organized medicine do not accurately reflect the views of the medical profession—a striking verified example is the AMA's continued opposition to social security coverage for physicians, despite the fact that this is favored by two-thirds of them in polls throughout the Nation.

Like the medical profession at large, most of us are in private practice and belong to our county medical societies. Our years of medical practice gives us extensive personal knowledge of the great medical needs of the aged and the frequently insurmountable obstacles they encounter in attempting to get good medical care. More often than we wish to recall, we have seen our patients, on reaching retirement, fail to receive necessary hospitalization, diagnostic procedures, and other medical services, and forced to give up their personal physicians.

From our experience we also know that currently available health insurance has not eliminated the financial obstacle to good medical care for the aged. Many do not have health insurance, particularly those needing it the most, while those covered still suffer considerable financial hardship because benefit payments are usually so inadequate.

Our elderly patients with Blue Cross policies are also the hardest hit by the current wave of increases in Blue Cross rates; as a result, many find it difficult to pay the premiums and some have had to give up their policies. We are deeply worried about the unfortunate predicament these patients will face when they require hospitalization.

It is clear to us that currently available health insurance must be bolstered by the Federal social security system to assure universal coverage of the aged regardless of their limited and usually shrinking economic resources.

In the 23 years of the Federal social security system, we physicians have witnessed with gratitude the financial help it has provided to our patients. For many, this was sufficient to maintain their personal dignity without which mental and physical health rapidly deteriorates. For some, it made possible the continuation of important doctor-patient relationships or the purchase of necessary medical services. To the best of our knowledge, the benefits of the Federal social security system have been provided with a minimum of redtape and without political interference.

More recently, the Federal social security system has worked directly with the medical profession in administering the disability freeze and the disability benefits programs. Practicing physicians who have participated in this work have found the same rational approach that has characterized the entire system. In particular, there has been no interference with professional judgments, no loss of professional integrity, no lowering of the quality of care.

We know the need for Forand-type legislation is unequivocal.

We believe that the Congress which enacts Forand-type legislation will receive the highest praise from a grateful people—those over 65, those supporting elderly relatives, as well as most younger people who justifiably worry what would happen to them if they became seriously ill in their old age.

We hope you will add your name to the Forand bill discharge petition and that you will aid the passage by this Congress of legislation for financing medical care for the aged by the social security system.

Sincerely,

ALLAN M. BUTLER, M.D.,
Chairman.

A Higher Living Standard for American Migrant Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an opportunity to improve the lot of the American migratory farmworker. In this connection, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on this subject by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell which he made last week to the National Travelers Aid Association.

This speech has a close relationship to a bill, H.R. 11313, introduced by me to eliminate the importation of foreign farm labor and to replace it with our own transient farmworkers who now average less than a thousand dollars' earnings a year and who could do the work now done by imported Mexican nationals.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE LUNCHEON OF THE 1960 BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL TRAVELERS AID ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 6, 1960

Members of the National Travelers Aid Society, I was pleased by your invitation to luncheon with you this afternoon, and to remark briefly on the status, and the prospects, of our migratory farmworkers—families that are often desolate, always in need of some kind.

It is my hope to use this time to recount for you some of the things that have been done to help the migrant, and to talk about some of the things that I feel must be done in the future if the migrant is ever to take his place as a full citizen of this wealthy Nation, with full access to the responsibilities and rewards of our social and economic life.

I would like to remark first, however, on the work of the Travelers Aid Society. There is no lonelier person than a traveler in trouble; our clearest example of the virtue of charity is the story of the Samaritan who helped a traveler in trouble.

Each year 30 million Americans of every background and income group change their city of residence. This ability to move freely, to pursue opportunity, to change jobs at will, was a breathtaking freedom to the people who came to this new world from the social confines and economic strictures of the old. In a dynamic economy such as ours, it remains an American characteristic.

Yet most people on the move must rely upon the uncertain help of strangers in case of trouble. To all travelers, the glow of the Travelers Aid lamp in bus, rail, and air terminals throughout the Nation is a welcome one.

Unfortunately, there are few such "kindly lights" for the 500,000 American migratory farmworkers to steer by.

Anyone familiar with American agriculture is aware of the extraordinry changes that have taken place in recent decades, and that are continuing. We can produce immense crops from fewer acres, far beyond our limit to consume them or profitably dispose of them. Modern processing, packaging and marketing techniques have brought to agriculture the stylization and management methods of industrial production—a system in which the migrant appears as an economic element, as one of the phases in the process.

President Eisenhower has warned that failure to confront the complex problems of the new mass agriculture "can cause serious strains on the firm freedom supports of our society." Of particular interest to us is the fact that the "scientific revolution" that causes headaches to agricultural producers also brings grief to agricultural labor—helps, in fact, to perpetuate the migratory labor system itself.

This much seems certain to me: We may have learned to use the tools of technology to dramatically increase agricultural production but we have failed to use those tools of progress to benefit many of the men, women, and children who labor for hire on American farms.

The migrants will be coming north now. As I speak to you, migrant families in our Southern States are gathering their few belongings boarding the old trucks and buses to begin their long trek. They will work long days, travel great distances before autumn brings them home again. And they can expect certain things:

The migrant can expect to receive the lowest wages in the entire American economy, less than $900 a year.

He can expect to be unemployed, numbering the jobs he is able to pick up away from the farm as well as those on the farm, about half of the days of the year.

He is expressly left out from the protection of most of our social and labor legislation.

He can expect to be ineligible, in all but a very few cases, for health and welfare services because of residency requirements fashioned, in some places, with him in mind.

He can expect that his children will be forced by economic necessity to work beside him in the fields, and that those same children, because they move with their parents from place to place, will often be deprived of the opportunity for an education.

Our 500,000 domestic American migrants can expect, also, to be in competition with 500,000 foreign workers, brought into this country every year.

And the migrant can expect to be considered, by many who employ him, and in the literal sense of the word, a "commodity" to be bought and used at the lowest possible price.

Those are his expectations, right now, as he starts north to harvest our crops and fill our supermarkets.

I have never been able to understand the apathy of most farm employer organizations

over the years when it comes to finding solutions to this vast and compelling human problem.

Even more distressing is the traditional and historical opposition of those farm employer organizations to any and all suggestions that are put forward for the relief of the substandard conditions of farmworkers.

Now I do not doubt that American growers and their organizations are not devoid of humanitarian instinct, nor that they have contributed their just share to the Albert Schweitzers and the Dr. Dooleys who dedicate their lives to the underprivileged of foreign countries. I have no doubt that many of these organizations support our foreign aid programs to assist those nations that are underprivileged.

Yet, when suggestions are made that would raise the status of our own migratory workers, who live in the poverty of a $900-a-year average income, these same individuals and organizations are seized with a pious horror at this assault upon free enterprise.

During the past 2 years I have made several speeches on the problems of the migrant farmworker. I have attempted to show that it is a problem that cannot be rationalized out of existence, that our posture as a nation founded on human dignity is seriously impaired by a farm labor system based upon the availability of a large supply of poverty-stricken workers.

In response to this position, recommendations have been made by farm employer organizations that would have the effect of making it the policy of the U.S. Government to help maintain that supply of underemployed and underpaid workers for the benefit of agricultural employers.

I do not believe that American agriculture does, can or should depend upon such a labor system.

In accordance with that conviction, I have made proposals and advanced programs that, in my opinion, would improve agricultural labor conditions and, in the long run, the health of agriculture itself.

Today I would like to summarize briefly what progress we have been able to make in the past 4 years. I would also like to summarize briefly some of the more important proposals, and advise you on their status.

I have the honor to serve as chairman of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, established by President Eisenhower in August 1954.

One of the most important projects of the committee is the promotion of joint Federal-State action through the establishment of State migratory labor committees. Much of the responsibility for the well-being of migrants and their families rests with the States. Workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, residency laws, and regulations for housing and transportation are, for example, primarily State responsibilities.

At the time the committee was established, only seven States had migratory labor committees. Today, the total has reached 28. Of the 31 States which employ 4,000 or more domestic migrants per year, 24 have organized migratory labor committees.

It seems to me that during the next general State legislative year, 1961, we should see a good deal of action by the States in the field of migratory labor. My optimism is based on a new source of support for migratory labor legislation. In the past what has been lacking in attempts to extend protective legislation to farmworkers has been support from most farm employer organizations.

At a speech in Chicago last year, I suggested that such organizations might contribute constructive suggestions in this area. I am delighted by the news that the American Farm Bureau Federation has recommended that its affiliated State farm bureaus consider State legislation to (1) improve housing standards for migratory workers; (2) extend occupational insurance to farm workers; (3) license farm labor contractors; (4) enact safety standards for truck transportation of farmworkers; (5) insure availability of school facilities to children of migratory workers; and (6) establish minimum age restrictions for the employment of minors in agriculture.

I welcome this somewhat belated action on the part of the Farm Bureau, and I would like to suggest that they join with those groups and individuals which have traditionally fought for such legislation through the years to put their recommendations across.

In addition to the growth of State interest stimulated by the President's Committee, the Department of Labor has been moving ahead in those areas within its competence and interest. Among those programs are:

Development and expansion of the annual worker plan through which an estimated 200,000 workers will move this year.

Development and issuance of amendments to the regulations governing the interstate recruitment of migratory farmworkers.

Development and introduction of a bill for national registration of crew leaders operating across State lines.

Development under PCML auspices of proposed legislation for the establishment of overnight rest facilities for migrant workers.

Initiation of studies now underway in several States to determine the advisability and feasibility of extending unemployment compensation to farmworkers.

Development of much stronger foreign worker standards—protecting our own workers from substandard competition.

These are concrete accomplishments by the Department of Labor in the field of farm labor. Taken together, they represent more significant progress than was made in any comparable period of time in history. I think that in the years to come the record will show that the programs undertaken by the Department of Labor over the past 4 years on behalf of farmworkers will have laid the groundwork for the accomplishments of the future.

In regard to that future, I believe there are a number of items of the first priority.

There is, first, the question of a minimum wage in agriculture.

In February of last year I first announced my conviction that a minimum wage for farmworkers was an essential first step in providing our migrants with the necessary economic improvement from which other improvements would follow, and without which no lasting improvement is possible.

At that time, I directed a special study to determine both the desirability and the feasibility of extending the minimum wage to agricultural workers.

A report will be released at the end of this month, and it will show that minimum wage for hired farmworkers is both feasible and desirable.

It will also show that such a minimum would apply to a relatively small percentage of farm employers, all of them large, who hire a substantial portion of the hired farm help in the United States, and would not apply to the small family farmer.

To assume, of course, that such legislation would receive the appropriate attention of Congress in a political year is to avoid the realities of our society. I am releasing this report however, so that ample discussion and thought can be given to it, in sufficient time and detail, to insure a meaningful consideration in the next Congress.

A second broad question relating to the future of the American migrant is the status of our foreign labor programs.

A little over a year ago, I appointed four distinguished consultants to advise me on the operation of Public Law 78, the act which enables the Secretary of Labor to recruit supplemental farm labor from Mexico.

The consultants reported that the mass importation of Mexican farmworkers, occurring at the rate of 450,000 last year, is having a definite adverse effect on the wages and working conditions of American farmworkers. To cure this, the consultants made recommendations.

In recent weeks, the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the House Committee on Agriculture has held hearings on the extension of Public Law 78.

Several of the bills before that subcommittee would do the opposite of what the consultants recommended. They would not only dilute the Secretary of Labor's authority to administer this very difficult program; three of the bills would also revoke the Secretary of Labor's authority to issue regulations governing the use of the U.S. Employment Service—a service through which many farm employers recruit domestic farm help.

I think that those bills are hostile to progress. I consider them dangerous to the progress that has been made so far, and I urged strongly that the administration declare itself against them by opposing them without dissent—and this was done.

It is the Department of Labor's position that Public Law 78 should not be extended unless and until adequate remedial measures are adopted and substantial improvements are made in the program.

The Department of Labor, in accordance with that position, will make recommendations for improving the operation of the Mexican farm labor program before the present law runs out.

To the individuals and organizations that have supported the Department of Labor's farm labor programs, I would like to say that even though the attention of Congress is distracted in a political year, that is not an indication that the momentum toward reform is slackening. Rather the opposite is true. Indifference is giving way to concern; ignorance is declining before knowledge.

This problem is going to be solved. Despite the long history of frustration that has been the lot of those who have worked to find just solutions to this great human need, the tide is beginning to run with them. I believe that the day will come when the migratory American farm worker will be able to hold up his head as a self-sufficient and self-sustaining member of our society, like every other American worker.

When that days comes—and it will come—then we will have held out a genuine hand of help to the families that wander on the face of our land, and know so little of its true richness.

Thank you.

Congressman Edward J. Derwinski's Remarks at Pulaski Foundation Banquet, Honoring Congressman Clement J. Zablocki and Architect Biernacki-Poray, March 28, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at the General Pulaski birthday dinner sponsored by the Pulaski Foundation, Inc., March 28.

Our colleague, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, was honored on that occasion along with the famous architect Biernacki-Poray.

During the course of the festivities, Congressman E. J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, paid tribute to these gentlemen for their roles in the building of a children's hospital in Krakow, Poland.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would ask that Congressman DERWINSKI's remarks appear in the RECORD so that all Members who did not attend the banquet can have the opportunity of knowing about the significance of this occasion.

The remarks follow:

Before I deliver my statements on the importance of this occasion, I have a personal message to deliver to Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK. As you know JOHN, I am speaking on behalf of the Republican Members of the House honoring our good friend and colleague, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI. CHARLIE HALLECK, our gentle, quiet, soft-spoken minority floor leader, has a great admiration for you, JOHN, and he asked that I deliver this reminder to you. CHARLIE is aware that your preoccupation with helping us balance the budget has made you a bit absent minded and wants to remind you that you are speaking to the Pulaski Foundation, a Polish-American organization, rather than to one of your fine Irish groups in Boston where you would be more apt to be singing "Mother Machree."

Seriously, it is a pleasure for me to represent the Republican Members of Congress in honoring our colleague CLEM ZABLOCKI. Actually, I wish to speak to you this evening not in my position as a Member of the House, but as an American of Polish extraction who appreciates the bipartisan nature of this evening. We are gathered here to join the Pulaski Foundation as they honor CLEM and Wladek Poray.

When I attended the Interparliamentary Union in Warsaw last fall I had occasion to consult with Mr. Poray and to examine with him the proposed site of this wonderful hospital that will soon be a reality. It was obvious to me that this action represented a concrete example of the effectiveness of a true "People to People Program." This project is a wonderful example of what we, as ordinary citizens with humanitarian hearts, can do to help people in a nation less fortunate. By a program such as this we effectively display personal interest and spirit that a cold precise government cannot convey. We further prove that our Nation above all else can be proud of the great hearts that our citizens possess and our truly national desire to, whenever possible, be of help to afflicted peoples.

Poland is one of the unfortunate countries entrapped behind the Iron Curtain as a result of the unfortunate Yalta Agreement, but her proud people maintain a hope that the future will alleviate their present distress. The development of this hospital plan, first sparked by the vision of Wladek Poray, spearheaded by CLEM ZABLOCKI and all our colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, approved by both Houses of Congress in a great display of bipartisanship, approved by our State Department and signed by President Eisenhower, proves to witnesses throughout the world that the heart of our Nation remains as great and as vigorous as it has always been. When we give public recognition to these gentlemen and all who cooperated with them, we canont help but have tremendous hope and staunch confidence that acts like these will help create in the future a much better, healthier, happier, and freer world.

Seventh District Voters Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I have never had any doubts but what our democratic system of government will continue to function successfully providing the people are given the facts upon which to render sound judgments.

This fact was demonstrated last week when I announced the results of a poll I conducted in the district which I am privileged to represent in Congress. Some commentators made quite a story out of the poll which showed my constituents favoring continued defense efforts but opposed to increased taxes for the same. This proves to me that the people from the "Heart of Ohio" district believe that if the waste and extravagance is cut out of the Defense Establishment, new taxes at this time will not be necessary to do all the things required for our protection and survival.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the Mount Vernon News for April 8, 1960, which further discusses my questionnaire:

SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT VOTERS SPEAK

What do the people of America want in the way of government?

That question has been answered, at least for those of the 17th Ohio Congressional District, in a questionnaire completed by Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING.

Compilation of returns from the questionnaire, as LEVERING says, "shows the subject uppermost in the minds of the people is spending, waste, and extravagance in all departments of Government, and particularly in the foreign aid program. The items most frequently mentioned were the interservice rivalry in the Defense Department, the high cost of storing surplus farm commodities, and the losses involved in the procurement and disposal of defense equipment."

For instance, one of the questions submitted was: "The President, in his budget message, indicated a surplus of about $4 billion for fiscal year 1961. This comes about chiefly through an increase in revenue rather than from reduction in services. In which way would you favor arriving at a surplus?"

The answer was decisive. Only 9 percent advocated maintaining present taxes with some increase, 86 percent were for reduction in spending, and the remainder, 5 percent, had no opinion.

Other items in the questionnaire which deal with controversial issues, most of them currently in the limelight are:

Do you favor an acceleration of our defense effort in such fields as long-range ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, and the satellite program? The answers: Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Do you favor Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools? Yes, 34 percent; no, 57 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include medical expenses? Yes, 39 percent; no, 54 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

On the farm program, 58 percent favored self-help plan and 10 percent were opposed; enlarging the soil bank program to pay farmers for taking 60 million acres out of production drew weak support, 15 percent, while 52 percent were against; abolishing controls and farm supports and subsidies was favored by 53 percent, with 20 percent opposed.

A stronger civil rights bill was approved by 45 percent "yes," to a 20 percent "no" vote.

This is only one congressional district of the many in the country, but it shows some significance. If every Congressman in the country would submit similar tests of public opinion, Congress could hardly ignore the majority vote in any category.

"Equal Opportunity in Housing"—An Address by Harris Wofford, Jr., Associate Professor, Notre Dame Law School—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am pleased to include in the RECORD the second half of an address on "Equal Opportunity in Housing" delivered by Harris Wofford, Jr., associate professor at the Law School of the University of Notre Dame, in South Bend., Ind.

This address was given on Equal Opportunity Day in South Bend on November 19, 1959, at an observance sponsored by the South Bend Urban League and Hering House Community Center, Inc. I was pleased to include the first half of this address in the RECORD of Friday, April 8, 1960, on page A3131.

Part 2 of the address follows:

TWOFOLD ACTION NEEDED

From all this the Commission found that two simultaneous things must be done in this field: (1) opportunity for good and for new housing must be opened for Negroes throughout the whole community, including the outlying areas of the city and the suburbs; and (2) the shortage of decent low-cost housing must be relieved and the present slums cleared or rehabilitated.

The alternative to such a dual program is not the status quo. For Negro housing needs are growing and Negro income are increasing, and if these are pent up within confined areas the result will be blockbusting. That is, present areas of Negro concentration will necessarily expand, block by block, with tension and violence in the wake. The centers of our cities will then increasingly become all-Negro, surrounded by what Mayor Dilworth of Philadelphia calls a "white noose," the all-white suburbs. I do not need to spell out the further results in terms of the city's tax base, the cost of social services, the spread of juvenile delinquency, the inevitability of de facto school segregation. This is the old story of two cities—of a house divided that cannot stand.

Yet there is no excuse for continuing this vicious circle. Take South Bend. I would not pretend to know the full dimensions of the problem here. But Negroes comprise less than 10 percent of the total population, about the proportion in the Nation as a whole. Even if all of this 10 percent wanted to live in the now white neighborhoods and

were able to afford new homes, their dispersal could cause no so-called "inundation." Actually, only a very small portion could afford homes in the better areas or would want to live in the midst of a preponderantly white neighborhood. And here is the final irony: The affront to human dignity that results when such white neighborhoods refuse the traditional American hospitality, the corruption in the souls of Americans who thus violate the great commandment to love their neighbors and be their brother's keeper—all this is done to keep out a relative handful of fellow citizens, a few Negro doctors or lawyers or businessmen who have come up the hard way and earned their right to be respected in any society.

Perhaps in the end we will regain our sense of humor about all this and see the absurdity of it, particularly when the public comes to understand what the Commission learned, that the residence of such Negroes in better neighborhoods does not mean a lowering of property values. The white neighborhood that panics at the coming of a Negro neighbor, the whites who rush to sell out, these sometimes take a loss as the price of their prejudice. But, as the Commission stated, "The only thing people in this situation have to fear is fear itself," stubborn, unreasoning fear, as President Roosevelt put it.

AN EXAMPLE OF PANIC

Let me tell an incident I do know about here in South Bend. A distinguished Negro legal scholar connected with the Commission on Civil Rights was invited to join the faculty at Notre Dame. Some residents in the area where I am presently renting a home, good people whom we have come to know and like, learned that our landlords were about to rent their house to a lawyer on the Commission's staff who was joining the law faculty here. Assuming that I was the Negro in question, some of them sounded the alarm, protesting that the value of their property was endangered. Even after my wife and I arrived as the new tenants we were rather breathlessly informed by one of our neighbors that the house had almost been rented to a Negro. When pressed a little for facts, this neighbor told us that with her own eyes she had seen the Negro drive up to the house in a university car. It happens that the Negro they feared had never looked at, driven up to, or considered this particular house. My wife had gone there once in a university car. What makes this miserable story so comic is that that very week we had read in the newspapers that this Negro and his wife were being entertained as guests of President Eisenhower at a state dinner in the White House. This man, a great lawyer, a form dean of Howard University Law School, a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, and his wife, a charming woman and an outstanding homekeeper and gardener, would have added many riches and much value to any block they lived on, in South Bend, Ind., or Washington, D.C. I think I can say that one of the factors that contributed to their decision not to come here was the housing situation they found facing them in South Bend.

Well, what is to be done about this? Disraeli is said to have remarked that there was hardly a woman in England who would not be more disturbed by the smashing of the joint of her small finger in a carriage door than by hearing that a million children had died of famine the preceding week in China. What I have talked about is not so far removed as a famine in China, or even as the denial of the right to vote in Mississippi. I have just reported a loss to South Bend caused in part by an affront to human dignity.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

For what they are worth, here are the main recommendations of the Commission. First, according to the unanimous finding of the Commission, "some official city and State program and agency concerned with promoting equal opportunity to decent housing is needed." The Commission recommended that "an appropriate biracial committee or commission on housing be established in every city and State with a substantial nonwhite population. Such agencies should be empowered to study racial problems in housing, receive, and investigate complaints alleging discrimination, attempt to solve problems through mediation and conciliation * * *" The Commission added that, "Where public opinion makes possible the adoption of laws against discrimination in housing, this might contribute significantly to the work of the agency promoting equal opportunity in housing. Then the agency would have legal support in its efforts at mediation and conciliation." It found that in New York where such city and State laws exist, significant progress was being made. I leave it to you and to the city fathers to say whether South Bend should accept this recommendation and appoint a commission to promote equal opportunity in housing as well as in employment. That would certainly be one constructive way to transform the promise in Mayor Voorde's proclamation of Equal Opportunity Day into more of a year-round reality.

In any event, whether or not South Bend soon joins their ranks, there are now 30 cities and 13 States where discrimination in housing in one form or another, is prohibited by law and where official agencies, through education, and mediation, are seeking enforcement. One great result of such laws is that the burden of upholding the Constitution is spread to the whole community. Resistance to the coming of a Negro family in a particular neighborhood becomes increasingly pointless when the law establishes freedom of choice in the whole area. The prospect of Negro concentration at one point of breakthrough and consequent inundation of the adjacent white area is also reduced. As one housewife in the Springfield Gardens section in the Queens testified in our New York hearing, she and her friends had refused to flee in panic when some Negroes moved in on the ground that, "we may as well stay here and learn to live with our neighbors on a block because this is something we're going to have to learn, no matter where we go." Instead they welcomed the newcomers and stabilized their community on a new democratic basis. "It's either this," this white housewife and PTA leader testified, "or taking a rowboat and rowing off Montauk Point, and then who knows * * * you might meet a fish you don't like."

While it seems to me important for northern cities and States to practice on the local level what their spokesmen preach on a national level, the necessity for nationwide action by the Federal Government will remain. Whether you approve of the present Federal housing programs or not, they exist on a vast scale—perhaps not vast enough to cope with the problem, but vast enough to be a major factor in the whole housing market. I mean FHA and VA home mortgage insurance as well as urban renewal and public housing. The question is whether the Government has any responsibility to see that these programs are used to promote equality of opportunity. The Commission accepted the argument of a California court that "when one dips one's hand into the Federal Treasury, a little democracy necessarily clings to whatever is withdrawn." The Commission found that all Federal housing assistance was subject to the constitutional rule against racial discrimination. Therefore, it recommended, again unanimously, "that the President issue an Executive order stating the constitutional objective of equal opportunity in housing, directing all Federal agencies to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution to the achievement of this goal."

There is no time to report the other more detailed findings and recommendations made by the Commission. Some of them concern South Bend, such as the need for better site location and design in public housing projects in order to avoid the type of high-rise large public housing apartment located in the midst of an all-Negro area which spells de facto segregation along with other troubles. Similarly the Commission stressed the need for full citizens' participation in all stages of the planning of urban renewal, and particularly the participation of Negro representatives. Father Hesburgh and Dean Johnson strongly urged all real estate boards to admit to membership qualified Negro real estate men. For further details I refer you to the Government Printing Office for a copy of the Commission's Report, or to the question period. I have barely scratched the surface of but one of the subjects in the Commission's 600-page report. (There is a 200-page abridgment you can get.)

THE NORTH'S RESPONSIBILITIES

I said I was reporting these recommendations "for what they are worth" because so far little attention has been given to the Commission's housing findings. The press has concentrated on the findings of denials of the right to vote in the South. While I think stronger legislation to protect the right to vote is, and should be, the No. 1 item on the agenda of the next session of Congress, I would like to see the North face up to its own responsibilities in civil rights—particularly in the field of housing and employment.

When the Commission selected housing as one of its three subjects some northern champions of civil rights saw in this a plot by the three southern members of the Commission to take the focus off the South and to fuzz the moral issue by showing that discrimination existed everywhere. While I do not deny that the southern members went along with our housing study partly because they thought it was good to throw some light into the dark corners outside the South, I would say that on this point I think they were right. The fact is that with nearly half of the Negro population residing outside the South the problem is now a national one. Discrimination does exist everywhere. If this is the truth, then only by facing it and acting upon it can we be free. I argued with some of my northern friends that the result of our housing study and our hearings in northern cities, of our building some moral heat on this issue outside the South, would be to increase the moral heat everywhere. But both these northern critics and I so far appear to be wrong. The focus has not been taken off the South and the moral heat in the North about its own shortcomings has not been generated because the Commission's housing study has been largely lost in the shuffle.

Speaking of moral heat closer home than Mississippi, let me mention one item in the report of the Indiana State Advisory Committee to the Commission, headed by Jack Scott, your former mayor. This Indiana committee reported that there are no Negro residents in 30 of the State's 92 counties, and that in some Indiana communities there have been signs advising "Niggers don't let the sun go down on you here." I don't know whether such signs are now in existence, but our Indiana advisory committee aptly noted that "if one cannot establish residence in one-third of the State, he cannot meet the qualifications for voting," and concluded that "in this way in parts of Indiana the Negro is being deprived of his right to vote by indirection."

But I don't want to stop with such a sour note about this State. I am well aware of

the continuing migration of Negroes to Indiana and to South Bend, and I recall the story of the Negro witness who was testifying before a congressional committee and was solemnly asked by a southern Senator: "Would you rather live in the sovereign State of Mississippi or in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?" The Negro is supposed to have answered, "I'll take Indiana."

And I might add that Indiana is now making up for the fact that its original State constitution of 1816 denied Negroes the right to vote and that its constitution of 1851 not only continued the denial, but even prohibited their migration to the State by the present more important fact that Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS is taking the leadership in the House of Representatives in the effort to enact new legislation establishipg the right to vote everywhere. Immediately after Father Hesburgh, Chairman Hannah, and Dean Johnson, the three northern members of the Commission, proposed a constitutional amendment establishing universal suffrage and prohibiting State literacy and interpretation tests through which most of the discrimination in the South takes place, Congressman BRADEMAS introduced a bill to submit this proposed constitutional amendment to the States for ratification.

So I am full of hope about the role Indiana can now play in fulfilling the American dream. Pericles told ancient Athens that it was the school of Greece. I don't want to push the comparison too far, but South Bend, like any American city that truly wishes to turn the American dream into a reality, can be a school of America. For two-thirds of the American people are now living in urban areas, and the equality of opportunity promised by the Constitution must, like charity, begin at home and in the homes of Americans. When we speak of housing we are talking about the face of America now and in the future. As Father Hesburgh said in opening our New York hearing, "That face must have the beauty and dignity and harmony of the Constitution, not the face of slums and discrimination and chaos." If this city in the crossroads of America, or any city dedicated to the unfinished work left by Lincoln, can succeed in this, then the promise of America will be nearer fulfillment; the promise that Thomas Wolfe put in these words: "to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity, to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make—this, seeker, is the promise of America."

Remarks of Congressman Robert W. Levering on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Plaque Commemorating the Anniversary of the Fall of Bataan at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Arlington, Va., April 9, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, April 9, the 18th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, an organization unique in this country, presented a beautiful plaque to the trophy room at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington, Va., in the name of the unknown among those who died in defense of freedom in the early months of World War II in the Philippines.

Present for the ceremony on behalf of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor were Kenneth Stull, national commander, John S. Koot and Joseph Vater, of the tribute committee, as well as Albert Senna, former national commander, and several other members of the organization. Col. Ismael Lapus and Lt. Alejandro Melchoir from the Philippine Embassy appeared on behalf of the Independent Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, I can attest personally to the fact that many of the defenders of Bataan and Corregidor were buried in unmarked graves during the 3½-year period our troops were confined in prisoner-of-war camps. By unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include, for the RECORD, the remarks it was my privilege to make on the occasion of the trophy presentation:

Today as we observe the 18th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, we perform a conscious act of recalling those far-off days of suffering and sacrifice. As we dedicate this plaque we pay tribute to those who did not return.

In December 1941 the ground forces available to meet the Japanese invasion of the Philippines comprised the Philippine Army, with a total strength of less than 100,000, and a U.S. Regular Army contingent of some 25,000. The Philippine Army was ill-equipped and its training was incomplete. These forces, we quickly learned, were inadequate to stop the enemy at the shoreline, and General MacArthur withdrew them into the mountainous peninsula of Bataan and to the island of Corregidor. This withdrawal was conducted with consummate skill under constant enemy attack.

The epic struggle against overwhelming odds began on December 10, 1941, when the initial Japanese amphibious landings were made on the island of Luzon. The Japanese timetable of conquest called for the overwhelming of the Philippines in 10 days. But the enemy had not anticipated the heroic resistance of the American soldiers and their Filipino comrades in arms. Actually, it was almost 120 days before the Americans and the Filipinos, too weakened to resist any longer, were forced to surrender.

Shortage of food had reduced the defenders of Bataan to less than one-fourth rations. The supply of needed clothing had long been exhausted and a large part of the troops were barefooted and clad in rags. Wounds and disease had taken their toll; less than half the men were capable of walking any distance. Those indescribably weary men still capable of action in the twilight hours of Bataan had little left with which to continue the fight other than their will and their pride. They had no antitank weapons and little or no artillery. They had only rifles and small amounts of ammunition. Four long months of bitter fighting against a well-trained and well-equipped foe, without replacements in men, equipment, or supplies, had brought them to the brink of annihilation.

April 9, 1942, when Bataan fell, was a dark day in the course of our struggle in the Pacific. But Bataan has become a word of honor and courage in the language of freedom the world over. Bataan was a valuable lesson in the relationship of free peoples. Even as this gallant band of Filipinos and Americans laid down its arms, the loyalty of the Filipinos, soldiers and civilians alike, to the cause of freedom remained steadfast.

Bataan was a military defeat, but it was a victory of the spirit—the spirit which moves men of different nationalities to fight shoulder to shoulder for their common freedom.

This plaque commemorates those men who fought as heroically and tenaciously as any military force has ever done. It commemorates especially those who did not return. Their desperate resistance, holding as they did a sizable portion of the Japanese strength at bay for so long, allowed American forces to be dispatched to Australia, New Caledonia, and other islands for the counter-offensive which began 4 months later at Guadalcanal. Nobody could have done more.

It seem to me the words of Jose Rizal, the Philippines' greatest hero, spoken on the night before his execution, are appropriate at this time. "The place matters not, cypress or laurel or lilly white, scafford or open plain, combat or martyrdom's plight."

The Milan Trade Fair—A Showcase for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, with the growing recognition in the United States of international trade fairs abroad as one of the most important showcases in which to present the story and the products of our system of free enterprise, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the opening in Italy on April 12 of the largest international agricultural, industrial and commercial fair in the world—the 38th International Milan Trade Fair.

The fairgrounds, utilizing nearly 4½ million square feet and containing 47 miles of display frontage, is situated in the center of the city of Milan, the geographical center of the European common market. From April 12 until the 27th, 13,500 exhibitors will show more than 1 million products made in 120 countries and territories in North and South America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe to the expected record attendance of 4,350,000 persons.

Among the 33 national pavilions at the fair will be those of the Soviet Union and the U.S. Government. In addition to our official exhibit, there will be exhibited independently the products of 550 large and small U.S. companies. I am informed that advance registration at the fair indicates a greater U.S. attendance than ever before because of the growing interest in our country of the needs for the enhancement of economic well-being, both here and abroad, through foreign trade and investment in all the areas of the world which are represented at the fair.

This year the permanent fairgrounds have been enlarged and five complete new international expositions have been added. A vast new agricultural pavilion, covering a total area of nearly 200,000 square feet, is bringing into one integrated exposition all exhibits related

to farm machinery and farm products of all types. In addition, the hall devoted to nuclear power applications in industry, opened last year, has been enlarged.

Exhibits at the 1960 fair will cover 120 product classifications. They will be arranged in eight main groups of displays, each one almost a complete international exposition in itself. These main sections of the fair include:

Agricultural produce and equipment; industrial and agricultural chemicals and related equipment; construction materials and machinery; manufacturing machinery, equipment and materials, and office equipment; electrical, electronic, and optical products; aircraft, marine, and automotive products, equipment, and supplies; consumer goods, including household appliances and furnishings, textiles and apparel, and sporting goods; national pavilions of the many governments officially participating, including the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Products on exhibit will range in size from housewives' needles to the largest construction and manufacturing machinery and will include light and heavy industrial and agricultural equipment and products, photographic equipment and supplies, automobiles, aircraft, boats, furniture, printing machinery, hotel supplies, oil country goods, raw materials, office supplies, nuclear power equipment, paints, toys, highway, and homebuilding machinery and materials, engineering goods, machine tools, textile machinery, foods and beverages, glassware and ceramics, plastics, refrigerating equipment, radio and television equipment, lumber products, farm machinery, motion picture equipment, livestock, pharmaceuticals and veterinary supplies, and virtually all other types of products from all parts of the world.

One of the unusual aspects of the Milan Fair is that throughout the 2 weeks' exposition, economic, technical, and trade discussions and conferences are held to enable both government officials and business executives from all over the world to meet and discuss their problems and to explore ways by which they might increase trade, commerce and investment between their countries. I commend the American businessmen who will take part in this truly fine vehicle for international collaboration and hope that their number will continue to grow.

God and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we hear that no member of certain religious faiths should become President of the United States. As you know, under the Constitution, there is no religious test for this or any other public office, and this is as it should be.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that my minister, the Reverend Kenneth R. Locke, pastor of the Western Highlands Presbyterian Church, of Kansas City, Kans., and my friend the Reverend Rice Lardner, Presbyterian minister of Olathe, Kans., are good friends of the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts. Both of these able men rebel at the thought that religion should be raised as an issue in the presidential campaign.

In the March 7 issue of Monday Morning, a magazine for Presbyterian ministers, an article appeared by the Reverend Ernest Ackerman, pastor of the First Church, Perry, Okla., entitled "Election Year Bigotry," which I believe other Members would enjoy reading and which I include in the extension of my remarks:

ELECTION YEAR BIGOTRY

I am both hurt and angry. I am simply appalled by the devious and insistent tinge of bigotry and, even worse, downright fear being evidenced by many of the brethren in this election year. Out here in the "hardshell" belt one expects to be bombarded by the prejudice and fear inherent in poorly educated groups used to clannish decisions, but to find it in our own ministry, flashing out like a licking tongue of flame intended to reduce all to the ashes of conformity, speaks ill of the guidance some of our people must be receiving. I for one raise an agonized voice in protest.

Could it be that we have forgotten the very foundations of the Presbyterianism we so vociferously proclaim? I don't need to review it. It has been reviewed many times, and we have all applauded it in principle and glowed in the power of God working through His people. "Thy will be done." Amen. "In our weakness is our strength." Amen. And as long as we had no specific fear to test it, it remained great. Apparently now that we have a fear confronting us which we may not be able to control, we repudiate it. I sorely suspect that, in many of our United Presbyterian churches, if the minister doesn't control the election of elders, the selection of teachers, the vote to build, or whether young people may dance at fellowships, the right of conscientious voice should properly be shelved temporarily, at least until we may smugly applaud it again in principle in some denominational publication.

I read recently of a translator of Scripture in Africa who could find no adequate word for "trust" in a certain dialect. A colporteur happened in and set two chairs together and proceeded to stretch out on them, saying how good it felt to "lean my whole weight on" the chairs. The translator had his word for trust. How much do we trust God, for one, and our people, in this profound sense? How far will ministers go in demonstrating by example to their flocks their trust in something we disagree with, perhaps even secretly fear?

Where is the enlightened "love God and love thy neighbor" of last year? Shall we grudgingly lift ourselves to call the Negro our brother in 1 year, but not the Roman Catholic in the next? Is it snidely righteous for one President to be photographed often with Dr. Elson and wrong for another perhaps to be photographed with Cardinal Cushing? Are not the safeguards in our American Government, in the first amendment to the Constitution and, in the extreme, of impeachment for malfeasance, as safe in the one as in the other?

In the final analysis, if our way of life is the Christ-intended way, by the living God we had better confront the test and turn to a better way. How many times have we preached on the frequency of Jesus' words, "Fear not," and their synonyms? Or on the greatest commandment? Or on the Lenten meaning of the cross? Et cetera ad infinitum? Or do our themes really conceal something like this: "Because you have neither the time nor inclination to be as intellectual as I, just believe what I tell you to believe, and fear those things I tell you to fear; love whom I say to love, and hate whom I tell you to hate." I pray that this is the absurdity that it implies.

I would like to be reassured that our Presbyterian system of today is the leader in Christian thinking in this and all other matters. My own hurts, from what I have read and heard since Senator KENNEDY announced his candidacy, will be soothed and healed by a great and ringing, far-reaching, Christian pronouncement of principle by the next general assembly.

In the meantime, my whole weight is leaning on God my Saviour. He will lead the people who are entrusted to my care into righteousness providing I guide them into leaning their whole weight on Him too.

Resolution To Abolish the Distribution Guides System in the Canton Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer and insert, together with my remarks, a resolution which was adopted unanimously by the members of Local No. 524 of Canton, Ohio, National Federation of Post Office Clerks—AFL–CIO—at their meeting of March 17, 1960.

I sincerely hope that their resolution shall have the careful study and consideration of the proper committees of Congress and of the Post Office Department.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO ABOLISH THE DISTRIBUTION GUIDES SYSTEM IN THE CANTON POST OFFICE

Whereas the Post Office Department went on record several years ago when it put into operation the work performance standards system, that they had no intention of ever measuring individual production; and

Whereas the clerks in the Canton Post Office are already overburdened with very difficult schemes which they must learn and master on their own time; and

Whereas the Canton Post Office is one of the very few post offices having the cumbersom, costly, and tedious 77-hole, wing-type combined distribution case; and

Whereas in the creatio nof this guides system, the physical condition and age of the individual clerk was not considered, thus bringing about the condition that if he could not maintain a far rate of efficiency he could be removed to a position more adaptable to his capabilities which could lead to some serious personal problems, infringing on seniority rights, preferred assignments, or possibly removal from the service; and

Whereas the distribution guides system has added to the clerk's burden with unrealistic standards set so high as to make them imposible to attain as our clerks have have already proven; and

Whereas this burden will place undue and unfair mental and physical strain on the

clerks thus creating a condition that will eventually lead to the impairment of the physical, mental health, and the well-being of the clerks; and

Whereas such a speedup system is a personal affront to the postal clerk who historically has been recognized as a most sincere and dedicated public servant; and

Whereas such a system is another step toward an unpromising and not too optimistic future for the post office clerk, a future that is completely and ruthlessly mechanized, standardized, and artificial, thus completely ignoring the value of the human factor; and

Whereas employee organizations were neither consulted nor permitted to give their opinions or suggestions, nor were they permitted to help in setting up work standards or time on each operation as is the custom and practice in private industry; and

Whereas the distribution of mail, before this distribution guides system, was handled in a very efficient manner, effecting quick dispatch, and next-day delivery. The clerical force at the Canton, Ohio, Post Office feel that this present system is just another watchdog or check on the career men who are the backbone of the postal service. This system is a throwback to the old piecework program which organize labor threw out years ago: Therefore be is

Resolved, The National Federation of Post Office Clerks (AFL–CIO) Local No. 524, Canton, Ohio, hereby goes on record as being opposed to the distribution guides system or any other system which in effect policies and is used as a psychological whip to speed up the efforts of the individual clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our contention and firm belief that the most economical and successful method of moving mail is through proper supervision; and be it further

Resolved, That we intend to seek all avenues of approach in obtaining assistance to halt this inhuman speedup system which will completely destroy the morale of faithful clerks and reduce the once proud public servants to a mere automation existing in servitude; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to W. E. Dornan, Canton postmaster, the Post Office Department, including our regional office at Cincinnati, Ohio, the Senators and Representatives from Ohio, the chairman of the two Post Office Committees in Congress, and to George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and all affiliated locals, including the Greater Canton AFL–CIO Council.

The Folly of the Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press of March 5, 1960:

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 5, 1960]

COMPULSORY MEDICAL INSURANCE FOLLY

The so-called Forand bill, which would impose compulsory medical insurance to take care of the Nation's needy elderly, stands little chance of approval in the current session of Congress.

But the bill has many supporters, particularly among elderly persons who have been deluging Members of Congress with letters and who now and in time to come will constitute a powerful political force.

The Forand bill is not wrong insofar as it epitomizes society's concern about the needy elderly. It is wrong in its arithmetic. What it proposes is to tax all and impose on all health insurance whether they want it or not, or need it or not. And then it goes on and proposes no more than a pittance for those really in need.

Among those receiving social security benefits are many who have health insurance and other ample means of paying for their medical needs. Then there are those who lack means. They constitute the problem.

Why should the Government undertake to finance the cost of medical care for all, the rich and poor? Why should the poor be taxed to pay for the poor? It's too much for too little. It's like swathing a man from head to toe in bandages to treat a puncture in his belly.

The problem of providing medical aid for the elderly is not to be gaged by the number over 65, but by the number actually in need. If all over 65 are to receive free medical care, the cost in taxes will be so high that all taxpayers will in natural course demand Government medical care, and the Nation will be saddled with socialized medicine, which would be as unsatisfactory as it would be costly.

The question of providing medical care for the elderly is a serious social problem, but it can be solved short of suffocating governmental paternalism which deprives individuals of the right to solve their own problems and gives them too little in exchange for forfeiting their economic independence.

The problem of health insurance is being solved to a substantial degree at the private level. Millions of American industrial workers are provided health insurance that will continue in force in retirement. Insurance companies are striving to formulate policies to meet medical care costs in the policyholder's later years. Individuals are seeking their own solutions.

The American people have less need of Government-supplied medical care than they have for financial honesty in Government—policies that protect the future buying power of the dollar. Deficit spending by Government, far beyond that occasioned by war or reasonable need, is to blame for the neediness of many elderly persons today.

What the Forand bill proposes would be to heap great, unnecessary burdens on the people now to relieve them of future burdens. The arithmetic is bad as anyone can well perceive with a bit of calculation. Hardship is not relieved by creating greater hardship, nor by creating excessive costs that would prevent the individual from contributing to the solution of his own problems.

Goldwater Gaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Goldwater stampede in South Carolina was given the silent treatment by the great metropolitan areas and national networks, but the truth is seeping through. It is electrifying and is giving the oppressed taxpayers hope for a presidential choice in November. The following editorial appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., one of the South's leading newspapers:

[From the Greenville News, Apr. 8, 1960]

STATE GOP ACTION MAY HAVE EFFECT

The backing given Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, by South Carolina Republicans may have more significance than the mere 13 votes the State's delegates will cast for him at the National Republican Convention this summer.

In his speech before the State GOP convention, Senator GOLDWATER made it unmistakably clear that he is a bedrock conservative. His philosophical inclination toward States rights and individual liberty is emphasized in more detail in his new book which was reviewed on this page several days ago by our Columbia correspondent, W. D. Workman, Jr.

It would be unrealistic, of course, to credit Senator GOLDWATER with much of a chance of snatching the Republican presidential nomination from Vice President NIXON. The withdrawal of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller assured the nomination for Mr. NIXON and President Eisenhower's open support of him has now made assurance doubly sure.

But the South Carolina backing may yet create an important reaction. When the Arizona Senator's name is placed in nomination, or even if it is not, things may happen.

It may be assumed that the State convention's action did not go unnoticed by Republicans in other States. Despite the fact that the left-liberal press elsewhere rather self-consciously ignored it or relegated it to some inconspicious spot, the word of this kind of thing gets around.

The only conclusion that GOP leaders can gain from it is that there is still in existence a body of opinion which strongly opposes latter-day liberalism and which sees too many of its symptoms in Mr. NIXON.

There have been several recent reports that leading Republicans, including National Chairman THRUSTON MORTON, have already divided this feeling. They have warned the Vice President and the White House that, despite some early optimism, they face a rugged campaign come next November and "me-tooism" won't win the race. The action taken in Columbia provides solid confirmation of this.

By itself, it probably would not provide enough pressure to divert Mr. NIXON from the leftward trend which he has been accused of adopting lately. But if it should inspire others to follow a similar course, an irresistible force may be set in motion.

Above all, it should be remembered that there is at this moment no leading candidate for the vice-presidential nomination. Several figures, including House Minority Leader HALLECK, of Indiana, have been mentioned, but in reality the nomination is still a wide open race.

Given vigorous backing, Senator GOLDWATER would be an almost irresistible candidate. He would be opposed by the union bosses, to be sure, but few of them attend Republican conventions and there is still no proof that they can persuade their membership to follow their dictates in the general election.

Mr. NIXON has shown signs of making that fatal error of supposing that he can afford to ignore his friends and placate his enemies. One way to avoid this, or at least to minimize it, would be to place a solid conservative on the ticket with him. For that role few men are better suited than Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Address by Nathan Straus on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the American people would be happy indeed to see Germany become a truly democratic country. The fact, however, that men who were openly associated with Hitler during World War II and who played a prominent role as Nazis are still in power today, arouses considerable doubt in our minds whether the new Germany is really on the road to democracy.

The visit to this country by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer last month brought this matter to the fore again. The recent wave of swastika smearings on synagogues, churches, community centers and other public edifices, which was started on Christmas Eve in Cologne, Germany, also raised much doubt as to the extent of real democracy in Germany and, in particular, the effect of German education in conveying to German youth the truth about Hitler and the Nazi regime.

These problems are being seriously discussed in the American press, on radio and television, and other forums of public opinion. A noteworthy contribution toward this discussion was made recently by Mr. Nathan Straus, who delivered a very interesting address over radio station WMCA in New York on April 1, 1960.

Mr. Straus is a well-known benefactor and philanthropist in New York. He is one of our leading citizens, a public-spirited person, and a man whose views and opinions are highly regarded by the people of New York. His address, entitled "Watch on the Rhine," has aroused much interest and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the address by Mr. Straus which is as follows:

WATCH ON THE RHINE
(By Nathan Straus)

When Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Premier David Ben-Gurion issue a statement expressing agreement in their views, it is indeed news. Dr. Adenauer said he had been "deeply moved" and added, "The German people draw a deep satisfaction from the fact that through restitution to victims of nazism a contribution was made toward the process of rehabilitation in Israel." Premier Ben-Gurion said: "We remember the past not in order to brood upon it, but in order that it shall never reoccur. The Germany of today is not the Germany of yesterday. After having met with the Chancellor I am sure that the judgment is correct."

While WMCA does not venture to disagree with the interpretation of conditions in present-day Germany by the Israeli Premier and the German Chancellor, we herewith present some facts, facts that have been verified, facts that do not seem to justify the rosy picture thus portrayed of Germany today.

Has there been a fundamental change in Germany from the sadistic days of Adolph Hitler? Has Germany become a truly democratic country with an appreciation of the horrors of Hitlerism? Are the men now in power new men? Are the facts of the leaders of Germany today new faces, men uncontaminated with the deeds of the Hitler era?

Here are the facts:

Hans Globke was the author of the Nazi regulations which decreed that being a Jew was a crime. He was responsible for affixing the letter "J" to passports of Jewish citizens of Germany to prevent them from escaping from Germany and thus escaping the Hitler gas chambers. He is remembered as the man who once remarked of the cases with which he dealt: "They (the Jews) should have chosen their parents more carefully." This man, Hans Globke, is now, at this very moment, state secretary in the Adenauer government, the man responsible for the appointment of the top people in the civil service.

Theodor Oberlaender was an officer in Hitler's brown-shirted storm troops. He participated in Hitler's first putsch in 1923 and he became a member of the Nazi Party with membership card No. 2,331,552. Is he now in jail. He is not. He is, instead, Cabinet Minister for Refugee Affairs in the present German Government.

Like Herr Oberlaender, Gerhard Schroeder was also a member of Hitler's brown-shirted storm troops. He was a member of the Nazi Party as early as 1933 and he bears his share of guilt for the crimes of the Third Reich. What price did he pay? He is today Minister of the Interior in the present German Government.

What of the men of riches and power in the Hitler era? Who were they then and who are they now?

Friedrich Flick was described in 1946 by the U.S. authorities as head of a $400 million industrial combine and the greatest single power behind the Nazi war machine. In 1947 the U.S. War Crimes Commission convicted and sentenced Flick to 7 years in prison. But after serving only 3 years of his sentence, Flick was released. Who and what is he today? Friedrich Flick is said to be the richest man in Germany. He has been described in German newspapers as the colossus of the Ruhr industries. He is a controlling figure in industries turning out airplanes, paper, chemicals, and plastics, as well as operating Daimler-Benz, one of Europe's largest car producers.

Alfred Krupp, bearer of one of Germany's most notorious names, a name known as a family of makers of munitions, the Krupp industries, assisted his father, Gustav Krupp, in arming the Nazi war machine. Alfred Krupp was branded as a war criminal and sentenced by the U. S. War Crimes Commission in 1948 to a 12-year prison term. But he was released after 2½ years. Since then, with the aid of the American Government, he has become the dominant figure in a giant integrated operation encompassing everything from coal and iron mines to machine plants.

The magazine Business Week has commented: "The trend in the steel industry brings back memories of big business and Hitler's Third Reich." And Fortune magazine noted that the Krupp industries had actively and flagrantly supported the Fuehrer, and adds "The ruler of Krupp accepted all the medals the Nazis pinned on him."

Joseph Neckermann is described in a recent issue of Time magazine as "The mail-order king—hard-eyed, aggressive Joseph Neckermann, 47, founder and sole owner of the company." How did Herr Neckermann rise to wealth and power? In the words of Time magazine:

"In Berlin as throughout Germany, hundreds of Jewish businessmen were being persecuted by the Nazis, forced to sell their businesses at ridiculously low prices to get enough cash to flee Germany."

Neckermann, who normally would have been in the armed forces, had been excused from military duty when World War II began, as a big supplier to the military and, according to Time, "he became a Nazi well connected in party circles." For this he was sentenced by the American authorities to a term in prison, but because of the alleged reason that he had contracted tuberculosis, he was soon released.

Herman Abs was one of the leading financiers who supported the Hitler war machine. A U.S. military government report in 1946 commented: "Abs was the guiding spirit of the vicious Deutsche Bank, which combined an unusual concentration of economic power with active participation in the criminal policies of the Nazi regime." Herman Abs was on the United Nations war crimes list. He was, however, never tried in person for his deeds. He was sentenced in absentia by a Yugoslav court to 15 years of forced labor for war crimes.

Herman Abs is again today ruler of the Deutsche Bank, one of the largest financial institutions in West Germany. He is also chairman or director of over 30 important companies in West Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, and the United States.

Additional evidence of the power, in industrial life and in political life of Germany today could be shown. But perhaps the fact that today the richest man in Germany, the steel industry king in Germany, the mail order king, the man who dominates part of Germany's growing financial power, the state secretary and the Cabinet Minister for Refugees were all prominent Nazis—some of them sentenced to prison by the American War Crimes Commission—is enough to show the caliber of the men who exemplify the so-called new and democratic Germany.

Now let us look at the education of the German youth in the new and democratic Germany.

Not only is industrial life and government dominated by former Nazis, but so is the educational system.

German textbooks in use today do not include much information about Hitler or about the crimes of the Nazis or the hideous record of the extermination camps: Dachau, Buchenwald, Auschwitz, and Belsen.

The textbook in history used in the German "Volkshule" (elementary schools), which every child is supposed to attend, contains exactly one paragraph about the Hitler regime. It is devoted chiefly to deploring the fact that Hitler's policies resulted in the military destruction of Germany. It says that and no more.

In higher education the same conditions exist.

The textbook used in the "gymnasium," corresponding roughly to our last 2 years of high school and freshman year in college, contains only three pages of reference to the Nazi era. These pages consist of a characterization of the era as one marred by dictatorship in many countries, including Russia, Italy, and Germany. This textbook states only that dictatorship proved a bad thing for each of the countries and that each of the dictators was overthrown by the people of his own country. There is no further reference to Hitler or his rule, no mention of the deeds of the man responsible for the murder and torture of millions.

As a corollary to this record of Germany today, it is not surprising to read in a recent issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun of a Canadian Jew's charges that he was beaten up by a German for calling Hitler a "scoundrel and a criminal." The incident is related in the following words:

"Chaim Kuflik, 57, a small gray-haired Polish-born Canadian Jew from Toronto, said the incident took place in a Frankfurt restaurant where a tall blond German started to talk to him.

Mr. Kuflik said when he praised Chancellor Konrad Adenauer as a 'real great statesman,' the German retorted: "There has only been one great German and that was Adolph Hitler.' Mr. Kuflik, whose father, brother, wife, and child were killed by the Nazis in Poland, replied he thought Hitler was a 'scoundrel and a criminal.' The German assaulted him and mauled him badly. • • • Two police officers who arrived after the German had left by the back door told Mr. Kuflik it was his own fault that he was beaten up."

Let us now recall, aware of these facts, the recent declaration of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion when he met with Chancellor Adenauer: "We remember the past not in order to brood upon it, but in order that it shall never reoccur."

It would seem from the facts recited here that the "past" is still the present. The danger which once flamed into genocide is still alive in Germany today, in the bodies and the minds of the men who helped to create the "hell" of World War II. These same men are the leaders of Germany in 1960.

Teaching Space-Age Science to Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as an example of what my alert and dedicated constituents are doing back in the Second Congressional District of Illinois to keep strong our country I am extending my remarks to include an article by Dr. William I. Harber in the February 1960 issue of the Chicago Schools Journal. The message of Dr. Harber is of importance to the thinking men of America, especially at this time when science teaching is so important to national defense. Dr. Harber's article follows:

TEACHING SPACE-AGE SCIENCE TO CHILDREN—IS THE CONTENT OF OUR SCIENCE COURSES UP TO DATE?

(By William I. Harber)

In a short monograph, "Man in Space: A Tool and Program for the Study of Social Change"[1] there is a contribution by Lawrence K. Frank entitled "Cultural Implications of Man in Space." Mr. Frank says, among other things, "Ordinarily the teaching of physics, chemistry and mathematics is limited to the classic framework, the ideas developed prior to 1900, with the result that the younger members of society learn of the new climate of opinion from comics, science fiction, TV, movies and other informal sources." He goes on to say that "an introduction to MIS (man in space) may be more feasible in nursery school than in elementary grades."

My first reaction on reading this statement was that Mr. Frank was pulling the reader's leg. But after a careful rereading I began to sense his meaning.

As a teacher of physical science in the junior college, I had been puzzled from time to time by the following phenomenon. Affable students would bring articles and clippings on scientific matters to my desk and leave them with the earnest suggestion that I read them. Even though I had frequently seen or read the particular item a student brought, I thanked each student warmly for his thoughtfulness.

STUDENTS INTERESTED IN RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

What I didn't understand for some time, longer than I care to admit, was why such bearers of reading material were so obviously trying not to give offense as they laid the magazine or clipping down. I think, in part, they were trying to bring me up to date on some topics, so that I wouldn't be so far behind the times when the next semester came around.

At the same time they were considerately trying to avoid any suggestion, other than the implied one, that their teacher was unfamiliar with 20th century developments in science. It is a tribute to their scientific acumen that such a judgment was amply supported by the only evidence upon which a hypothesis could be formulated—the content of their course—and a tribute to their human acumen that they realized that, although the poor fellow obviously needed help, it would be best to render it diffidently and as if by accident, lest his pride be wounded.

DO STUDENTS KNOW THE EARTH IS ROUND?

Let us take a look at one of the major areas we cover in our physical science survey course—astronomy. During the last decade that I have taught this subject, I have started out with this bombshell: "Is the earth really round?" The syllabus which I have used for the course furnishes such exciting bits of information as the fact that ships disappear over the horizon bottom first and the fact that you see more the higher up you go.

While I am explaining to the class how back in B.C. old Eratosthenes figured out the circumference of the earth in "stadia," my audience is quietly dividing up into two major camps: (1) those students who knew that this had to be a dull course, else why would it be required, and (2) those students who are wondering whether their teacher is an unreconstructed birdwatcher who has been impressed into the teaching of physical science because of the shortage of scientists. It is the students in this latter group who, I believe, begin to feel sorry for the instructor, and commence to slip him hot items in the sciences from press and periodical.

COLLEGE COURSES INCLUDE 20TH CENTURY CONCEPTS

I am happy to say that in recent years college instructors, aware of the inadequacy of the Newton-Galileo kind of course for present-day science, are contemplating revamping some of their course content. The new texts deal at length with 20th century developments. At least, if such a text were employed together with lecture-demonstrations which took cognizance of more than the most traditional and elementary physical concepts, students would not feel it incumbent upon them to bring me articles on solar batteries after a discussion on the voltaic cell, clippings on solar furnaces after a lecture on the steam engine, and items on radio telescopes after examining and discussing the operation of the crystal set.

But this is science at the college level. How does it fare in the high schools? Examination of the equipment catalogs shows that the laboratory supply houses are still vending the same apparatus that was in use 25 years ago. In fact, since the equipment is sturdily built, much of it in use is 25 years old. Physics teachers are famous for the extreme care with which they handle and maintain their equipment. The result is that many laboratories are well stocked with equipment designed to teach a science which has experienced only a small portion of the impact of 20th century theory and experiment, and only partially or not at all supplied with equipment for demonstrating or experimenting with post-Newtonian concepts.

What do the experiments largely center around? Usually they deal with the great classic works of the 17th and 18th centuries. Not that Galileo's gravitational constant and Archimedes' principle are unimportant, but where do such limitations leave the student? Mainly, he comes to rest at the beginning of the 20th century, when Messrs. Planck, Einstein, and Bohr began to take up the slack in the physical sciences and created a new approach to time, matter, and space.

"CLASSICAL" APPROACHES MAY DIMINISH ENTHUSIASM

The preceding comments are not at all intended to denigrate the high school physics teacher. He is no more nor less the victim of the cultural lag which has weakened science instruction than is the college teacher. One of the first experiments in many college physics courses is designed to teach the student to use measuring instruments such as calipers and micrometers. Such an approach to the thrilling and compelling world of time, space, and matter not only makes the student's entry into that world dull, plodding, and perhaps distasteful, but does not even concede that an 18 year old can measure. This conviction that 18 year olds can't measure is frequently shared by college chemistry courses. The college chemistry student sometimes—you may not believe this—also starts the course with an experiment in measuring but on an even cruder scale. The student works with a meter stick.

If the student had some idea before he came to college that he was capable of measuring objects or spaces, he is soon disburdened of this belief.

IS ELEMENTARY SCIENCE UP TO DATE?

Much of the kind of procedure for instruction in science which I have so far described is, fortunately, in the process of disappearing from high school and college classrooms. But a peculiar problem faces the college teacher and frequently the high school teacher. This is the fact that elementary school science instruction, insofar as it deals with the physical sciences, tends to approach them largely in the classical manner.

[1] Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol. 72 (New York, 1958), pp. 165–214.

A first reaction to the suggestion that it would be appropriate in the elementary school to talk about mass-energy relationships, curved space, and the expanding universe might well be one of angry rejection or at least of extreme doubt. Is it really possible to utilize all we know about the physical world in teaching elementary science? The answer is of course it is. The view of the world which is implicit in pre-20th century science is no less strange to the young child than the view which recent scientific developments demonstrate to be more accurate. Young children adopt new frames of reference much more readily than do older ones.

If, in the elementary grades, the child is exposed only or even mainly to the classical kind of science, he will have to wait until high school to transcend the limitations of the prequantum picture of the world. If we serve him the classical approach in high school, then it is left to the college to reorient him.

WE MUST START SPACE SCIENCE EARLY

In general, the longer the child lives with the classical view, the more difficult it becomes for him to make any change. College teachers frequently wonder why students don't become excited by new ideas which are presented in the college classroom. The answer is that the students figure that, if they have gotten along this well with, for example, a classical science framework, why throw it aside for views and insights which are much more complicated and not at first glance obviously more rewarding? At 18, a student has the world and its inhabitants pretty well figured out.

I think that Mr. Frank is right. We cannot begin too soon to deal with and teach science of the space age. We cannot go quite so far back to begin as Mr. Frank suggests, since the Chicago school system, for better or for worse, has no nursery schools. But we can, and I think we should, begin as early as we are able to teach our students a science which deals with mass-energy relationships instead of inclined planes, with curved space instead of pinholes in black construction paper, and with an expanding universe instead of a round world. These students live in a world in which astronauts are training for other worlds. We should not circumscribe them within the narrower horizons of our own childhood.

"Since science is knowledge and understanding of nature, it is an essential part of our total knowledge and therefore claims an important place in our general education. We cannot all be scientists, nor should we want to be; but we may, at least, develop an appreciation of science, just as we do of music or the arts, through some knowledge of its facts, objectives, and methods"—(Paul E. Klopsteg).

Country Elevators Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, after the announcement of a proposed cut in storage rates and handling charges on Government-owned grain, I received heavy mail from the country grain elevators in North Dakota protesting such cut.

Since the matter appeared to seriously affect the legitimate interest of those elevators, I called a factfinding meeting at Bismarck, N. Dak., on April 6, upon notice to all interested parties including the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, and the Farmers Grain Dealers Association. More than 400 persons, representing farmers' elevators, cooperative elevators, and privately owned elevators, from all corners of the State, appeared and testified against the proposed cut, citing among other things their increased costs, lack of a storage cost analysis, high cost of construction in the area, and the arbitrary action of the Department of Agriculture.

It was the unanimous opinion of the meeting that the uniform storage contracts now in effect be continued for 1 year in order to provide time within which to study and negotiate any needed changes. The following resolution was adopted without a single dissenting vote. Names of the elevators represented are appended hereto. Copies of the resolution, the names of the sponsors, and statements received at the meeting are today being delivered to the Department of Agriculture and the House Committee on Agriculture.

The resolution and list of elevators represented are as follows:

It is the consensus of this meeting of farmers, elevator managers, directors, and elevator owners, meeting at Bismarck, N. Dak. Wednesday, April 6, 1960, that:

1. The average cost of operating primary elevators throughout North Dakota exceed the proposed payment-formula recently announced by the Department of Agriculture.

2. The proposed new rate structure for Government-stored grain at local elevators was arbitrarily arrived at by the Department and made public without permitting the country elevator trade an opportunity of hearing; and

3. This right to be heard, we feel should not be arbitrarily abrogated inasmuch as the news stories emanating from a congressional committee investigation of Commodity Credit Corporation's operations, have led the public to believe that exorbitant profits have accrued to the trade in general by reason of long-established grain storage rates. Such fixed conclusions, either by the Department or by the public, do not conform to the facts. There is no instance on record where any local elevator has abused or unduly profited from the established grain storage policy.

Further, since the congressional committee is still investigating the grain storage rate problem, it is our recommendation that USDA immediately rescind its announced action and extend the established rate agreements until (1) the committee has completed its findings and submitted a report with its recommendations, and (2) consider the reports and findings of operators and owners throughout the country as evidenced by this meeting.

It is the judgment of the group that we recommend a 1-year moratorium on the announced arbitrary rates and on any proposed change in the present uniform storage agreement.

LIST OF ELEVATORS REPRESENTED

Equity Elevator, Adrian, N. Dak.
Amenia Seed & Grain Co., Amenia, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Agate, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Alexander, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Association, Alfred, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Ayr, N. Dak.
Peavy Elevator Co., Arena, N. Dak.
Grain & Stock Exchange, Barlow, N. Dak.
Farmers Grain Co., Blanchard, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Bowman, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Baldwin, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Berthold, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Bismarck, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator, Baker, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator Association, Bisbee, N. Dak.
GTA, Breien, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Burnstad, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., Buchanan, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Bottineau, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Berea, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Blabon, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op, Clementsville, N. Dak.
Linderman Bros., Carrington, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Crary, N. Dak.
Casselton Elevator Co., Casselton, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Carson, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Cooperstown, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Coleharbor, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Charbonneau, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Churchs Ferry, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Cartwright, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Corinth, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Association, Center, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Crosby, N. Dak.
Co-op Grain Co., Cogswell, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op, Cleveland, N. Dak.
Don Nicolson Elevator Co., Carrington, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Crocus, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Association, Dazey, N. Dak.
Rohrville Farmers Union Elevator, Devils Lake, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Devils Lake, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Dodge, N. Dak.
Co-op Elevator Association, Durbin, N. Dak.
Glen J. Larson Elevator, Douglas, N. Dak.
Dwight Seed & Grain Co., Dwight, N. Dak.
Osborne McMillan Elevator Co., Dickinson, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Cooperative Elevator, Dickinson, N. Dak.
Producers Marketing Co., Embden and Cayuga, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator, Eldridge, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., Edgeley, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Edmunds, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Elgin, N. Dak.
Farmers Shipping & Supply Co., Edmore, N. Dak.
Esmond Equity & Trading Co., Esmond, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., Epping, N. Dak.
Co-op Association, Fessenden, N. Dak.
Osborne McMillan Elevator Co., Fullerton, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Finley, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Fairdale, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Forman, N. Dak.

Farmers Union Elevator, Flasher, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Garrison, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Gardner, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Garske, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Geneseo, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Galchutt, N. Dak.
Birdsall Grain Co., Gladstone, N. Dak.
Jacques Seed Co., Glen Ullin, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Glenburn, N. Dak.
Swendseid Company, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
R. F. Gunkelman & Sons, Grandin, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Gladstone, N. Dak.
Glen Ullin Roller Mills, Glen Ullin, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Hazen, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Hartland, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Hope, N. Dak.
Equity Union Exchange, Haynes, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator Co., Harlow, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Harvey, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Hansboro, N. Dak.
Co-op Equity Exchange, Hettinger, N. Dak.
Nelson Grain Co., Hamlet, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Hazelton, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Hatton, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Halliday, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Hamberg, N. Dak.
Jamestown Terminal Elevator, Jamestown, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Jud, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Kenaston, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Knox, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Kulm, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator, Kintyre, N. Dak.
Farmers Mutual Elevator Co., Kathryn, N. Dak.
Equity Elevator Co., Kramer, N. Dak.
Equity Elevator Co., Killdeer, N. Dak.
GTA, Linton, N. Dak.
Equity Exchange, Lemmon, S. Dak.
GTA, Lidgerwood, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Lansford, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., LaMoure, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator, Leeds, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Leeds, N. Dak.
GTA, Lignite, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Lankin N. Dak.
Farmers Exchange, Leal, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Lunds Valley, N. Dak.
Osborne McMillan Elevator Co., Minot, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Mayville, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Manfred, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Mohall, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Mohall, N. Dak.
GTA, Moorhead, Minn.
Farmers Union Elevator, Minnewaukan, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Minot, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Association, Mandan, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator & Merc. Co., Moffet, N. Dak.
Cargill, Inc., Minot, N. Dak.
Bowdon Grain Co., McLaughlin, S. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Mayville, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Maddock, N. Dak.
Equity Elevator, Munster, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., New Salem, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator Co., Niobe, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Napoleon, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, New Rockford, N. Dak.
Co-op Elevator, Niagara, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, New Town, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator, Oberon, N. Dak.
Norway Spur Grain Co., Oakes, N. Dak.
Pickardville Grain Co., Pickardville, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Park River, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Palermo, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Elevator Co., Parshall, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Portland, N. Dak.
Co-op Elevator Co., Pekin, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Association, Perth, N. Dak.
Co-op Equity Exchange, Regent, N. Dak.
Co-op Elevator Co., Rawson, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op, Regan, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Association, Rock Lake, N. Dak.
Equity, Reeder, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Ryder, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator, Ray, N. Dak.
Co-op Elevator, Richardton, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op, Rutland, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Ross, N. Dak.
Farmers Grain Co., Rolla, N. Dak.
Farmers Equity Elevator Co., Sterling, N. Dak.
Farmers Union, Simcoe, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Starkweather, N. Dak.
Farmers Grain Co., Sheyenne, N. Dak.
Equity Exchange, Solen, N. Dak.
Scranton Grain Co., Scranton, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Shepard, N. Dak.
Equity Exchange Elevator, Scranton, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Sykeston, N. Dak.
GTA, Strasburg, N. Dak.
Equity Co-op Elevator Co., Sheyenne, N. Dak.
GTA, Selfridge, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Elevator, Sharon, N. Dak.
Stanton Grain Co., Stanton, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., Sutton, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Steele, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Solen, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Sentinel Butte, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator Co., Trenton, N. Dak.
Farmers Grain Co., Tioga, N. Dak.
Farmers Cooperative Association, Thunder Hawk, S. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Tioga, N. Dak.
Peavey Elevator, Underwood, N. Dak.
Hi Line Farmers Union Grain Co., Valley City, N. Dak.
Farmers Elevator, Willow City, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Grain Co., Wheatland, N. Dak.
Still Grain Co., Wilton, N. Dak.
Wilton Feed Mill, Wilton, N. Dak.
Merle A. Larson, Inc., Washburn, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Association, Williston, N. Dak.
City Elevator, Inc., Williston, N. Dak.
Farmers Co-op Association, Wing, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Wilton, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Webster, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Elevator Co., Walhalla, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, Williston, N. Dak.
Farmers Union GTA, White Earth, N. Dak.
C. J. Thoreson Elevator, York, N. Dak.
Farmers Union Co-op Association, Zeeland, N. Dak.

Your Congressman: What Do You Know About Him?—What Does He Know About You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Bertram Enterprise is a very fine weekly published in Bertram, Burnet County, Tex., and the publisher and editor is Mr. N. Oliver Cox.

In the issue of Thursday, April 7, 1960, appeared a splendid article discussing the need of a Member to hear from his constituents and giving suggestions on what should be contained in a letter written to a Member of Congress. The article is as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN: WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT HIM?—WHAT DOES HE KNOW ABOUT YOU?

Your spokesman in Congress, your representatives, are the two Senators from your State and the Representatives from your congressional district. This is true regardless of whether the incumbent office holder represents the political party to which you belong or an opposing political party. Once Senators or Representatives have been elected they represent all the people of their State or their district no matter which party you are affiliated with.

Your spokesman in the National Government cannot do a good job of representing you unless they know and understand your views and you, in turn understand their problems. They need and want the opinions of all their constituents—if they can get them—regardless of party affiliations.

WHAT TO WRITE ABOUT

It must be remembered that a Congressman's first obligation is to his constituents. His big problem is to get reelected, and much of his time is taken up with satisfying the demands of those who have sent him to Washington. Their views are always given first place in his thoughts. Accurate and useful information sent to him by a voter in his district is always appreciated. He welcomes hearing from "back home" because it shows him the people know he is alive and are interested in what he is doing. Until we realize our representatives in Congress want and welcome our views and we take the trouble to communicate frequently, our relations in Washington will not be what they should—or ought to be. Remember, you don't have to wait until you have a complaint to write to your Senators and Representatives. They're human, too, and a pat on the back is appreciated by them as it is by you, and a slap in the face arouses their anger as readily as yours. Don't gripe—write.

TEN TIPS ON WRITING YOUR CONGRESSMAN

1. Keep your letters as brief as possible.
2. Tell the essentials about yourself or your business.

3. Be forthright: If you're for something, say so. Don't beat around the bush.

4. Avoid emotion: Prove your case with facts and figures.

5. Be reasonable: Seek only possible things.

6. Speak for yourself: Use your own stationery and letter style.

7. Be courteous: Compliment on a good vote, and recognize his staff, too.

8. Request action: Your man is elected to do something.

9. Ask for a answer: You've told him where you stand. Ask him where he stands.

10. Don't stop with one letter. Keep your Congressman informed of your views on all important legislation.

Address Before the National Association of Broadcasters, Chicago, Ill., April 5, 1960, by Frederick W. Ford, Chairman Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an important address by Frederick W. Ford, the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, on the subject of the broadcasters responsibility to the public.

As radio and TV commentator, John Crosby pointed out in a syndicated article on April 11, the chief value of Chairman Ford's speech is that the remarks are self-evident truths, namely, that broadcasters have obligations which cannot be sidetracked by or subordinated to the business aspects.

The address follows:

The Federal Communications Commission is now beginning its second 25 years under the Communications Act of 1934. Consider that in those first 25 years the number of broadcast receivers has soared from 18½ million to about 200 million of which 150 million are radio sets and 50 million are television sets—that almost two-thirds of the world's total are in the United States—that from 600 stations (all AM) in 1934, we now have almost 5,000 operating broadcast stations of which 3,500 are AM, 858 FM, and 566 TV.

Yet, while it is true that all who have participated can point to these figures with justifiable pride in the accomplishment of this phenomenal growth and development of radio broadcast communication since the Commission was established in 1934, it is also true that never before in history has the Commission or the industry been beset with so many thorny and knotty problems as are with us today.

It is my purpose here, today, to talk with you about some of the measures we in Government feel are required to meet these problems and at the same time indicate to you those areas where industry self-discipline and regulation is the proper solution. Our objective is a common one—namely, that radio and television can go forward to achieve the full measure of its possibilities for service to the entire public of the United States.

In general, when the Commission is faced with a problem indicating the need for corrective action, the fundamental question in my mind is not whether the Commission has the authority to take corrective action, but it is to determine precisely what remedy is required and whether it is the Commission's responsibility to apply that remedy. If it should then appear that further statutory authority is needed before the remedy is applied, it becomes the Commission's obligation to inform the Congress of that fact and propose the necessary legislation.

We can all agree on the principle that the least government is the best government, or in more modern terms, that the least regulation is the best regulation. The Congress, however, in enacting and amending our statute from time to time, has made the determination of the extent of regulation which it considers necessary. And within the framework of that statute, it has given the Commission broad powers to administer it. It is the Commission's obligation, therefore, to administer the statute as faithfully as possible and to seek its amendment when in the Commission's judgment that course becomes necessary.

It would be impossible to discuss adequately the many problems which confronted me when I became the Chairman of the Commission a little more than 3 weeks ago and assumed the statutory responsibility "to coordinate and organize the work of the Commission in such manner as to promote prompt and efficient disposition of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission." Instead, therefore, I would like to discuss with you some of the matters facing the Commission relating to programing.

Events of the past year or so have sharply pointed up the need for greater licensee responsibility to insure that stations are operated in the public interest. The four areas in which this problem has been most frequently mentioned are (1) fixed quiz shows, (2) payola, (3) excessive violence, and (4) obligation to meet local community needs.

When the full facts became known with respect to the deceptive practices employed in certain quiz shows, the industry acted promptly in taking these shows off the air and establishing more effective internal controls to prevent their reoccurrence. This prompt action is to be commended. But the Commission nevertheless believed that, in order to avoid a repetition of such a fraud on the public, whether through negligence or willfulness, it was necessary to propose rules which will require that in any program involving intellectual skill or knowledge where the result has been predetermined, the public shall be informed of that fact and of the nature of the assistance rendered. In addition, we have prepared for submission to the Congress a proposed statute which will hold persons outside the jurisdiction of the Commission criminally responsible for any deceptions of this nature. There have been bills along this line already introduced in the House of Representatives.

We expect measures of this nature to become effective in the near future. I am sure it is everyone's wish that the situation will not arise requiring their application, but if it does, it will be met with swift action since deceptions of this nature are wrong and indefensible. It is my earnest hope that the industry's initiative in removing such programs from the air has already ripened into a determined persistence to insure that programs involving deceptions of this nature never go out over the air again.

With the thought in mind that you might have more than a passing interest in the Commission's public notice of March 16, 1960, dealing with the requirements of section 317 of the Communications Act with respect to sponsorship identification, I would like to spend a few moments on this subject.

The first duty of the Commission with respect to the matter of payola was to determine the extent of this pratcice in the industry. As you know, this was accomplished by our letter of December 2, 1959 requiring each station in the country to answer a questionnaire under oath. A preliminary tabulation of the replies has been made an submitted to the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees. The results of that tabulation show that:

Two thousand seven hundred and fifty-seven stations (59 percent of the total on the air) stated in effect that no payola in any form was found in connection with the station's operation.

Four hundred and forty-seven stations (9.5 percent of the total) stated that there were instances in which consideration other than cash was received by the station and/or its employees in connection with the broadcast of certain matter without the required announcement being made.

Fifty stations (1 percent of the total) stated that there were instances in which cash had been received by a station employee as consideration and there was no announcement of sponsorship.

Eighteen stations (four-tenths of 1 percent) indicated that there were instances where the station itself had received cash as consideration and failed to announce sponsorship.

The remainder, 1,374 stations (29 percent of the total) replied that only free records were furnished to the station and that these were played without announcing by whom they were furnished.

Thus, 4,131 or 88 percent of the radio and television stations on the air stated in effect that they either received no payola or it was limited to free records which were not announced at the time they were played on the air as being furnished. This leaves 515, or 11 percent of the stations on the air, in which the station or its employees had received cash or other consideration for broadcasting material without the required announcement having been made.

In order to remove all doubts as to the licensee's obligation in this area, we have issued a notice of a proposed rule which will require each station to establish reasonable internal procedures to assure itself that the statutory requirement of an announcement that all matter paid for or furnished shall be made at the time it is broadcast is being observed. We have also drafted legislation for submission to Congress to include other persons as well as the station owner in this requirement so that it will be applicable to stations and employees alike.

The replies to our inquiry of December 2, 1959, totaled between 7,500–8,000 separate documents. On January 21, 1960, we made public our intention to consider these replies in connection with the processing of broadcast applications. As a result, by March 16, 1960, the date of our public notice on sponsorship identification, there had piled up over 400 applications which could not be acted on until determinations had

been reached with respect to the matters set forth in the stations' replies. In the meantime, we had received numerous requests for definitive rulings on the requirements of section 317.

Our public notice of March 16 was designed (1) to apprise broadcasters of the Commission's views with respect to past practices; (2) to serve as a guide for future operations; (3) to permit action on hundreds of pending applications. We were not unmindful of the many problems with which broadcasters would be confronted as a result of our interpretation of the law. Since March 16, a few more have been called to our attention. In addition, we have received requests by interested parties seeking formal opportunity to submit comments on our interpretations.

The Commission believes that it would be appropriate to provide a forum for the expression of views with respect to the Commission's Notice of March 16. As you know, this was done last week when the Commission issued its Notice of Inquiry providing for the submission of comments, briefs and memoranda of law by interested parties. Our public notice is now open to comment by interested parties, and you may be assured that these comments will receive consideration.

In full recognition of the basic concept that it is the licensee's responsibility to select program material for broadcast in the public interest, I hesitate to speak to broadcasters about program content. I share with you the belief that neither the Commission, the Congress nor the public wants anyone in Government to dictate what should or should not be broadcast. Public comment and complaints about excessive violence have, however, reached such proportions that I feel compelled to mention it to you today.

A number of witnesses in the Commission's recent hearings on programing testified that in their opinion, action looking toward a solution to this problem was of the utmost urgency. Time will not permit even a summary of all such testimony but I would like to quote from one:

"In the fertile minds of children are implanted the seeds of violence, trickery, and corruption and the idea that as long as justice triumphs in the end, the means used to attain it matters little, if at all. Surely to present a preponderance of crime and saccharine superficiality is to distort reality and truth."

That statement was given to the Commission on behalf of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, an organization of nearly 12 million parents, teachers, and other citizens organized in more than 45,000 PTA's across the country. This is a formidable group.

In his remarks to the opening session of the White House Conference on Children and Youth last week, the President of the United States stated:

"You are working with the most precious resource of our Nation; a whole generation of Americans who will someday make their country's policies and dispose of its great power. The very life of America depends upon the wisdom and resourcefulness which they bring to the basic problems with which they will then be confronted. And the responsibility for their early preparation belongs to the older citizen, not the younger one."

Now I am aware of the efforts of the television broadcasters to be constantly alert to potential harmful effects of the medium and to be responsive to constructive criticism, and that is why I am raising the question with you because you, yourselves, have faced this issue squarely in the television code. I quote from the preamble:

"Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children."

When I consider the attraction that the television set has for the children and youth of this country, I cannot help but feel that all that needs to be done in this area is not being done—in short, is television's responsibility toward children being met?

It is not merely a question of whether there is too much of this type or that type of program or advertising matter. Rather, it is the question of whether this industry will measure up to its self-imposed responsibilities with respect to the advancement of education, religion, and culture, the provision of wholesome entertainment, its special responsibility toward children, decency and decorum in production, its unique position as a vehicle for community affairs and in its factual, fair and unbiased treatment of news, public events, and controversial issues.

It is the earnest hope of all concerned that improvement in these matters can be accomplished by voluntary adherence to the television code by all stations rather than risk the imposition of restrictive measures which can only result in destroying originality and initiative.

It is axiomatic that the broadcaster's success hinges on his ability to get people to tune to his station. To do this, he must offer a program schedule which appeals to the listener or viewer. Only in this way is the advertiser attracted to his station. There is no doubt that the average station operation has to be viewed this way from the dollar-and-cents point of view. In this respect, the broadcaster is a businessman like the theater owner or newspaper publisher.

But, and this is a big "but," the law demands of the broadcaster that his operation be responsive to the public interests. There are imposed certain obligations which cannot be sidetracked by, or subordinated to, the business aspects. It is a task which requires thought, perseverance, and considered judgment.

The Commission was created by Congress to insure that the obligations of the licensees are met. The Commission is required by law to review the broadcaster's performance at least every 3 years, not to determine whether he has made a profit, but to see whether he has faithfully carried out his obligations to operate in the public interest.

What are some of these obligations specifically? First, of course, is the obligation to determine what the needs of his public are. Requests for time by local groups to bring matters of importance to the attention of the community are certainly indications of public need. The broadcaster is charged with responding sympathetically to such requests and to make available a reasonable amount of broadcast time for these purposes. I fail to see how an operation can be in the interest of the public when such requests for time are consistently ignored or turned down because of disruption to the commercial schedule.

Second, I believe further that the broadcaster has the affirmative duty to stimulate the community's use of his station as an outlet for local expression. He should take steps to alert local groups and organizations that his station stands ready to make its facilities available and to cooperate with them in the broadcast of programs dealing with community problems.

Operation in the public interest begins to crystallize when viewed in this light. Where an effective station policy is established in this regard, an important element of operation in the public interest has been delineated.

In summary, the public can be assured that "fixed" quiz shows are a thing of the past, and actions are in process which will prevent their recurrence. Payola, or as it is more technically known in broadcasting, the failure to announce the sponsorship of material being broadcast, has been symptomatic of a certain degree of laxity of licensee responsibility. There is reason to believe that the exposure of this practice by the Harris committee, and the proposed actions now underway, can give the public assurance that it will no longer be a part of the broadcasting scene.

The task now ahead is to profit by experience and to go forward in other areas to make the broadcast medium all that it is capable of, namely—a vital force for good in the social, cultural, educational, and political life of the Nation.

Pornography—The New Black Plague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the increased traffic in printed and pictured obscene materials has become a problem of real proportions. On March 29, I introduced a bill to create a Presidential Commission on noxious printed and pictured material. By establishing legally and scientifically the causal relationship which we feel exists between this smut and antisocial behavior, this Commission can perform a great service to society. Effective law enforcement in this area desperately needs authoritative findings upon which definitive legislation may be based for prosecution of filth merchants who exploit young people and psychotic adults. Society fights, at every turn, the sale of narcotics, but those who peddle printed and pictured materials which poison the mind are able to avoid, on too many occasions, the severe penalties which should be levied against them. An effective approach to this threat is threat is urgently needed; an approach which the Commission I have proposed can fully develop.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article entitled, "Pornography—The New Black Plague," which recently appeared in the National Parent-Teacher, the official publication of the National Congress of Parent-Teacher Organizations. The article thoroughly exposes the unconscionable schemes utilized in the transmission of obscene materials through the mails. However, I feel that this fine article does not go far enough in pointing out the extent to which this filth has permeated

our society. Not only through the mails, but through the use of all media of interstate commerce, newsstands, and so-called art theaters are supplied, by unscrupulous exploiters, with their poisonous sewage. Profit at any cost seems to be their sole interest.

We must find a means of restricting the production, distribution, and sale of this poison. Before prosecution can become really effective, I repeat, we must establish this casual impact which poisons the mind as surely as narcotics poison the body. We will continue to spin our wheels in our legislative efforts for the curbing of this traffic until and unless this is accomplished.

The article follows:

PORNOGRAPHY—THE NEW BLACK PLAGUE

Are you one of the growing number of parents who have felt the shock of seeing among their child's possessions some of the filth that is being sent to young people through the mails? Even if you aren't, you can imagine the horror and heartache that such a discovery has brought to other parents. Mailed pornography knows no boundaries. It infiltrates every part of the country, reaching children and youth on farms and in cities, in suburbs and slums, in stern homes and trustingly permissive ones. No child is safe from this most ruthless of all rackets—the distribution of pornography by mail.

The material comes in a plain envelope, bearing your child's name. The pictures inside defy description. They are not just nudes. They picture the naked bodies of men and women, often boys and girls, singly and together, in every imaginable position of lewdness, intimacy, and perversion. Some of them masquerade as "art photographs." Others are portraints to be hung in a youth's room as a reminder of "how joyous life can be if one is modern." Some are enclosed in small, attractive gift cases that a boy can give to his girl or boastfully display to his friends. Other pictures are on the backs of playing cards—samples of complete decks that the recipient is urged to order and resell to his friends, card by card, at a commission that sounds fabulous to a youngster.

Where does the torrent of smut come from? How does it get mailed to your home? Who is responsible?

The child who receives the degrading stuff may be innocent of wrongdoing. As a young art student, he may have answered a magazine advertisement for art materials. Or he may have sent a dime or a quarter for a train or a model airplane offered at a bargain as a come-on. Such innocent actions can put his name on a "sucker list" for commercialized smut.

Or he may have done nothing at all to bring on the deluge. His name may have been taken from a high school yearbook, the membership list of a youth club, or a newspaper story about school activities. The Post Office Department estimates that between seven hundred thousand and a million children will receive unsolicited obscene and pornographic materials through the mails this year. No one can be certain that his child will not be a victim of the mail traffikers in smut and slime.

How does an obscene picture affect a child or youth who sees it? Children are by nature curious, daring, breathlessly eager for new sensations. Yet on some guileless minds such a picture may barely register. On others the imprint may quickly blur and dissolve. But on mind after mind the impression is likely to be powerful and lasting. The U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency believes pornography may be most damaging to the child who has had little or no sex education.

Pictures of obscenity and perversion may excite children, giving them a feeling of being grown up. Or they may make all intimacy seem foul and disgusting. Testifying before the subcommittee, Dr. Benjamin Karpman, chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C., said, "You can take perfectly healthy boys or girls and by exposing them to abnormalities you can virtually crystallize their habits for the rest of their lives."

Arthur E. Summerfield, U.S. Postmaster General, charges the purveyors of pornography with contributing to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. "Sex criminals and sex murders," he says, "almost always have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material." We had better heed the implications of this statement; children who have never been exposed to such material may become the victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it. It is to the interest of all parents, therefore, that not only their own children but all children be protected from this immoral sewage.

We cannot risk delay. The indecent traffic is growing heavier every day. Mail-order pornography is big business. Every year the "large, defiant barons of obscenity," as Mr. Summerfield calls them, sell some $700 million worth of filth. Complaints about this depraved merchandising flood the Post Office Department at the rate of at least 50,000 annually. They come from clergymen, high school principals, college professors, newspaper editors, PTA members, and other alarmed citizens.

Why doesn't the Post Office Department do something about the wholesale promotion and distribution of filth through the mails? over the years the Department has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent matter. But it has met powerful opposition from the people who stand to profit by the corruption of children. Occasionally resistance has come from others—from people dedicated to freedom of the press. Confusing liberty with license, these people unwittingly assist the purveyors of pornography.

Last year the Post Office Department conducted 4,000 investigations of obscene mailings and caused the arrest of 293 persons—an increase of 45 percent over the figure for the previous year and the highest number on record. Nevertheless, as the figures indicate, the quantity of filth in the mails is increasing every day. This is partly because the smut sellers, knowing that tremendous profits can be realized from a small investment, are willing to risk a small fine or a light prison sentence. It is partly because certain courts, notably those in Los Angeles and New York, where most of the mail-order business in pornography originates, have been extremely cautious in their decisions on obscenity. Their liberal rulings have established virtual sanctuaries in which dealers in obscenity operate with impunity.

In 1958, as a result of persistent urging by the Post Office Department, an important forward step was taken: The obscenity statute was amended. Previously distributors of pornography could be prosecuted only in the district in which the obscene material was mailed. The amended law makes it possible to prosecute the merchants of filth at intermediate offices and at the point of delivery, where the actual damage is done. And it authorizes fines up to $10,000 for second offenders and imprisonment for 10 years. We now have a powerful means of stamping out a vile racket.

But success depends on the cooperation of a concerned citizenry, the people into whose homes the obscene materials are sent. Parents can do more than anyone else to help apprehend the mailers of filth. The Post Office Department therefore urges all parents to take two simple steps:

Save all materials received, including the envelopes and enclosures.

Report the matter immediately to the Postmaster General or to the local postmaster, and turn the materials over to him.

In appealing to the Nation to defeat commercialized pornography, it was natural that the Post Office Department should ask the help of the national congress. At the annual convention last May a message was presented by W. D. Brewer, regional director of the Denver region of the U.S. Post Office Department. Mr Brewer read a telegram from Deputy Postmaster General Edson O. Sessions addressed to the delegates. "Postmaster General Summerfield," he told them, "is waging an all-out effort at all levels, but most importantly he needs the help of parents and educators if the campaign to erase smut and filth is to be effective. In a recent report to Congress the Postmaster General said, 'It is clear there must be a greater, expanded awareness of the seriousness and the demoralizing results of the wholesale distribution of filth to the children of this country* * *. It is my opinion that the greatest single need today is widespread and concerted public support of this program.'"

The national congress was already acutely aware of the problem. For several months its action committee on comics, motion pictures, radio, and television, headed by J. C. Moffitt, second vice president, had been studying the problem of pornography and its impact upon American children and youth. When the message from the Post Office Department was delivered, the action committee was ready with its recommendations.

The committee urged that State congresses, councils, and local units form action committees and invite all other interested groups to cooperate in the analysis and solution of the problem. Councils and local units were urged to cooperate with distributors of publications and with law-enforcement agents to end the distribution of obscene materials. The committee recommended that each State congress, with professional legal assistance, compile a summary and interpretation of its State laws on obscenity and distribute copies to all PTA's in the State. Through national congress publications the action committee itself proposes to disseminate similar information on Federal laws for the assistance of State and local organizations.

Unanimously the convention approved the recommendations of the action committee and voted to support the Postmaster General's plan for combating the distribution of pornographic materials.

But now a word of clarification: At this moment the national congress is concentrating its forces on just one problem, the most urgent and alarming of all, the filth that crowds home mailboxes and reaches children. The congress has not set out to clean up newsstands, greatly as some may stand in need of a powerful scrub brush and a strong detergent. It is not girding itself to attack the magazines that exploit curiosity about sex and cater to prurient taste. However, grave these menaces may be, they

are not so immediately urgent as mail pornography.

Nor is the congress unaware of the fact that some adults buy obscene material and bring it home, where it falls into the hands of children. We deplore this. It should be as unthinkable for any parent to bring such poison into his home as it would be to bring heroin or marihuana. But the problem is one of adult enlightenment and thus of adult education.

Still less is the national congress setting itself up as a censor of literature and art or as an agent for the restriction of freedom of expression. We realize that there are differences of taste and judgment about literature and art. But in the matter of mail-order obscenity there are no differences of opinion. The thousands of urgent protests to the Post Office Department prove beyond doubt that most Americans have no difficulty distinguishing between filth and art. No one could look at the slimy stuff that is going through the mails, literally by the ton, and have the slightest doubt that it is filth.

The national congress agrees with the Post Office Department that simple nudity, scanty clothing, or revealing garments, though we may disapprove of them, do not constitute obscenity. But lewd poses, shameless exhibitionism, erotic posturing, and portrayals of unnatured sex behavior are unquestionably obscene. By no stretch of the imagination could any person, any mentally healthy person, deny that these things are pornographic and perverted.

The National Parent-Teacher calls the attention of its readers to the urgency of this problem and to the action that is being taken by the national congress. From time to time the magazine will bring you progress reports from the Congress' action committee. It will also bring you the views and counsel of psychiatrists, sociologists, law enforcement officers, and other experts.

What can you do right now? Carry out the Postmaster General's instructions and take to your postmaster any indecent material that comes into your home through the mails. Urge your PTA to establish and support a local action committee.

The barons of obscenity exploit the innocence of children for profit. They grow rich by robbing youth of its happiness and its physical and mental health. If we parents, teachers, and other concerned citizens back up the Post Office Department, if we insist on vigorous prosecutions and maximum penalties for the guilty, we can defeat the vicious purveyors of pornography. The job will take perseverance, impatience, and pluck. The stakes are high: Either we wipe out this new black plague or the pernicious infection will spread throughout our society.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Carlson, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by George Chaplin at the Dedication of the Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce Building and Cultural Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 1960, the community of Honolulu joined with the Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce in the dedication of its recently completed building and cultural hall. This was a doubly auspicious occasion, first, for the reason that this event occurred on the 75th anniversary of the coming to Hawaii of the first Japanese contract immigrants, and, secondly, for the reason that the building so dedicated symbolically represents a further affirmation of the greatness of our American way of life in its fulfillment of the aspirations, not only of one segment of Hawaii's cosmopolitan population, but of all Hawaii's people.

The keynote speaker for this occasion was Mr. George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, whose message, I feel, serves well to agitate those who would take our American heritage for granted.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address of Mr. George Chaplin, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE CHAPLIN, EDITOR OF THE ADVERTISER, HONOLULU, HAWAII, AT THE DEDICATION OF NEW BUILDINGS OF JAPANESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, APRIL 3, 1960

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, in recent months, many new buildings have risen in Honolulu. For the most part they are pleasant to the eye and to the mind, reflecting as they do the community's healthy expansion. But the buildings and the culture center in which we meet tonight embody not only the quality of growth but of something far more precious. For they are constructed not only of steel and stone, glass and wood, but of memories, too—memories which stretch three-quarters of a century, from the canefields of 1885 to the Halls of Congress today. And for tomorrow—with its memories yet to come—this edifice is to be a link in that causeway of faith and hope which Hawaii offers between West and East.

If tonight should emphasize anything, it is that America's strength lies in its diversity—in the blending of many cultures, of many races, of many religions.

Immigrants came to America speaking many tongues—but a single language—the language of human aspiration. Some came searching for religious freedom, some for economic opportunity. All came for the chance to advance to the limit of their individual capacities in a free society.

The very roots of this Republic were nurtured by the cultural and racial ingredients of farflung lands. Of the 56 leaders who signed the Declaration of Independence, 18 were of non-English background.

And when the Continental Congress sought a great seal for the United States, it was urged to make it a composite of six national emblems from abroad.

Americans of foreign extraction battled for our freedom in the Revolution, for the preservation of the Union a hundred years ago and more recently—in two world wars—for the cause of democracy everywhere. This has dramatic and significant relevance to Hawaii, for without the gallant record of the 100th and 442d we would not today be a State.

The American dream is also the American reality. We see about us a Nation whose arts and sciences, whose commerce and politics, whose medicine and music, whose whole culture is the product of the skills and talents and devotion of men and women whose ancestry spans most of the world.

The record abundantly fortifies the observation of the U.S. Supreme Court that our National Constitution was fashioned for "an undefined and expanding future, and for a people gathered and to be gathered from many nations and of many tongues."

Obviously it is not—nor was it ever—an easy decision to depart one's homeland and to travel long days across a vast sea to start anew. It meant leaving loved ones. It meant, in days goneby, traveling in horribly crowded immigrant ships. It meant, in many cases, coming in as indentured servants, as contract laborers.

And yet, as Historian Carl Wittke, of Western Reserve University, noted:

"Some 35 million made that decision in the years before World War I (including the first group to come from Japan to live in Hawaii). They turned with hope in their hearts to the great republic across the sea, confident that it would give them both freedom and bread. * * * The grand central motif of U.S. history has been the impact of successive immigrant tides upon a New World environment. This country has been a mother of exiles, the cradle of a new race of men and a young Nation with Old World memories.

"Over 40 languages and dialects are still spoken in the United States and each has supported its own press. The roster of our city governments"—and I might add, our own State government (as well as in the field of sports)—"reads like the roll call of the United Nations."

Why do I trace this history? Because it helps put into clearer focus what Hawaii is today and what it could and should be tomorrow. Hawaii has moved the boundaries of the American States more than 2,000 miles nearer to Asia. And Hawaii is the first American State where a majority of citizens have ancestral ties with Asia rather than Europe. This adds a healthy new component to the bright human amalgam of America. This is a new State not just in time but in outlook and in opportunity.

Hawaii, happily, still has its pioneer vigor—the drive and the dedication one finds especially in first, second, and third-generation Americans. I am convinced this helps account for the fierce pride in Americanism that distinguishes these islands. I am convinced that it helps account for the tremendous turnout at elections here. And I am convinced that it helps explain, too, the tremendous emphasis on better education for our youngsters—emphasis by parents who in many cases had to work in their early years rather than go to school and who are determined to create a better life for their children.

In Hawaii one can speak or write of the Bill of Rights and not be accused of being out of date. In Hawaii one can find families enjoying the customs and traditions and the cookery and folk dances of other lands—without the slightest conflict with their devotion to Americanism. In Hawaii one can observe and marvel at and be a part of the melting-pot strength of many nations. This is an exciting and wonderful thing.

What then is Hawaii's future? We are certain to be a wonderland to increasing scores of thousands who come here to enjoy spectacular scenery, salubrious climate and warm hospitality. But our destiny goes beyond this. For we have the duty, the obligation imposed on us by our human resources and by geography and history to spread the message of good will—of peace through good human relations—to the rest of the world, especially to those lands fronting, as we do, on the Pacific.

Consider what our stake is in Asia, how vital that continent and its islands are to the future of the world. Take population alone. India has 397 million people. Red China has 640 million. Pakistan has 85½ million. Japan, 92 million. Indonesia (which, by the way, is the sixth largest nation of the globe) has almost 87 million. Europe, by comparison, shrinks somewhat in importance when one adds up the millions of people and the millions of square miles that form Asia.

You will recall from history that Columbus was seeking the wealth of Japan and China when he landed instead in North America. After sailing from one island to another, he was sure he was finally on the right track to Japan when he put into a place now known as Cuba. It has really not been until almost the present that Americans have recognized that much of the world's fate will be determined in the cities and villages and on the rivers and farms of Asian countries. The problems of Asia are many; they are complicated. Consider these 10 points listed by William D. Patterson, associate publisher of the Saturday Review:

"1. Most people in Asia will go to bed hungry tonight.

"2. Most people in Asia cannot read or write.

"3. Most people in Asia live in grinding poverty.

"4. Most people in Asia have never seen a doctor.

"5. Most people in Asia have never heard of democracy.

"6. Most people in Asia have never known civil liberties.

"7. Most people in Asia believe anything different would be better than what they have, and they are determined to get it.

"8. Most people in Asia believe that freedom or free enterprise means the freedom of western colonial powers to exploit Asians.

"9. Most people in Asia distrust people with white skins.

"10. Most people in Asia are determined never again to be ruled by foreigners."

Now, Patterson made up that list some years ago—but it still is valid in most of the East. There are a few lands of notable exception, Japan being one. The fact is that nationalism is sweeping the people of Asia.

They intend to have no more of colonialism, no more British rule in India, no more French rule in what was Indochina, no more Dutch rule in Indonesia. The people of those lands intend to set their own destiny. For a long, long time, the native leaders of those countries have looked to America for inspiration. After all, we were 13 Colonies when we overthrew the tyranny of foreign rule in the American Revolution. As a young republic, we were weak and beset by serious problems. We had a dubious credit rating abroad. It was not until after the Civil War a mere century ago that we were even certain we had a Union.

In short, we have much in common with the nationalism that is synonymous with the free lands of Asia. Our respect for the policy of self-determination in the Philippines is an illustration. Meanwhile, the Communists pretend to be the friends of nationalism—and yet they are the most dangerous exponents of colonialism and imperialism in the world today. They impose colonialism by whatever means they regard as necessary—ranging from mass murder, as most recently in Tibet, to mass indoctrination in the false religion of Marx and Engels.

Unfortunately, while we talk, the Russians act. In Moscow they are building a massive center for the training of foreign students. Between 3,500 and 4,000 young people from Asia and Africa and Latin America will study there, with the entire cost being absorbed by the Russian Government. This augments a program that has been in progress in Peiping and in other centers behind the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. Thoroughly saturated with Communist dogma, these young people return to their cities, towns, and villages as future leaders—the Khrushchevs and the Mao Tse-tungs of tomorrow.

By contrast, what are we doing in this field? Long before Khrushchev's announcement of the Moscow student center, a similar facility for free East and free West was proposed for the University of Hawaii. The State Department sent out a survey team, which reported favorably. The Secretary of State recommended the center to Congress, but without a specific request for funds. The other day the Washington Post editorially accused the administration of "slowly strangling the whole idea." It is up to Congress to provide not only the funds but the Federal leadership if the Nation is to make effective use of Hawaii's unique potential in the field of East-West education. And we ourselves in Hawaii, through our legislature and through our individual efforts, should also demonstrate in tangible form that we recognize the worth of this project.

But education is only one of several areas of national concern in which these islands can advance the cause of freedom.

There is commerce—with Hawaii providing a natural and convenient meeting place for the businessmen of East and West to exchange ideas and products in a climate of congeniality and mutual benefit.

There is diplomacy—with Hawaii offering an ever-expanding reservoir of talent especially among those of Asian extraction. To the best of my knowledge, our country does not have a single ambassador of oriental background. I would be the last to urge that such selection be made on that basis alone. But I would be among the first to contend that here in Hawaii there are people possessed of the intelligence, the education, the insight and the devotion required for the ablest representation abroad of our great Nation.

I digress for a moment to observe that in our midst tonight is a splendid example of what I've just said. I refer to our esteemed friend, Baron Goto—and, at the risk of making him blush, I will ask him to rise for an expression of similar opinion by this audience.

I should note that one person who did not know this was going to happen was Baron. He's a credit to our family—the human family.

Yes, Hawaii has much to offer to our Nation and to our world. These islands are flowering a new American, representing the best of both East and West.

The answer is "Yes"—if the leaders of our Nation and if we in Hawaii dedicate ourselves to that objective.

We have here a fortunate measure of mankind's most precious possession—brotherhood. We are not without our imperfections, but on balance Hawaii's record in human relations is probably the world's best.

With this achievement goes responsibility and the brightness with which the democratic ideal shines in Hawaii is a yardstick of the challenge facing us—the challenge to work for peace through East-West cooperation, through East-West exchange of ideas and information, goods and services.

This challenge demands our finest effort—a fact strongly brought home by this function tonight. For these buildings, so newly dedicated, are one major organization's impressive response to the needs of our time. These buildings exist for only one purpose—the purpose of service, of contributing to better understanding through culture and commerce.

Travelers to Hawaii and residents too, will have the invitation and the opportunity to visit here, to observe ceremonials and customs that are bright threads in the rich fabric of American diversity. Businessmen will find here many services to facilitate East-West trade. And members of this Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce will proudly enjoy this thoughtfully designed, graciously appointed gathering place for meetings and social functions.

Behind any such project, as this are the men who made it possible with their dreams, with their work—years of work—and with their funds.

There is not time to name all who merit appreciation, but I must mention a few. First, Harry M. Tagawa, general chairman of the building committee. Then Ralph C. Honda, Tasuke Yamagata, Edward N. Yamasaki, and Masayuki Adachi, Hideo Kawana, Clyde K. Shimada, Horace M. Sakoda, and Arthur Y. Ambo, all chairmen of important committees. A special word of congratulations to your able new president, Katsuro Miho, who assumes the leadership of this fine organization at a time when its opportunities were never so bright, its challenge never so large.

I am confident that when history records Hawaii's role in the furtherance of peace through East-West friendship, the efforts of this chamber will loom quite large, indeed. Again, my congratulations and all good wishes. Thank you.

Where Is the Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, I include therein what I consider a great editorial from a great paper, the South Alabamian of Jackson, Clarke County, Ala. This wonderful editorial about our great river system was published April 7, 1960. Well, it tells the story. We could go on and on about this, but I would to keep it just as this great writer has written it. Truly, I wish every man could know as much about these wonderful rivers down in our beloved Southland as the South Alabamian does, because we have more navigable miles of streams than any other State in the Union, and because our Army engineers have done so much and we have finished, of course, the great Demopolis lock and dam at Demopolis, Ala., the Eutaw, Ala., lock and dam there, and we have developed to a certain extent the Warrior-Tombigbee, and we are now working on the Coosa-Alabama and we are having a meeting this week. I do hope our great CLARENCE CANNON, who is one of the Nation's greatest statesmen, will see fit, with the help of his committee, the Appropriations Committee in the House, to approve the Millers Ferry project and the other projects that we have there.

My family and I went up, when they dedicated the great St. Lawrence Seaway, when we had the Queen of England and her husband, Prince Phillip. Well, it was a great gathering, but I could not help thinking that those beautiful waters would soon be frozen and they would not be able to use them, while our undeveloped warm waters were going to waste and on down to the sea. But it would not be long, because we are doing so much. The great Jackson lock and dam will soon be completed. We have our great docks there in Mobile that cost over $50 million—did not cost the Federal Government a cent—the taxpayers in the State of Alabama paid for it. We have our beautiful Brookley there that has made such a record—that airbase—better than any other base in the world. Well, we have a great project there; we have over 16,000 people, and our payroll and purchases amount to over $100 million a year; and we hope soon to have missiles along with the taking care of these jet and airplanes that cover the world.

These projects that my friend, the editor of the South Alabamian, tells about should have been developed 100 years ago. Well, they will be, and when they are—take, for instance, the great Tennessee-Tombigbee—when that is completed, and we have put it through the House and through the Senate, and President Harry Truman signed it when he was President of the United States—we just need a little appropriation to get it started. I think we will get it, because the Army engineers are making a survey and if they approve it, I believe the great CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will give us the funds to start this project. When that is done, we will have a direct route from Sioux City, Iowa, clear on down by Cairo, Ill., through the Tennessee-Tombigbee and down to the Alabama and the Mobile Rivers, into Mobile Bay and the Gulf of Mexico. It will be a greater project than the Panama Canal or any other water project that has ever been developed in this Nation.

So I think this editorial is timely. It follows:

WHERE IS THE MONEY?

The Federal budget has been published, and taxpayers throughout the Nation have

torn themselves away from their forms 1040, 1040A, and all the other devices designed to bring the glittering flow of coin into the Federal Treasury. There were the usual billions for national defense, more billions to buy and store more farm surpluses on top of the accumulation from previous years now resting in crammed warehouses and groaning elevators. There were more billions earmarked for financing the machinery of government, still more for foreign aid, and nearly a billion for the development and protection of our national resources. This latter item was the one which was most avidly perused by thousands of Alabamians and Georgians living in the Alabama-Coosa River Basin. They knew Congress had authorized a project to develop their rivers, and the President for whom this budget was prepared had publicly stated previously that the development of these rivers, already begun by the Alabama Power Co., was an excellent example of his administration's partnership policy. Surely then it was expected that he would see to it that the funds to finance the Federal Government's initial share of this partnership project would be included in his budget.

To those optimistic people who expect deeds to follow words, this document was bitterly disappointing. There was a long list of projects of infinite variety, from wildlife studies and small boat harbors to siltation studies and hyacinth control. The dismal fact remained, however, the Alabama-Coosa River had again been ignored.

Where is the money? Are not our Federal taxes computed on the same tax tables as those of our neighbors in other States where rivers are being developed with Federal funds? Do we not send our sons to defend our country in time of national emergency? Then why are we consistently ignored when we ask for less than our share of the money, while others, no more deserving than we, are favored? Certainly it can't be ignorance on the part of those responsible for appropriation of funds because the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association has spent years gathering and processing facts and figures which they have taken to Washington to present to the congressional committees controlling these funds. Nor can it be from any lack of interest on the part of the business leaders of our State. Year after year these men have left their businesses and at considerable personal expense have spent long weary hours in congressional corridors and offices pleading for assistance in the development of these rivers. Is it a "pork barrel" project denied in the interest of governmental economy? Certainly not; the Corps of Engineers surveys made in 1941 showed that the development of these rivers would actually return a profit to the Federal Treasury. Again in 1958 a second study by the Corps of Engineers confirmed this fact. For the past 3 years, the Senate has approved the appropriation of the necessary funds, only to be blocked by a negative vote in the committee of the House of Representatives. The elected Representatives from the districts within the Alabama-Coosa River Basin have made every effort to win approval for the request for funds, but to no avail.

Where is the money? It is available and the decision rests with the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations in the House of Representatives. We, the people of Alabama, must exert every effort to influence the members of this committee in favor of the Alabama-Coosa River development.

All that stands in the way to prevent the project moving to completion is congressional approval of the funds. Let's stop dreaming and start digging. The treasure is well worth the effort. We must see to it that the necessary funds are appropriated by Congress. Let's get on with it.

World Trade Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the following comments by Paul L. Vogel which appeared in Trade Winds, the International House Newsletter, New Orleans, is well worthy of consideration:

WORLD TRADE NOTES

(A digest of highlights in current world trade affairs prepared by Paul L. Vogel, director of the World Trade Development Department of International House)

American businessmen would do well to closely follow the comparatively fast-moving momentum of Central American economic integration.

The past 125 years have witnessed many fruitless efforts to effect the economic and/or political unification of the five Central American States. Reasons for the lack of success have been manifest: the absence of internal communications, an unstable political climate and the diversity of cultural and social conditions. Thus, in a sense, observers through the years were not particularly surprised that efforts accomplished little.

But today, in this new decade of the sixties, any American businessman who has a stake, either present or future, in the Central American market would be acting most injudiciously were he to continue to dismiss the practical implications of current efforts toward economic integration.

The decade of the 1960's will be almost revolutionary in the strides which will be made. Highway construction to bind the Central American Republics will make more progress than in the past 125 years. Expansion of intra-Central American air service will be dramatic. Most important of all, a new look, embracing political, economic, social, and cultural attitudes will prevade all segments, all classes, of the Central American community. For the trials and tribulations endured for generations in fighting for a proper and legitimate place in the council of nations and for a reasonable share of the earth's bounty have brought about a dramatic transformation of attitudes toward Central American integration.

In a sense, the progress made toward integration during the last 10 years has been remarkable for the lack of publicity and fanfare which has accompanied it. Perhaps this has been the result of the preoccupation of most government officials and businessmen with the very much publicized development of the European Economic Community and of the Communist threat of internal subversion and external aggression which preceded it. But, undoubtedly, the paucity of publicity has also been the result of a difference in approach on the part of the five Central American States as compared to the procedure employed by the six member States of the European Economic Community.

The European Economic Community made a full-fledged appearance on the world scene with the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957. The signing of this treaty provided the basis for the creation of (a) a Customs Union, (b) a special Development Fund for overseas territories, (c) a European Investment Bank, (d) an Executive Commission, (e) an Executive Council of Ministers, (f) an Economic and Social Committee, (g) a Monetary Committee, (h) a European Parliament, and (i) a Court of Justice. The Customs Union carried with it a specific timetable covering 12–15 years during which virtually all restrictions of intra-EEC trade would be eliminated and a common external tariff would come into being.

In contrast, Central American efforts toward integration have proceeded from the exact opposite direction. Instead of promulgating a common market and establishing a full array of institutions and juridical bodies, the Central American Republics have proceeded to reach agreements in principle on the desirability of constructing a customs union and a common market. Within the framework of these multilateral agreements, each of five nations has then proceeded to negotiate with each of the remaining four nations to determine, among other things, the commodity areas where reciprocal tariff concessions could be made, and how to go about equalizing tariffs on goods entering from third nations. Equally important, these bilateral negotiations have dealt with the mechanics of establishing officially sponsored industries which would have unimpeded access to all the Central American markets.

A third step in these negotiations has consisted of multilateral agreements in which the concessions already made during the bilateral discussions between the respective nations have been redrawn in the form of a multilateral treaty with an accelerated timetable.

The Department of Defense Is Using College and University Talent To Entertain Our Troops Abroad and Should Schedule Them To Appear Before Students of Other Countries—Mankind Will Profit When Young Men and Women of All Nations and in Great Numbers Study and Learn Together, President Eisenhower Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower gave top priority to a massive interchange of mutual understanding in his highly important speech at Delhi University in India last December. At that time the President said:

More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources and rewards of their common destiny.

Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clearer knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace.

The President's special international cultural exchange program has so far failed miserably to include young people from our colleges and universities in its program. Yet I am assured by Dr.

Howard Hanson, president and chairman of the board of the National Music Council, that student groups "will contribute even more importantly to the cultural exchange program than the exchange of commercial professional groups."

I have introduced legislation to provide the massive interchange which President Eisenhower has called for, and this legislation has been cosponsored by my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR. At the same time, the Department of Defense—which sends college and university talent abroad to entertain our troops—could schedule them to appear before students of those countries where our troops are stationed. Such a step would be a highly significant addition to our Nation's foreign policy and would be the most important step to implement the President's suggestions at Delhi University which has been made to date.

At the same time, the administration should abandon its plans to destroy the historic buildings on Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital just across the street from the White House. These buildings could be utilized for educational and cultural purposes in the expansion of the massive interchange the President has called for. Congressman FRANK THOMPSON and I have sponsored legislation—H.R. 11678 and H.R. 11691—for this purpose too. Similar legislation has been cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY, MORSE, HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, HENNINGS, GRUENING, MANSFIELD, and MURRAY.

I include as part of my remarks a speech on the subject of "The Arts and Sciences and International Understanding," which I made on April 11, 1960, to the members of the University Women's Club of Washington, D.C.:

THE ARTS AND SCIENCES AND INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you the Nation's need to further develop its creative resources. This country is richer than we know in artistic achievement. The Communists, however, are telling people around the world that Americans are hardhearted materialists interested only in making money. This is strange talk from the irreligious materialists of Moscow, but it is sometimes a convincing argument to people around the world who know little of our cultural achievements. This type of Communist propaganda makes it obvious that today the United States is involved on a new front in its struggle to win the support and understanding of the world for democracy. We face a committed, energetic, formidable competitor in the Soviet Union. The Communist cause is stretching out to reach millions of persons around the world. We must compete more actively if we are to reach the minds and hearts of the youth of other countries who are to be the leaders of tomorrow.

Experience has demonstrated that military, political, and economic diplomacy, although practiced so effectively in the past, are no longer enough to win peoples' understanding. In a world whose political and military geniuses are stalemated by the discoveries of scientists, we have learned that negotiations over the green baize tables of diplomacy are only one way for nations to try to reach an understanding. Direct contacts between our people and people of other nations are essential to help dispel some of the misconceptions they have concerning the philosophy and goals of the United States.

We must provide new avenues by which we can demonstrate the American imagination and its creative force to many more of our own citizens as well as to people throughout the world. An intensified encouragement of our participation in the arts would make it manifest that cultural endeavor is an integral part of this Nation's way of life. We need to establish a cultural breakthrough at both the national and international levels. A concerted effort must be made to better display America's cultural image.

In the field of music alone, how many people realize, for example, that Americans in a recent year spent more money at the box office for concerts than they spent for baseball games; that we support in this country 1,000 symphony orchestras and 450 opera-producing groups; that over 255 educational institutions offer degree courses in music and advanced level musical training. We have a plentiful reservoir of artistic talent in this country. We should place this talent in the spotlight.

If we are going to take significant steps toward making far-reaching contributions in the cultural field, the task before us is a great one. Today, I want to discuss some of the specific actions which should be taken to accomplish these ends. If the United States is to be able to establish a cultural and scientific breakthrough around the world, we have to take definite action.

President Eisenhower gave top priority to massive interchange of mutual understanding in his speech at Delhi University last December. At that time the President said:

"More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources and rewards of their common destiny.

"Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clearer knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace."

As a corollary to this idea we must make certain that many more of America's talented young artists are included in the President's special international cultural exchange program. To achieve this end I have proposed legislation to create an actual two-way exchange program since no such cultural exchange now exists. So far, the major, if not the entire, emphasis of the program has been restricted to large professional groups and individual professional artists. Moreover, the price of tickets of admission in many instances has been beyond the pocketbooks of most people in other countries. There is some doubt that the program as presently administered is as much of a success as some of its proponents would have us believe. Under the present program the large professional groups and distinguished American artists perform in opera houses and great halls and usually for only limited engagements because of the expense.

Why should we display only that portion of America's artistic talent which draws huge impersonal audiences? Why should we play only to a world of gilded mirrors and red plush? Truly these performances do not reach the man in the street, the university student with limited funds, and the student artists in the countries around the world. It is the individual whom we must reach. Our international cultural exchange program must include our students and their teachers, community groups, and university and conservatory groups. There is not only a vast audience abroad for every one of them, but also a vast reservoir of friendship for them to tap. In addition to the professional artists, we should be most certainly sending our talented young artists and art groups on a university circuit all over the globe.

My proposal envisages an actual two-way cultural exchange program. It would support the performances of individual artists, choral groups, youth orchestras, and drama groups from other countries on their tour of the university circuit in the United States. Thus, young artists from around the world would have a chance to see this country, to learn something of our way of life on university campuses and, what is most important, have a chance to talk with other young people who have similar interests and talent. The merits of this type of exchange are undeniable for, as Isaac Stern declared at the recent International Music Conference, the most effective penetration in cultural exchange is at the youth level, on both sides.

Recently I returned from an inspection tour of the operations of the mutual security program in some 20 countries in Asia, Africa, and southern Europe. I was impressed especially by the fact that the leaders in many of these nations are very young, under 30 years of age in many cases. It is my firm belief that we can best reach the young people in other countries through a cultural exchange program such as I have described.

Van Cliburn made the most significant cultural breakthrough in the last decade, yet he received absolutely no financial help at all from the President's special international cultural exchange program.

Van Cliburn's expenses were paid with funds raised by the Institute of International Education from the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund. Many others of our highly talented young people who could help to carry the message of international goodwill have not been able to secure such distinguished private patronage. Furthermore, the door of the Government's cultural exchange program has been closed by administrators in the Department of State who seem surprisingly unaware of the tremendous potential of the young talent in our colleges and universities.

So far the President's special international cultural exchange program has devoted almost its entire congressional appropriations to sending major professional groups abroad. The State Department overlooks the opportunity of utilizing young talented American artists in this program. This shortsightedness must be corrected if we are going to effect a massive interchange of mutual understanding through student exchanges. The legislation which I have proposed would make permanent the inclusion of young American artists in our cultural exchange programs. No longer would this endeavor be subject to the whim of individual officials or of any political administration in Washington. The enactment of this legislation would insure that a specific provision for young artists has the support of the Congress which is vital if we are to enhance America's cultural image.

In addition to the need for the Federal Government to place a broader emphasis on the arts in direct connection with international cultural activities, we should provide a means to promote among more of our own citizens a knowledge of and interest in the creative arts. For example, I believe we should establish in Washington, D.C., a national showcase program to display the very excellent fine arts programs of our institutions of higher education. The primary purpose of the showcase would be to encourage the further development and growth of all the arts in colleges and universities. The time is right to establish a permanent program to encourage our young people with interest and talent in the arts, instead of leaving their discovery—as in the case of Van Cliburn—to the U.S.S.R.

As R. L. Bruckberger emphasized in his recent book "The Image of America," "America does not always give its own creative minds the recognition due them, indeed it sometimes ignores them altogether. This is so often the case that an observer as casual as the average European traveler in America finds it only too easy to assume that in certain fields there are no creative minds. * * * In their hearts, Americans do not believe that there could ever be found among them men of such stature as Stravinsky, Picasso, and Bergson."

It is my firm conviction that we do have talent which can be encouraged through the showcase program by giving national recognition and encouragement to young American artists. The bill I have introduced is sponsored also by Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama; Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey; and Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. It would inaugurate an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences. This program, to be held every 2 years, would present high quality international exhibitions, productions, festivals and programs in these fields. I am sure that such an enterprise would greatly strengthen the mutual understanding of the peoples of the world.

I have often been asked how I would expect the International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences to be initiated, organized, and operated. Here are some answers to the questions that have been raised.

The President of the United States would communicate with the heads of all the nations in the world, inviting them to send representatives to Washington for a conference. This meeting could be under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who would be responsible for practical arrangements. The President would address this conference, calling upon the nations to join with the United States in competitions in the arts and sciences.

Following this conference I would expect that most of the nations would set up committees which would be responsible for arranging participation in the competitions. An American committee would work through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under appropriate guidance from the Department of State. Distinguished private citizens would be appointed by the President to serve on this committee.

As I mentioned before, my bill calls for an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences to be held every 2 years. I would hope that the first Olympiad might take place in the new Lincoln Center in New York, and that our proposed National Cultural Center in Washington would be completed in time for the second. If a cooperating nation extended an invitation for the Olympiad, I think that this invitation should be carefully considered and accepted if approved by a meeting of representatives of all participating countries. Pending the assurance that there would be facilities for the competitions overseas, I believe we should continue to hold them at 2-year intervals in the Nation's Capital.

As I see it, the Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences could include competitions in five main fields.

First, I should like to see an international folk festival, where the nations of the world would compete in dancing and folk singing, and in displaying native handicrafts including fabrics, woodcarving, and other traditional crafts. This would help to preserve the folk heritage of mankind, a heritage which is rapidly being dissipated around the world. The industrialization of the modern world is seriously diminishing the interest of many in the folk arts. It would be a tragedy if these noble traditions were to be lost. I believe that the International Olympiad program would be a strong influence in preserving this inheritance from man's past.

Secondly, there could be festival of drama and the dance which would involve competition in the presentation of assigned classical plays, such as Shakespearean tragedy; competition in the presentation of original plays; competition in the presentation of national theatrical forms such as the Kabuki and plays of Japan; and finally, competition in classical dance forms such as the ballet. The difference between these dances and those which might be presented under the folk festival is that there are certain types of dances which are common to a variety of cultures and competition here would be on the basis of national interpretation of these classical dance forms.

There could be a music festival which would involve individual competition in all of the principal instruments in use today around the world. We should have competition in piano, the stringed instruments, the brasses, and the woodwinds. Special categories for national instruments which would make it possible for the world to become acquainted with the unique musical heritage of various cultures could be included.

There could also be a competition in painting and sculpture. Here an international body of critics might set up the appropriate categories, and select qualified judges. I hope there will be several categories, including both the classical and modern schools, and the traditional art of the world's civilizations.

The fifth competition might be in the sciences. A group of distinguished international scientists could decide upon the type of competitions to be held. It might be patterned after the science talent search and National Science Fair, which are sponsored by Science Service.

The International Olympiad could follow the tradition of the sports olympics with the lighting of the traditional flame, the reciting of the Olympic oath, and the awarding of medals.

However, I believe that the winners in the Olympiaid should receive additional prizes, such as opportunities for concert tours, gifts of musical instruments, and opportunities for additional exhibits of their artistic or scientific achievements.

Many benefits are to be derived from these contests. First, there would be an opportunity for young artists or scientists to win distinction. Secondly, people would have a chance to learn that Americans are not materialistic money-minded individuals. Finally, the world would be enriched by this exchange of artistic and scientific ideas.

Unquestionably an appropriation would be required from the Congress to initiate these contests. However, I think that there would be enough public interest after the first Olympiad to warrant reliance upon public subscription to finance future American participation. The revenue from admission to various events would be very substantial, and should go a long way toward financing the entire project.

The arts and the sciences are a universal language. We should use this language to become better acquainted with our friends around the world, and to enable them to understand us.

The milennium will have to be achieved by hard work. The alternative may be the destruction of mankind. I believe the International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences and the two-way cultural exchange program of young artists would be gigantic steps toward more effectively promoting international stability and mutual understanding of the world's peoples.

As we go about living our busy lives today, we think of and pray for peace in our time. And as we ask for divine guidance, we should remember that it is not enough just to ask for peace—we must work for it.

Chactic and Deplorable Condition Found in the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, hearings which have just been concluded before the House Small Business Committee's Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, produced evidence of chaotic and deplorable conditions in the dairy industry. This has been shown to be the case in several sections of the United States, including our own great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, had appointed a special subcommittee to look into this matter. The hearings to which I have made reference were before that special subcommittee, over which our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] presided. In the course of these hearings, the chairman of the special subcommittee, the Honorable TOM STEED, stated:

The Chair would like to say that in the Congress we have two types of committees that conduct public hearings. We have legislative committees and then we have the special select committees such as this one here today. Our Small Business Committee is not a legislative committee. It has been set up as a factfinding committee to keep the House of Representatives informed on troubles and problems of the small business community.

This special subcommittee deals with the dairy industry. All of the complaints that have been looked into, both from the staff and from the public hearing level, have been brought to this subcommittee by Members of the Congress at the request of constituents of theirs. We have operated in many States because this problem is a widespread problem. When price wars are involved, naturally every consumer is interested in buying what he wants at as low a price as he can get it and it is often an easy feeling on the part of the buyers that low prices are to be desired, and because of that we sometimes find ourselves in the position of, in the minds of some, of being interested only in raising prices, making the public pay more than it otherwise has to pay. That is not so. This subcommittee is not interested in prices as such. We believe that only when there is free and open competition can the consumer have quality service and prices that are fair to him, and since milk is the most widely and largely consumed item of food that we have, we feel that there is no more important industry in our country than the dairy industry, and our purpose is trying to determine the facts of the chaotic and unstable conditions we find in this industry today and to see if recommendations can be made to the legislative committees of remedies that might help insure that the traditional old tried and true American system of free enterprise can be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that as a result of the work of this Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, two very important bills have been introduced to assist and encourage small business in its struggle to survive and prosper. Those bills

are H.R. 8841, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and H.R. 10235, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. The first of these would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease-and-desist orders in an effort to help save small business. The other bill, H.R. 10235, would help save small business by prohibiting sales at prices below cost in certain situations where the existence of small business concerns and competition are threatened.

In the hearings before the special subcommittee, a large amount of additional evidence of the chatotic and deplorable condition in the dairy industry resulting from unfair trade practices was received and considered by the subcommittee. This included the presentation of factual evidence by Mr. Brooks Robertson, a research analyst of the subcommittee. Mr. Robertson's presentation is a brief of the conditions in the industry as he found them in making many of the spot investigations as a result of the complaints received from Members of the Congress who had, in turn, received these complaints from their constituents throughout the United States.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks I include in the RECORD at this point the presentation of these facts as made to the special subcommittee by Mr. Brooks Robertson on April 6, 1960:

STATEMENT OF BROOKS ROBERTSON, INVESTIGATOR-ANALYST FOR THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, Congressman STUBBLEFIELD and Congressman JOHNSON of Colorado, my name is Brooks Robertson and I am investigator-analyst for the Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

At your request, I have prepared summaries of the results of investigations that I have made for the subcommittee in various sections of the United States where the subcommittee has not as yet been able to schedule public hearings. These investigations, as well as those which led to public hearings, were without exception made at the request of one or more Members of Congress representing the areas involved, who had received complaints from their constituents relative to alleged improper acts and practices noted in the dairy industry.

Among the Members of the House of Representatives who requested formal public hearings were Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER, Hon. BYRON L. JOHNSON, Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN, Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT, Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR, Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, Hon. RANDALL S. HARMON, Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, Hon. EDWARD BOLAND, Hon. TOM O'NEILL, Hon. J. CARLTON LOSER.

Complying with requests of several Congressmen in whose districts these investigators have been made, as well as in which public hearings have been held, copies of the results, including confidential material, have been transmitted by you, Mr. Chairman, to the Federal Trade Commission or the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, for their assistance and guidance in looking into alleged law violations in this industry. As a result, complaints have been issued by the Federal Trade Commission and indictments secured by the Department of Justice, and it is understood that several investigations are being made at this time by these two enforcement agencies of the Federal Government.

With your consent, I shall read the summaries mentioned and request that they and the attached affidavits, statements, photographs, and other data mentioned be included in this record of the final hearings of this subcommittee during the 86th Congress.

It is also requested that the confidential and other data received during these investigations and not included in the record, be received into the files of the committee for future reference.

GREATER METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C., AREA

This milkshed includes the area within a radius of approximately 150 miles of Washington, D.C., and the marketing area served includes Washington, the three nearby counties of Maryland, and the nearby area of Virginia.

Early in 1959, the dairy industry of this area was, through the acts of the local operating division of the National Dairy Products Corporation, thrown into a chaotic condition which condition affected the entire industry in this area from the individual dairy farmer producers through the various handler levels and, of course, the consumers.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate this matter by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, Member of Congress from the affected area, who had received numerous complaints from farmer-producer constituents. Complaints were also received from numerous individuals and concerns at other levels in the industry and the consuming public manifested its interest and concern as this situation was developing.

On April 1, 1959, I was directed to make an aggressive, thorough, and comprehensive investigation into this matter with a view of providing information on which might be based a public hearing in Washington, D.C., by your subcommittee. I was actively engaged in this investigation for several months, during which time dozens of interviews were held with representatives of the industry at all levels. Maryland, Virginia, and District of Columbia health officials, officers of milk producers cooperatives and retail outlets, including virtually all of the large grocery chain stores and supermarkets were interviewed. I attended numerous meetings and conferences held by the District of Columbia Commissioners and meeting held by other interested groups.

As is well known, this alleged milk price war was widely publicized by radio, television, and the press, with the two sides purchasing time and space on these media to present their respective positions to the public on this controversy.

Information obtained indicated that the largest processor and distributor in the area, the National Dairy Products Corp., had taken the position that the price of the raw product from local sources was too high and their continuing to pay it was rendering their position noncompetitive in this market. It was reported that this concern was making an effort to cause the District of Columbia health code to be relaxed to permit the importation, processing and distribution of milk from areas other than this milkshed and thus endeavor to avail themselves of a less expensive supply of raw milk.

It appears that to offset this move and thus to preserve their market, the farmer-producers acting through their marketing cooperatives, petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture to issue and make effective a Federal milk marketing order for this area which was accomplished and which became effective July 1, 1959. Under this order minimum prices paid producers for milk were established by the Secretary.

The activities of your subcommittee in thoroughly investigating and following these developments closely were well known in the industry at all levels, as well as by health officials involved and shortly after July 1, 1959, the effective date of the Federal milk marketing order, the situation started to improve. The public hearings by your subcommittee, already postponed from a tentative starting date in June, were again postponed pending further resolution of the problems noted. The greatest contribution, it is believed, to the solution of the many problems, appeared to have come from the industry itself and all segments participated. Late in July, it was decided by your subcommittee that the situation had so improved and that as all segments were endeavoring to continue this improvement, it would not be necessary to hold public hearings at that time.

Following your instructions, your staff has continued to observe and note further developments in this area and will continue to do so. Should acts or practices reoccur that would tend to demoralize the industry and the market, the information already obtained and that the subcommittee is continuing to receive, will be available for an early public hearing into the matter.

In view of the present status of the market in this area at this time, as described above, the only document offered into the record at this time is the attached statement of Mr. William B. Hooper, general manager of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, which outlines some of the problems of the milk producers in this area and milkshed.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, his statement will be received as a part of the record.

(Above-mentioned statement not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

UPPER BAY, SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY, CALIF., AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the cities of San Francisco, Berkeley, and Oakland, and the rather extended section north of San Francisco, the milkshed adjacent to Sacramento and the entire San Joaquin Valley south to and including the area adjacent to Los Angeles.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate the problems of milk producers and independent processors by Hon. JOHN J. MCFALL, Hon. HARLAN HAGEN, and Hon. B. F. SISK, Members of Congress representing districts in this area.

Requests for the investigation which I made during the week of October 26–30, 1959, were received as a result of complaints from the constituents of these Congressmen and from the Associated Independent Dairies of America, San Francisco, as well as from several milk producers' cooperatives concerning practices employed by the major processors and distributors of milk and other dairy products in the area described.

The Association of Independent Dairies has a membership of approximately 22 which concerns appear to be all of the independents that are left in this area at this time. This group has, since the completion of my investigation, filed a suit in the State courts of California against the major dairies alleging violations of the State law. A large percentage of the complaints received were from many independent producers presented, in some cases, through the particular cooperative to which they belong and all allege unfair treatment by the major dairies.

The situation in California is unique in that there appear to be no effective bargaining cooperatives such as found in other areas and the individual producer in a large majority of the cases has no alternative but to negotiate individually with the particular dairy to which his milk is sold. The State law provides a minimum price to be paid to producers as well as a maximum price to

be charged consumers and the difficulty in which the producers find themselves is brought about through the terms of the contracts through which the milk is purchased and the various bases of utilization as class I and class II. It is alleged that an actual feudal system is in effect in this connection and that the major dairies who purchase the raw product from the producers are arrogant and unfair to the producers in their arbitrary handling of the contracts and their determination of the usage and subsequent payments. In general, the complaints describe the agent of the purchasing dairy as submitting a contract to the producer calling for delivery of a certain percentage of his production at the class I rate, sometimes as low as 50 percent of his entire daily production. The purchaser will then require the producer to sell him the balance of his production at the class II or manufacturing rate.

There appears to be no successful appeal channel open to these producers and history has shown that if the producer objects to this usage ratio, the big dairy will cancel the contract, summarily, thus causing the producer to become a grade B producer with all of his milk going to the manufacturing plants at the low class II rate. It is further alleged that once a producer has failed to comply with the terms of the large dairy and his grade A contract has been thus cancelled, he finds it impossible to get a contract with another dairy and hence remains a grade B producer indefinitely.

Information tending to confirm these and other charges of unfair practices in the industry as described above, was received from the following:

California Milk Producers Federation, San Francisco, Calif.

DeLash Distributing Co., Patterson, Calif.

Charles J. DeMartini Dairy, Pettluma, Calif.

Pete Van Ruiten Dairy, Artesia, Calif.

Delbert F. Bettencourt, Gustine, Calif.

John Verboon, Hanford, Calif.

Jack W. Lowe, Hanford, Calif.

Wallace R. Clark, Hanford, Calif.

The information provided by the above concerns was received on a confidential basis and is included in the committee files for future reference. Additional information received and submitted herewith for inclusion in this report is as follows:

1. Resolution No. 11, dated November 2, 1959, of the Western Dairymen's Association.

2. Statement on vertical integration and contract buying in the dairy industry of the California Milk Producers Federation, dated September 29, 1959.

3. Statement of experiences of the Central Valley Milk Marketing Association with milk distributors, dated October 30, 1959.

4. Statement of Virgil E. Ernest and Nelson S. Riddle, doing business as Laurel Farms, Tulare, Calif., dated November 9, 1959.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the material will be received for the record.

(Above material not included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, in reading the next summary, which concerns the southeastern Florida area, attention is invited to a more recent report given by the Honorable BYRON L. JOHNSON a few minutes ago.

This area includes cities from Vero Beach on the north to Key West on the south, and intermediate points.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area by the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS and the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, Members of Congress representing districts within the area, and Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association.

Requests for the investigation which I made on September 8, 9, and 10, 1959, were received as a result of complaints of constituents of the Congressmen and members of NADA concerning pricing practices noted in the area. These practices, it was alleged, involved accusations against Foremost Dairy, Inc., the Borden Co., and Sealtest Southern Dairies, a division of National Dairy Products Corp.

During the course of these investigations, information was received to the effect that the large dairies operating in the area had broken the market to the point that half gallons of milk were sold out of stores at 19 cents and in some instances at lower prices. This milk price war, being carried on at sales below cost and alleged discriminatory pricing, was proving disastrous to the smaller independent dairies. There is attached an affidavit made by Tripson Dairy, Inc., Vero Beach, Fla., a statement from the Velda Corp., Miami, Fla., and a statement from the Adams Dairy, Key West, Fla., which documents are submitted for inclusion in this report and which tend to verify the complaints described above.

In addition to the attached information, additional information has been received for the confidential use of the committee and is included in the committee files.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received for the record.

(Above material not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MEMPHIS, TENN., AND VICINITY AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This milkshed and marketing area consists of an area with a radius of about 30 miles from Memphis on both sides of the Mississippi River at this point.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to make an investigation by the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, Member of Congress from this district, who had received complaints from his constituents, and Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association, who had received complaints from his members concerning the pricing practices in this area.

My investigation, which was made August 27–30, 1959, revealed a truly chaotic condition in this market and tended to verify the complaints from the small businessmen which had been received. Four major dairies appeared to control the pricing policies in the area which, during the price war, resulted in sales below cost and discriminatory pricing. The three small independent dairies surviving this type of competition were struggling against great odds to stay in business. Here, again, as in many other areas investigated, the supermarkets and chain grocery stores appeared to be accomplices of the giant dairies in these sales and pricing programs and immediate relief was sought by the small businessmen.

Attached to this report for inclusion in the record are affidavits submitted by Meadow Brook Dairies, Inc., Cedar Grove Dairies, both of Memphis, and the Southern Guernsey Dairy of nearby Hernando, Miss.

Considerable additional information was secured relative to the milk market situation in this area and has been included in the committee files for future reference.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received for the record.

(Above information not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PADUCAH, MURRAY, AND MAYFIELD, KY., AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the three cities mentioned and intermediate and adjacent points.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to make an investigation by the Honorable FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Member of Congress from this area, who had received complaints from constituents, and Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association, who had received complaints from his members concerning the chaotic pricing situation which had developed in this market.

My investigation, which was made on August 30, 31, and September 1, 1959, revealed that in the city of Paducah, only one independent processor and distributor of milk and dairy products has survived the alleged unfair competition of certain of the nationwide chain dairies and that in the entire area the competition presented by the large dairies owned outside of this area were repeatedly reducing local competition and tending to create monopolies. Information received tended to verify these complaints as well as the complaints that large nationwide supermarket and chain grocery stores were cooperating with the large dairies with the result that in the entire area fluid milk was being sold at prices below cost of production and intra-area discriminatory pricing was apparent.

Attached hereto for inclusion in this report are affidavits from the Dairy Brand Products Co., Harrisburg, Ill., Ryan Milk Co., Inc., Murray, Ky., and the Sunshine Dairy, of Paducah, Ky., outlining the situation investigated in detail.

In addition to these affidavits, considerable other information was received tending to confirm the merits of the complaints received and are made a part of the committee files for future reference.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received for the record.

(Above material not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

INDIANAPOLIS, COLUMBUS, AND MUNCIE, IND., AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. The entire State of Indiana has been suffering from a chaotic condition existing in the dairy industry from the producer through the consumer levels in which connection reference is respectfully made to the hearings held by the Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry at South Bend, Ind., on July 1, 1959. The particular area, subject of my investigation on January 20, 21, and 22, 1960, includes Indianapolis, Columbus, and Muncie, Ind., and intermediate points.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area by the Honorable JOSEPH W. BARR, the Honorable RANDALL S. HARMON, and the Honorable EARL HOGAN, who represent congressional districts in this area.

These requests for an investigation were made as a result of the Members of Congress receiving complaints from their constituents concerning pricing practices noted in the area. These practices, it is alleged, involved wholesale and retail sales below cost, discriminatory pricing, and other trade practices believed to be unfair to these smaller and independent businessmen.

Cited in the complaints received are several of the large grocery chains reported by some to be in collusion with the larger dairies operating in this are, the result of which collusion appearing to be lessening of competition and thus tending to create monopolies.

Affidavits received from the following independent processors and distributors verifying the complaints received are attached and made a part of this report:

Maplehurst Farms, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Hoosier Dairy Products Co., Noblesville, Ind.

William R. Roberts & Sons, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Thompson Dairy, Inc., Columbus, Ind.

Hornaday Milk Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Banquet Ice Cream & Milk Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

In addition to these affidavits, letters, and statements were received from the following

independent processors and distributors which are also made a part of this report:

Golden Guernsey Farms, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Riggins, Inc., Muncie, Ind.

Mutual Milk Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received in the record.

(Above affidavits not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PASCAGOULA, BILOXI, AND GULFPORT, MISS., AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the three cities mentioned and intermediate points located on or near the Gulf of Mexico.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate pricing problems in this area by the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, Member of Congress, representing the area and by Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association.

These requests for an investigation were made as a result of the Member of Congress receiving complaints from his constituents and NIDA from its members concerning the pricing practices noted in the area. Charges were made that through the use of milk as a loss leader, sales below cost and discriminatory pricing by the large nationwide dairies, the smaller independent dairies in the area are being damaged to an irreparable extent.

On March 17 and 18, 1960, I conducted a thorough investigation into the complaints received from this area and received information tending to substantiate the charges. This included discriminatory pricing by the utilization of unrealistic large discounts and rebates to particular customers resulting in the practice of sales below cost which, it is charged, could be designed only to reduce and eliminate the competition of independent dairies and the creation of a monoply.

There is attached and made a part of this report an affidavit dated March 24, 1960, from Suni-Land Dairy, Inc., Pascagoula, Miss., verifying most of these allegations and additional information was received from the Home Milk Products Co., Biloxi, Miss. In addition to the information hereby included in the record, other information of a confidential nature is included in the committee files for future reference.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received for the record.

(Above statements not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

DETROIT AND FLINT, MICH., AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the eastern part of the State of Michigan, including the cities of Flint, Detroit, and intermediate points. The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Diary Industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area, particularly Detroit, by Members of Congress from Michigan, including Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA, Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, and Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

These requests for investigations were made as a result of the Members of Congress receiving complaints from their constitutents concerning the pricing practices noted in the area. These practices, it is alleged, involve collusion between supermarket foodstores and large processors and distributors of fluid milk and other dairy products. Particularly, attention was invited to the plight of the now independent retail routemen who, until about a year ago, were employees of the large dairies, but who were forced to purchase their routes or have their employment terminated.

Several hundred of these men were thus virtually compelled to purchase their routes and have made full payment to the large dairies involved. It is alleged that within a short time thereafter, the chain supermarkets, through special discounts or other means, offered milk for sale at retail at their stores at prices below those being charged these routemen by the same large wholesale distributors.

On March 14, 15, and 16, 1960, I conducted an investigation into this situation based on the complaints that had been received. The investigation developed information to the effect that supermarkets and other retail stores were, in fact, selling milk at prices far below cost—in some cases as low as 19 cents per half gallon. At the same time, routemen were being charged from 35 cents to 41 cents per half gallon by the same wholesale suppliers, thus making an obviously impossible competitive situation. It was generally charged that the large dairies, in collusion with the large supermarkets, were willfully attempting to eliminate the home delivery service through these pricing practices and thus concentrate the retail distribution of milk in the stores.

Information confirming the situation as described herein was received through interviews with officers and members of the United Dairy Workers, AFL–CIO, Local No. 83, Highland Park, Mich., and Local No. 383, Flint, Mich. In addition, newspaper clippings, photographs, and written statements were secured and the following such material is submitted for the record: Letter dated March 21, 1960, from the United Dairy Workers, Local No. 383, Flint, Mich.; photostatic copies of supermarket advertisements taken from Michigan newspapers; and letter dated January 15, 1960, and resolution from United Dairy Workers Local No. 83, and 116 letters received from the following independent milk deliverymen described above, which letters are to be retained in the subcommittee files for future reference; letter dated April 1, 1960, from Twin Pines Dairy Farm, Detroit, Mich., and statement from Mr. Glenn Lake, president, Michigan Milk Producers Association.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be received for the record.

(Above statements not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EAST ST. LOUIS, BELLEVILLE, GRANITE CITY, AND SOUTHERN ILLINOIS AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes, in addition to the cities mentioned above, practically the entire southern half of the State of Illinois. In this general area, all of the more disturbing factors are found at all levels of the dairy industry.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area by the Honorable MELVIN PRICE and the Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY, Members of Congress representing districts within this area.

Requests for the investigation were received from the Congressmen as a result of complaints received from their constituents which included independent processors and distributors, dairy workers' local unions, individual employees of dairies employed as retail deliverymen on a commission basis, and producers. On February 23, 1960, I proceeded to this area interviewing several dozen members of the industry on all levels, completing the investigation in 4 days, on February 26, 1960.

The complaints investigated were sales below cost, discriminatory pricing and a planned program by the large national dairies to eliminate home delivery and the small independent dairies. I covered this area thoroughly and noted that in a majority of instances fluid milk was advertised in the windows and offered for sale in the stores at the ridiculously low price of 10 cents per half gallon and in some cases even less. I arranged for pictures to be taken of this evidence of this milk price war and they are attached and made a part of this report.

The most common general complaint encountered was one which I verified involving particularly the large Pevely and Adams Dairies of St. Louis, Mo., which concerns continue to flood the market in nearby Illinois with their milk at wholesale prices always below wholesale prices offered by independent dairies in Illinois regardless of the general and comparative price levels.

Affidavits were received from the Edwardsville Creamery Co., Edwardsville, Ill., the New Era Dairy, Inc., Carbondale, Ill., and the Dressel-Young Dairy of Granite City, Ill., which reflect and substantiate the complaints and which are attached and made a part of this record.

In addition to these affidavits, statements were received and are made a part of this record from the Collinsville Dairy, Collinsville, Ill., Joseph L. Powers, representing employees of the Niederer Dairy, East St. Louis, Ill., Pat Quick, representing Sealtest Dairy employees, East St. Louis, Ill., and Milk Haulers & Dairy Workers Local No. 528, Greenville, Ill.

Also submitted herewith for inclusion in the printed record are photographs taken in the area visited, advertising milk for sale at prices as low as 10 cents per half gallon. Your attention is invited to the last picture of this series taken of a sign in the window of the State Street Supermarket, El Dorado, Ill. The sign reads as follows: "Going Wild, We Don't Have Cheap Milk, But We Do Have a Bargain in Dollar Bills, We Will Give You a Dollar Bill for 75 Cents."

This comedy relief is introduced as portraying the general confusion, misunderstanding and fear that prevails in the lower economic levels in the dairy industry in this area of Illinois.

An abundance of material, including newspaper advertisements of below-cost prices, statistics and other statements of a confidential nature, were received and are being held in the committee files.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the material will be received for the record.

(Above material not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NORTHWEST ARKANSAS AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the northwest section of Arkansas from Fort Smith north to the Missouri line and east to the area of Siloam Springs, Ark., and intermediate points.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate the dairy industry in this area by the Honorable JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Member of Congress representing the area and Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association. These requests for the investigation were made as a result of the Congressman receiving complaints from his constituents and NIDA receiving compaints from its members concerning the pricing practices noted in the area. These practices, it is alleged, involve sale of milk below cost through the supermarkets, chainstores and other outlets, the excessive use of milk as a loss leader and other unfair trade practices alleged to be followed for the purpose of reducing or eliminating competition of small independent processors and distributors. Direct charges were received against Foremost, Beatrice, and other large dairies alleging unfair competitive trade practices as mentioned.

I conducted an investigation in this area on February 24, 25, and 26, 1960, and received information tending to verify the allegations made. For example, in one retail store that I visited, I received a quart of Meadow Gold milk distributed by Beatrice Foods Co., by surrendering a small coupon taken from the local paper. This milk was given away free with no purchasing performance required. This appears to be the most flagrant loss

leader use of milk that the subcommittee has encountered and presents an example of apparent collusion between the large distributors and certain retail outlets designed to provide unfair competition to the local independent dairies and their commission deliverymen. Obviously, the home delivery service of the industry in this area cannot survive a continuation of these practices.

Information confirming the practices herein described was received through interviews with officers of independent dairies, routemen, and from newspaper advertisements which are attached and made a part of this record. Statements were also received from the Dixie Dairy, Inc., Siloam Springs, Ark., and the Cottage Club Dairy, Inc., Fayetteville, Ark., which are attached and made a part of this record. Likewise attached for inclusion in the record is a picture which I had taken of the milk display case in the Thriftway IGA store in Fayetteville, Ark., on February 24, 1960, attached to which is a page from the newspaper mentioned above, which has the coupon mentioned describing the gift of one quart of Meadow Gold milk free.

In addition to the above information that is included in this record concerning this area, an abundance of additional supporting material is included in the committee files for future reference.

Mr. STEED. Without objection, the statements will be made part of the record.

(Above statements not included in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

BURLINGTON, IOWA, AREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. This area includes the city of Burlington, Iowa, and all nearby points within a radius of approximately 30 miles. The population served is estimated at 40,000 and the total fluid milk product is produced, processed, and consumed within this area. Import and export of fluid milk is negligible.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area by the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, representing this district in Congress, and by Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association.

Requests for the investigation, which I made on March 24 and 25, 1960, were received as a result of complaints from constituents of the Congressman and members of the NIDA concerning the pricing practices noted in the area. These practices, it is alleged, involve a concerted effort on the part of supermarkets and chain stores, apparently in collusion, toward the illegal control of prices of milk and in and out of the stores. The objectives are alleged to be (1) the control of pricing, (2) use of milk as a loss leader, and (3) the elimination of the home delivery feature of the industry in this area. There are three well-established and efficient independent processors and distributors in this area, all of whom are receiving 36 cents per half gallon with no quantity or other discounts admitted, and during my visit to the area the out-of-store price was 29 cents per half gallon. Obviously a continuation of this practice would eliminate the home deliverymen who work on a commission basis for the dairies and are required to sell to their customers at prices far in excess of the current out-of-store prices.

Information confirming the situation as described herein was received through interviews with managers of supermarkets, officers of the three dairies and home deliverymen employed by these dairies. Inasmuch as it appears that retaliatory pricing practices are being used against some small business concern and these retaliatory pricing actions were being used because the small busines concerns did not participate in and carry out an agreement fixing the resale price of dairy products and inasmuch as the Federal Trade Commission is presently investigating the situation in this area, no documents are submitted at this time for inclusion in the record. The statements and other information received during this investigation are included in the committee files for future reference.

MONAHANS, ODESSA, AND MIDLAND, TEX., AREA

This area includes the three cities mentioned above and some additional territory in the east central part of the State of Texas.

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the dairy industry was requested to investigate pricing practices in this area by the Honorable J. T. RUTHERFORD, Member of Congress representing this district.

Requests for the investigation, which I made on March 19, 1960, were received as a result of complaints of constituents of the Congressman concerning pricing practices noted in the area.

Information received during the investigation revealed that very little milk is produced in this immediate area and that the requirement of this commodity is, therefore, necessarily imported from other points such as New Orleans, La., Dallas and Abilene, Tex. Thus, very little fluid milk is processed in the area and the complaints were received from local distributors of the out-of-area processors and several of the local retail stores. It appears that the intense competition for this busines has produced the use of large discounts and rebates involving discriminatory pricing in many instances. One independent businessman, having the agency for the product of a New Orleans dairy, advised that he does not grant discounts or pay rebates, but simply reduces his list price to meet wholesale and retail competitive prices that have been reduced by the discount system. The alleged cutthroat competition in this market has, in the opinion of those interviewed, resulted in below cost selling and discriminatory pricing resulting in a disastrous effect on the small distributors in the area.

Confusion and fear of reprisals and loss of business appear to dominate the small businessmen in this industry in this area and reluctance was noted on their part to document their problems. The investigation, however, produced some detailed information which was received in confidence and which is made a part of the committee files for future reference.

Mr. STEED. Thank you, Mr. Robertson.

Norfolk Cited as One of the All America Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent Virginia's most populous and most progressive congressional district. My district includes America's great port city, Norfolk, which is also Virginia's largest city.

During recent years Norfolk has been engaged in a major program of improvement. Her progress has been truly phenomenal and is a tribute to the people of the city, and particularly to their officials and community leaders whose foresight, good judgment, and tireless energies have overcome tremendous obstacles and achieved almost unbelievable results.

The publishers of Look magazine and the officials of the National Municipal League, in recognition of outstanding achievements, selected Norfolk as one of the All America Cities. The award was made jointly at impressive ceremonies on March 3, with presentation addresses by Mr. Cecil Morgan, past president of the National Municipal League, and Mr. Vernon C. Myers, publisher of Look magazine. I commend a reading of their remarks to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY CECIL MORGAN, PAST PRESIDENT, NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, AT ALL AMERICA CITY AWARD PRESENTATION, NORFOLK, VA., MARCH 3, 1960

Mayor Duckwork, members of the city council, Mr. City Manager, Governor Darden, Reverend Brown, and citizens of Norfolk, it is an honor to be in this great city of fine tradition, participating in this celebration marked, as it is, by the display of your historic mace, the replica of which I am proudly wearing. It is a pleasure to be with all of you and to help give recognition to the accomplishments of the diligent and progressive citizens of Norfolk.

Let me begin by telling you a little about the National Municipal League and its joint program with Look magazine.

The National Municipal League is a 65-year-old organization dedicated to the improvement of government through citizen participation. It prepares studies, improves methods, conducts research, disseminates information, and is a fountainhead of knowledge and experience in government affairs.

This program—the All America City Award presentation—is one of the ways the league dramatizes what can be accomplished by informed citizens, working in cooperation with dedicated public officials.

This program was started in 1949, and is a characteristically American scheme of recognition. Each year a group of distinguished judges selects an "all-American team" of 11 players in the "game of civic progress."

Cities are judged first for citizen action—the effort and initiative shown by members of the community in working together for civic improvement.

Secondly, cities are judged by the resulting accomplishments—which must be of outstanding benefit to the community as a whole.

We are proud of the fact that since 1952, a great national magazine—Look—has cosponsored this program, sharing our desire to recognize outstanding citizen participation in community affairs.

The reasons for the All America City Contest are simple. In recent years the problems of our municipalities have multiplied many times over. Far-reaching changes have taken place in almost every area.

Population has grown; industrial development has been rapid; health, housing, education, and transportation requirements have become pressing needs. New services have become vital and taxes have increased. Often, local government has been strained to its limits in coping with this rapid change and enormous growth. Citizen participation has been essential—and our contest is designed to provide recognition to those cities where local action has been most noticeable and most effective.

Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, served as head of the distinguished panel of judges that selected Norfolk as one of the 11 winners. Nearly 100 cities entered the competition—so you may be sure that Norfolk's accomplishments were outstanding to place your city in the winning lineup.

You are probably interested in knowing who the other members of your All America team are. Like Norfolk, each of these cities was honored for outstanding citizen teamwork in solving community problems. They are: Alton, Ill.; De Soto, Mo.; East St. Louis, Ill.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Lamar, Colo.; San Juan, P.R.; Santa Fe Springs, Calif.; Metropolitan Seattle, Wash.; Vallejo, Calif.; Winston-Salem, N.C.

Basically, the National Municipal League attempts to help citizens help themselves. And this is what Norfolk has done. You have helped yourselves—through knowledge of your needs, intelligent planning, and just plain hard work.

The past decade in Norfolk has witnessed the unfolding of a real American drama. It began with a dismal scene, which I am sure all of you remember. It took time for leadership, organization, and an aroused sense of public responsibility to converge and bring results—but vice, disease, and slums could not be tolerated. You declared war on these evils and you more than won your war.

Today is the dramatic culmination of a decade of work, planning, and striving to make Norfolk a better place in which to live. Your imposing buildings, lovely homes, and new highways spell opportunity and comfort. Your new industrial park, civic center, and medical center will be solid testimony that you have achieved your goals.

I am sure that I do not have to caution you not to rest on your laurels. A great tradition of civic action has taken root in Norfolk. For the first time, the citizens of this city are aware of their great power to effect necessary changes in local conditions. This tradition must not be permitted to die out.

I know that the momentum that has been building up for nearly 10 years is far from being spent. Indeed, I am sure it will provide the energy for even greater achievements in Norfolk in the years to come.

On behalf of the National Municipal League, I am proud to salute Norfolk—as a powerful addition to the All America City team—a winning team in the contest for better municipal living.

ALL AMERICA CITIES AWARD PRESENTATION, NORFOLK, VA., MARCH 3, 1960, BY VERNON C. MYERS, PUBLISHER, LOOK MAGAZINE

I am here today to enter the name of Norfolk on the rolls of a distinguished company. You may have some idea, from your own experience, or how much you have to do to win an All America Award. But I can tell you that the competition is keen. For the past 8 years, I have sat on the All-America Cities jury, and have heard 178 finalists present their stories. Most of them were excellent—every one of them had high merit or the city would not have been in the finals. And this I know without any doubt: the right to bear the All America City title is an honor contended for with heat and determination by citizens all over the country. To win, you have to be better than good. You have to be superb.

So, when Look congratulates the citizens of Norfolk, those congratulations are no empty good wishes. They are based on knowledge. We at Look know what the odds are. We know that winning an All America City Award requires citizen action of a high order—action that is creative, meaningful and persistent.

Look takes great pride in the All America Cities. We are especially proud to be associated in this program with our esteemed cosponsor, the National Muncipal League, an organization which, for more than 60 years has been a powerful champion in the cause of good government.

Just 11 years ago, the National Municipal League announced the first team of All America Cities. Since that time, the annual contest has grown into something of a national institution. We truly believe that the All America Cities Awards have defined and crystallized the concept of citizen action. And they have done more by focusing the attention of the Nation on those cities which have made citizen action a way of life in their communities, the awards—and the people who have helped win them—have inspired hundreds of groups in other cities to put forth similar efforts. That applies to Norfolk, too.

I said a moment ago that citizen action, to be of the highest order, must be creative. Let me explain that in terms of your own achievement.

The world "creative" comes from the verb "to create," which Webster defines in one of its meanings as "to make, by investing with new character or functions." What could better describe the job the citizens have done in Norfolk?

Out of a city whose problems had multiplied almost to the point of disaster, a city plagued by organized vice and disease, branded for its slums by housing authorities, choked by a population boom—out of this dismal picture of a community, Norfolk citizens are creating a city with a bright new character, and investing themselves as citizens, with new functions of civic service and action undreamed of 10 years ago.

The job you are doing for your historic city has, moreover, an importance to the Nation that reaches far beyond the achievements of other winning cities. As the site of the largest naval base on the east coast, you have a special responsibility. Time and again, the motivating force for citizen action in bringing about civic improvements is the desire of parents to make a better environment for their children. You in Norfolk must think not only of your own sons and daughters, but of the kind of environment you are offering to the sons and daughters of other citizens, from one end of the country to the other. That is a large assignment—and the more honor to you that you are living up to it.

I should like to say more in this matter of responsibility. A city holding an All-America City title is very much in the national spotlight. More than that, it is in the international spotlight. Brazil for example has patterned a program of its own on the All America Cities Contest. Municipal associations in Canada, Australia, West Germany, have contacted us for details, with the idea of inaugurating similar programs. The U.S. State Department consults the list of All America Cities winners in selecting places to send foreign officials who come here to study American communities and their governments.

These things have not happened because Look magazine sponsors the All America Cities awards, or because the National Municipal League sponsors them. They have happened because the American people themselves have taken the All America Cities competition to their hearts and, in a sense, have made it their own. The voices of praise have swelled to a multitude, but by the same token, the winning cities have become the focus of watchful criticism. As never before, what Norfolk has done in the past, what it is doing today, and what it will do in the future, is being weighed and measured in the national consciousness.

It takes courage to win an All America City award. It takes courage to be an All-America City. And I speak frankly when I say that it sometimes takes courage to be the sponsor of the All America Cities awards. It is hard for us to be philosophical about it when there are backsliders. One previous winner worked hard to elect a reform administration and clean out the gambling interests, and then fell asleep at the switch. Two years later, the old guard was back doing business at the same stand. A similar fate befell the citizens of two other All America Cities. And at this very moment, the citizens of a midwestern city—twice a winner of the All America City title—are preparing to fight all over again the battle they thought they had won in 1950 and 1951, when they threw out infamous machine government. Why? Because they forgot to be vigilant. They neglected their responsibility as an All America City.

Let us not mince words. It has taken a special kind of courage this year to sponsor All America Cities Awards to communities in the South. The eyes of the entire world are turned on the situation in the South—as I am sure I need not point out. An All America City in the South is on a particularly vulnerable spot—for it already stands out as an example in the public view. How you handle your relations with all your citizens in the coming years can have a profound bearing on the respect in which American democracy is held throughout the world. Without exaggeration, it could well be one of deciding factors in the battle of the West against communism.

Norfolk now joins three sister Virginia cities on the All America Cities roster—Roanoke, Richmond, Petersburg all have won in other years. Winston-Salem, N.C., which held its celebration last year, is another "star" of the South in this year's list of winners.

I feel confident that Norfolk will stand up to its responsibilities. That your responsibilities are greater than those of other cities will not frighten you. You have already made tremendous progress, and I predict that you will continue to make progress with increasing wisdom and vitality.

In conclusion, I should like to tell you why a national magazine goes to such trouble year after year to encourage communities to improve themselves. Look's greatest concern is in people—what they do, what they feel, what they believe, what they want. It's a never-ending story, which we try to tell with warmth, understanding, and wonder. We believe in people * * * but our interest goes beyond a mere belief. We also know what people can accomplish. We know that citizens of good will working together in their community for a common end, can achieve tremendous results. We have seen it happen time and time again. If we can help keep strong the average citizen's faith in his own importance and his own power, working with his fellows, to achieve his ambitions, then we shall have been well rewarded. It is citizens of cities like Norfolk who will make us know it is possible.

This Is the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to burden the RECORD with a dispute over dead men's bones and to weary my colleagues with a discussion now of a bill which was passed unanimously last year by the House. But, the double task has been thrust upon me by a distinguished Member from Indiana who, on March 24, revived a claim, first circulated in 1928, that a Samuel Wilson, buried in Merriam, Ind., was the progenitor of "Uncle Sam," our national symbol.

This House, acting on the recommendation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and by unanimous vote, passed early last summer a joint resolution honoring Samuel Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the real progenitor of "Uncle Sam" and declaring his grave in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, to be a national shrine.

The statement by the gentleman from Indiana obviously was not made to influence House action, already taken, but to persuade the other body to sidetrack or kill the resolution, denying Samuel Wilson of Troy the full recognition nationally already accorded him by historians, the city of Troy, and the State of New York.

Is it not fair to ask why those who now revive the bit of Merriam, Ind., folklore were silent last year when this matter was before the House? Where were they on May 7, 1959, when the Subcommittee on Public Lands, headed by the Honorable GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, conducted a day long public hearing on the bill which the House later passed? Where were they when the resolution came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, which committee passed it unanimously? Where were they when the matter was before a Senate subcommittee earlier this year, which committee subsequently approved it?

Perhaps it will be claimed that they did not know about the Troy resolution. All the wire services carried stories about it. Many great newspapers and national magazines carried feature articles about it.

A large delegation came from Troy to Washington, stopping at Philadelphia en route for well-publicized ceremonies at Independence Hall. Leading the delegation was a distinguished citizen of Troy, attired in a colorful "Uncle Sam" garb. He walked about Capitol Hill and posed for national television shots on the Capitol steps. Certainly the whole effort was not made in the dead of night.

The Troy group did not press their case with a newspaper feature story. They brought with them men who had made long and careful studies of historical fact. They included historians Thomas I. Gerson of the Record Newspapers, Troy, N.Y., Col. Edgar T. Noyes of Texas, and Dr. J. Almus Russell of Pennsylvania.

At the hearing, there was not a written word of opposition to the resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, as a national shrine.

The resolution was also supported by the American coalition of patriotic societies, the Eastern Regional Council of the U.S. Flag Committee, the National Society of U.S. Daughters of 1812, and many other groups.

As to the value of testimony submitted at the House subcommittee hearing on May 7, 1959, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, U.S. Senator, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, wrote to Mr. Gerson on March 30, 1960:

> I believe the record made before the House committee is complete and that it makes out a prima facie case warranting the enactment of the resolution. It is my intention to make that record available to the Indiana parties, with the suggestion that they disprove the record, if possible. If they cannot successfully challenge the record, the committee will proceed with the consideration of the resolution.

Passage of this legislation is important, because the "Uncle Sam" symbol represents very much the same in the minds and hearts of our people as does the U.S. flag, and as such it must be protected. The testimony before the House subcommittee revealed that some writers have attacked the symbol "Uncle Sam" as being archaic and suggested that it be abandoned. The enactment of this resolution would be an expression of the determination of Congress not to yield to forces which would destroy this enduring symbol.

It has been proved by testimony that the symbol of "Uncle Sam" is not the creature of a cartoonist's pen, but the result of the evolution of the American dream—as expressed in the life story of a most representative American, Samuel Wilson, who was born in Menotomy, now Arlington, Mass., on September 13, 1766, and who died in Troy, N.Y., July 31, 1854, and who is buried in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., where a bronze tablet marks his final resting place. Over his peaceful grave fly the Stars and Stripes maintained by the Uncle Sam's Council, Boy Scouts of America, Troy, N.Y.

The story of Sam Wilson's life is an abridged story of America. As a boy, Sam helped his brothers and sisters run the Wilson farm at Menotomy when their father, Edward Wilson, answered Paul Revere's dramatic call to arms on April 18–19, 1775, and took part in the Battle of Lexington which signaled the birth of New World freedom. Samuel Wilson, then but a boy of 8½, helped to ring the church bell and beat the drums that aroused the other Minute Men. The American Revolution had truly begun, and the Wilson family, all settlers and farmers, took an active part in it. Sam's older brothers, Joseph and Edward, Jr., fought with Gen. George Washington. Sam Wilson himself, as a boy of 14½, ran away from home to serve as a service boy with the American Army until the end of the war.

Samuel Wilson did not know it, but this was his training ground for the next war with England, the War of 1812, when he would emerge as "Uncle Sam," the symbol of an aspiring America and the embodiment of its spirit.

Young Sam was tall, lanky, and strong as a young bullock when he returned from the war. The dark fighting days of the Revolutionary War had broadened his vision, sharpened his wits. Just as Sam Wilson had spoken out against those defeatists who believed that the 13 separate and loosely joined Colonies could not win their independence from England, so he now opposed those pessimists who believed that the new Nation, perpetuated on September 17, 1787, could not survive as a weak and debt-burdened infant nation.

In February of 1789, almost penniless, Samuel Wilson and his brother Ebenezer migrated to Troy, where by dint of hard work Sam took root in the community and became known for his honesty and commonsense, wielding great influence for good.

By the beginning of the War of 1812 Sam Wilson had become prominent in the State. A tall, slender man with a "nutcracker" face, he was especially liked by children who called him "Uncle Sam." People came for miles around for his counsel. He was deeply religious, and was quoted as saying:

> The big thing is not what happens to us in life, but what we do about what happens to us.

He had left his mark upon Troy and the State of New York by the time 1812 rolled around. He had spurred the development of waterpower, championed many civic improvements—helped to give America its purpose and direction.

Sam Wilson and his brother, besides operating a brickmaking plant, a general store, and freightage service on the Hudson River—also owned and operated a meatpacking plant under the name of E. & S. Wilson," where they slaughtered 150 head of cattle a day.

In October of 1812 Sam Wilson was made inspector of provisions for the Army in New York by Elbert Anderson, Jr., the contractor for the Army. Anderson lived in New York City, and had no known holdings in Troy, other than his contract with Samuel Wilson.

Early in 1812, as the war got underway, Mr. Anderson arrived in Troy with Theodorus Bailey, the postmaster of New York City, according to Col. Edgar T. Noyes. Mr. Bailey, who represented New York State in Congress during his lifetime, had attained the rank of brigadier general in the New York State Militia. When Mr. Bailey died in 1828, according to Colonel Noyes, he left a written account of the origin of "Uncle Sam," for he had witnessed the incident that had linked Samuel Wilson who is now buried in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., to America's symbol.

That incident revealed that one of the visitors to the Wilson plant in Troy on October 1, 1812, asked what the initials "EA-US" on the barrels of meat stood for. A workman replied that the "EA" stood for Elbert Anderson, the contractor, and added jokingly that the "US" stood for "Uncle Sam" Wilson, or an abbreviation for the United States.

The allusion caught on and spread rapidly, for Sam Wilson was popular. He epitomized the plain American, with a devotion to honesty, self-reliance, and a passion for justice for himself and all men. The step from this to an impersonation of our country by an ideal "Uncle Sam" was a logical sequence. The term caught on like wildfire and the rest is history—history made largely by newspapers and cartoonists whose classic figure of Uncle Sam wears striped trousers, frock coat, and tall hat—

clothing typical of successful businessmen of that era.

Cartoonists of the day such as Thomas Nast and Frank Bellew joined the crusade for Uncle Sam as the symbol of our national aspirations. They were displeased with the earlier symbol of colonial America personified by "Brother Jonathan," a country bumpkin created during the Revolutionary War, who often got the best of King George. They found him just as inadequate as they did "Yankee Doodle," which had served its purpose.

The need for another national symbol was felt after America won independence, and around the turn of the century when Americans began to feel there was poetry and drama in the continental sweep of their expansion.

The Troy Record newspapers helped to bring the story of the origin of Uncle Sam to the attention of the Nation. Artists like Joseph Keppler propagated the figure of "Uncle Sam" built by Nast, Bellew, and others.

European caricaturists also accepted "Uncle Sam" with open arms, and even made him a rare target for the barbed jibes of jealous Old World nations.

Today, thanks to our testimony, "Uncle Sam" lives on for Americans as a flesh-and-blood human being, because we have accepted his origin. He is the neighbor who swaps yarns over the back fence at sunset; he is easy-walking, easy-talking. You know where you are with "Uncle Sam." And yet he remains a spokesman for all that went before him in the building of America, and all that is yet to come. For there is that sense of dedication in him, that urge of destiny running through him, because "Uncle Sam" Wilson who lies buried at Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., faced the problems of his troubled times with faith and courage, and with a deep conviction in the glorious destiny of the United States of America which the Wilson family helped to create.

Samuel Wilson, the prototype of "Uncle Sam," never left Troy except for several years after the War of 1812 when he and a younger brother opened another meat-processing plant in Catskill, N.Y. Oddly enough, there were many Samuel Wilsons living in the United States at that time, and many of these Samuel Wilsons were mistaken for the kindly, genial prototype of "Uncle Sam" who lived at 144 Ferry Street, Troy, N.Y.

Samuel Wilson died at his home, 144 Ferry Street, Troy, N.Y., on July 31, 1854, at the age of 88. He died of old age, and was buried the next day in Mount Ida Cemetery, Troy.

Some years later members of the extensive Wilson family moved Sam Wilson's body from Mount Ida Cemetery in Troy, N.Y., to its present location in Oakwood Cemtery, Troy, N.Y.

In 1931, a granddaughter, Marion Wilson Sheldon, erected a 5-ton granite shaft to his memory at his grave at Oakwood Cemetery, with an appropriate bronze plaque:

U.S.: In loving memory of "Uncle Sam," the name originating with Samuel Wilson, 1766–1854, during the War of 1812 and since adopted by the United States.

Appended for inclusion is the affidavit of the record of burial in Oakwood Cemetery:

TROY CEMETERY ASSOCIATION,
OAKWOOD,
TROY, N.Y., *May 1, 1959.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that, according to the permanent records of Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., Samuel Wilson is interred in lots Nos. 46 and 47, section F, grave No. 3. The records also show the interment number as 922.

Samuel Wilson was born in Massachusetts and died in Troy, N.Y., on July 31, 1854, at the age of 87. Cause of death is listed as old age. His parents are shown as Edward and Lucy Wilson.

We further certify that his wife, Betsy M. Wilson, is interred beside him in grave No. 4 in the above-mentioned lots and section, interment No. 1642. Betsy M. Wilson was born in New Hampshire and died in Troy, N.Y., on August 20, 1863, at the age of 90. Cause of death, old age.

ELBERT A. HOFFMAN,
Assistant Secretary and Superintendent.

Elbert A. Hoffman, to me personally known, appeared before me on May 1, 1959, and swore that the above information are statistics taken from the permanent records of the Troy Cemetery Association.

MARGARET A. BRENNAN,
Notary Public.

I assure the gentleman from Indiana that I respect the memory of the old gentleman buried in his State, but there is no historical proof that he was "Uncle Sam" or that he even lived in Troy.

We have submitted full proof and we ask that the honor due "Uncle Sam" Wilson not be rejected on the basis of a bit of folklore submitted at the 11th hour.

The spirit of our "Uncle Sam" might well, in the midst of this controversy, paraphrase Shakespeare to say:

He who steals my purse steals trash;
He who steals my name steals all.

The "Samuel Wilson" said to be buried in Merriam, Ind., must have been a member of another Wilson family and not the Samuel Wilson who died in Troy in 1854 at the age of 88. According to the accounts accepted in Indiana, he was quite a patriot in his own right.

But he was not the Samuel Wilson, the original "Uncle Sam," whose family fought in the War for Independence; whose life from 1766 to 1854 witnessed the birth and progress of the United States, spanning as it did the period before the Declaration of Independence to the emergence of the United States as a world power.

On April 2, 1856, Benjamin Mann Wilson, a son of "Uncle Sam" Wilson and "Aunt Betsy" Wilson, purchased two lots at Oakwood Cemetery—because Troy was growing, and plans were afoot to use the Mount Ida Cemetery for other purposes. And a few years later, Samuel Wilson's body was disinterred and reburied in its present resting place at Oakwood Cemetery, where he lies besides his beloved "Aunt Betsy."

Hofstra College: A Community Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am justifiably proud of an outstanding educational accomplishment in my congressional district. This month, Hofstra College, in Hempstead, N.Y., celebrates the 25th anniversary of its founding.

HOFSTRA COLLEGE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Twenty-five years ago, on April 8, 1935, the executors of the estate of Mrs. William S. Hofstra signed over a 12-acre Hempstead property to New York University. The following September, Nassau College-Hofstra Memorial opened its doors to 159 full-time freshmen and 631 evening students.

This was in keeping with Mrs. Hofstra's wish that the home, then called "The Netherlands," be used for the benefit of the Long Island community as a memorial to her deceased husband. At first a 2-year college, it was granted a provisional charter in 1937 to operate as a 4-year institution known as Hofstra College of New York University. Two years later, in 1939, the independent board of trustees terminated the contract with NYU and, in 1940, an absolute charter was given by the regents of the University of the State of New York to Hofstra College.

All classrooms and offices were housed in The Netherlands, the homestead renamed Hofstra Hall, in 1935. By 1938, additional acreage had been acquired and Calkins Gymnasium, Brower and Barnard Halls were erected, forming, with Hofstra Hall, the first or main quadrangle. Mason Hall, the library, was completed soon after. Today the library has 90,000 volumes.

Memorial Hall, devoted to student activities and named in memory of the Hofstra students who gave their lives in World War II, opened in 1949. Three wings have been added to the building which houses the cafeteria, bookstore, game rooms, lounges, dean of students and activities offices. The cafeteria seats 910 persons at one time and makes more than 5,000 daily sales, ranging from a cup of coffee to full-course meals.

Hofstra now has 18 buildings located on its 70-acre campus. Two additional buildings are under construction. All new buildings from the first one have been designed by one architect, Aymar Embury II.

Dr. Truesdel Peck Calkins was the first president of Hofstra. When he died in 1942, Howard S. Brower, one of the Hofstra estate executors and chairman of the college board of trustees, became acting president, serving until Dr. John Canford Adams became the second president in 1944.

The college has seen its period of greatest growth under the direction of

President Adams, a world-recognized Shakespearean authority. The only 4-year college in Nassau or Suffolk Counties to cater exclusively to the commuting student, Hofstra has no dormitories but does have parking spaces for some 2,000 cars. It is estimated that 92 percent of its 8,500 day and evening enrollment comes from Long Island.

This enrollment consists of some 3,000 day students, most of whom carry full schedules and are working toward the bachelor's degree; of 5,000 late afternoon and evening students who are employed during the day or are housewives; and about 500 students in 2 extension programs at Brentwood and Huntington.

According to a survey published in January 1960, by School and Society magazine, Hofstra today is the largest private independent college of liberal arts and sciences in this country and ranks fifth among all independent colleges, including public institutions.

President Adams is proud of the young, vigorous faculty Hofstra attracts. Of the 205 teachers serving full time, 114 hold the Ph. D. degree. Most of the 77 holding master's and the 14 with bachelor's degrees are currently studying toward the higher degrees. Two regular faculty members are on leave this year to accept Fulbright fellowships for teaching and study abroad. The part-time faculty of 157 includes many experts in their fields who are employed elsewhere when they are not teaching.

Always interested in experimentation, Hofstra will open, in September 1960, an experimental branch to be called the New College. With the help of a $170,000 grant from the fund for the advancement of education of the Ford Foundation, it will attempt to combine the freshman and sophomore academic years into one calendar year. Under the direction of Dr. Jack T. Johnson, Hofstra vice president and provost of the New College, the branch will emphasize a close faculty-student relationship and self-study. Enrollment will be limited to 120, with a handpicked faculty of 6. The branch will open in a new building at the extreme western end of the campus but it hoped that it will be moved away from the parent institution when another location is found.

Hofstra's curriculum is organized into five divisions: Humanities; natural sciences, mathematics, and engineering; social sciences; business; and education. Advanced degrees include the master of arts in a number of specializations; master of business administration; and master of science in education. The college recently announced that 1,316 schoolteachers of the metropolitan area are working toward their master's degrees in the evening program.

The Hofstra Playhouse, completed in 1958, provides a most modern and attractive setting for the numerous cultural and civic events sponsored by the college for its students and the Long Island community. The second annual subscription series of outstanding entertainers opened last fall with Katharine Cornell and Brian Aherne in "Dear Liar." The Hofstra Symphony Orchestra concerts and productions by the drama department are open to the public. The college is noted for its annual Shakespeare festival.

Other services, available not only to the Hofstra students but to the community, include a reading center for the improvement of that skill, a speech clinic, and a testing and counseling service. Civic, business, and educational organizations frequently use meeting spaces for lectures, films, and forums.

Although a commuter's college, Hofstra provides an atmosphere of campus life. Fraternities and sororities, chapters of national honor societies, and many special interest clubs abound. The memorial hall meetingrooms and lounges are used by these groups during winter months, and in the warm spring and fall the students can be found relaxing, between classes, on the well-kept lawns of the three large quadrangles. This year, most of the cocurricular groups have been busy for weeks, planning their floats for the annual spring day parade through the streets of Hempstead. Appropriately, the theme of the parade, which will complete the 25th year festivities on June 4, will be "celebrations."

Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, emphasizing the truth of the slogan, "Hiring the Handicapped Is Good Business," the 12th annual National Essay Contest selected as the theme for the 1960 National Essay Contest, "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity." The essay contest which closed January 31, 1960, was held in the several States and the first-place winners will enter the national competition which provides prizes of $1,000, $400, $300, $200, and $100.

It is pleasing to state that in the essay contest in the State of Pennsylvania one of my constituents, Michael Orlando, son of Mr. and Mrs. Mario Orlando, a student at the Altoona Catholic High School, was declared first-place winner among 14,789 other essays in the State contest. Michael had previously won the essay contest in the Blair County area which qualified him for the statewide competition.

The literary efforts of Michael Orlando have brought him acclaim in high school circles in the Keystone State and especially in Blair County, Pa., where labor organizations and the Fraternal Order of Eagles have been interested in providing employment for the physically handicapped. In this connection, the five prize-winning essays in Pennsylvania received U.S. savings bonds of $200 for first place, followed by the four runner-ups receiving bonds in lesser denominations. In addition to the $200 U.S. savings bond as first prize which was won by Michael Orlando he also will receive an all-expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C., to attend the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped scheduled for May 5 and May 6. The all-expense trip is being underwritten by the AFL–CIO with the Fraternal Order of Eagles contributing the State awards and the Disabled American Veterans contributing the prizes in the national contest.

Michael Orlando's essay is a unique presentation of the theme, "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity," which he chose as the subject of an interesting account of the experience of a normal American couple overcome temporarily by the winds of adversity. The experience of the couple reflects an abiding love for each other and a deep and penetrating faith in God that defies all efforts to shake it for the depths of despair. In congratulating Michael Orlando for his literary triumph, I wish to salute his fine parents and the faculty members of the Altoona Catholic High School for the encouragement they have given Michael and which undoubtedly aided him greatly in his determination to emerge as the winner of first-place honors in Pennsylvania.

As evidence of the importance attached to Michael Orlando's triumph in the essay contest, he was guest of honor at a luncheon, April 5, 1960, in the Lincoln Room of the Penn-Alto Hotel, Altoona, Pa. At this point in my remarks I wish to incorporate the following news article from the April 6, 1960, issue of the Altoona Mirror which describes the victory luncheon. I wish also to include Michael's prize-winning essay as a conclusion to my tribute to his literary ability and the hard-fought laurels he has won in a field of 14,789 young Americans who took the time and study to help focus attention on the importance of realizing that hiring the handicapped is good business.

The article and essay are as follows:

[From the Altoona Mirror, Apr. 6, 1960]

ESSAY CONTEST WINNER HONORED AT LUNCHEON

Members of the Blair County Committee on Employment of the Handicapped held a noon luncheon in the Lincoln Room of the Penn-Alto Hotel yesterday to present State and National awards to Michael Orlando, a student at the Altoona Catholic High School.

Michael was local winner in an essay contest sponsored by the Blair County Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. The subject of Michael's essay was "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity." The local county winning essay was sent to Harrisburg where it competed in the statewide contest. Michael's essay was selected as first-place winner from among 14,789 other essays in the State contest.

A U.S. savings bond in the amount of $200 was presented to Michael by Mark Brown, treasurer of the Pennsylvania State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, representing the prize donor organization.

Framed certificates of merit from both the President's and Governor's committees on employment of the handicapped were presented to Michael by Randolph M. Clark, chairman of the Blair County committee on employment of the handicapped, and J. Murray Sheilar.

This year, for the first time, there is an additional prize to the first-place winner of an expenses-paid trip to Washington, D.C., to attend the President's committee annual conference on May 5 and 6. The AFL–CIO has underwritten the expense of the trip, which will counsist of $100 expense money and transportation costs. Lawrence Schrenk, of the Blair County Central Labor Council, representing the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, AFL, and Charles Ferguson, of the Pennsylvania CIO Council, presented the checks to Michael for the trip.

Attending the meeting as guests of the Blair County Committee on Employment of the Handicapped were Mr. and Mrs. Mario Orlando, Michael's parents, and the Reverend Vincent A. Luther, principal of Altoona Catholic High School.

Members of the local committee in attendance were: Roy F. Thompson, mayor; William E. Jenkins, district administrator of vocational rehabilitation; John Tongue, Julius Iacurto, and Raymond Matejczyk, counselors of bureau of rehabilitation; Kermit Martz, John Fraker, and Kenneth V. Moore, Pennsylvania State Employment Service; J. Murray Shollar, Veterans of World War I; Willis Griffith, department of public assistance; Correll C. Gressley, Blair County Commissioner; Mrs. Eliza Leader, executive director, Blair County Tuberculosis and Health Society; Albert Evans, chief of social service, Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital; Pat Guido, Iaia Post, American Legion; Mrs. Eleanor Geesey, personnel director, William F. Gable Co.; Nelson Gault, personnel director, Veeder-Root, Inc.; Lawrence Schrenk, Blair County Central Labor Council; M. E. Weyant, secretary-treasurer, Transport Workers Union of America; AFL–CIO; Germania Stehle, Disabled American Veterans; John Horon, international representative, Transport Workers Union, AFL–CIO, and John Riley, WFBG–TV.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY

(By Michael Orlando)

Alice sat quickly watching her husband reading the morning paper. Instead of eating her breakfast she had let herself become entangled in a web of deep thought. On her face a clear look of admiration was visable. She was recalling the six wonderful years since Frank and she had been married.

It was true, she thought, that they had not been idle years, for together they had worked diligently to save enough money to buy their wonderful little home. She couldn't help feeling a tinge of pride in her husky husband, who in all those six glorious years had never missed a day's work at the plant and who seemed to be ever abounding in pent up energy. Yes, they had been hard years of work and worry, but the feeling of satisfaction that always comes with a job well done, was constantly there, so that together they had accomplished their task. Working mutually for so long had made them like one person, and she knew that they both felt that no problem would be too great to overcome, just as long as they faced it together.

As she sat there thinking of this, it suddenly struck her just how lucky she really was to have such a fine husband. Frank had always been kind and good to her, always being considerate and understanding, and after Joey had been born it seemed he could never do enough for her and their son.

Suddenly Frank interrupted her train of thought by lifting his head up and speaking. "You're awfully quiet this morning, Alice. Is something bothering you?"

Shaking herself back to reality she answered him. "Oh, no, Frank. I was just thinking how glad I was that we are finally settled. It's hard to believe that at last we have the home that we've wanted for so long Has it ever occurred to you how thankful we should be? We have a fine 3-year-old son, a new home, and you have a very good job that you're happy with. If someone has told me 10 years ago that I was going to be this happy, I never would have believed him. One thing, though, Frank, that has always fascinated me about you, is that you never seem to get tired of your job. Why, I don't believe in all the 6 years that we're been married, I've ever heard you say anything disparaging about your work."

Frank took a drink from his coffee cup. He paused a minute, then said, "You know, Alice, I've always told you that I have one strong belief and that is that a man's work is his life. If he obtains satisfaction from his job, then no matter what it is, it will help him to lead a happy, useful life. And he can always have pride and self respect."

Little did Frank know at the time he spoke these words that his very strong convictions would soon be put to a rugged test—a test so stiff that only a man with his spirit and determination would be able to pass. Little did Alice know that she too would be tested, not personally, but through her devoted love for her husband. Yes, neither of them realized that very close now was the tragedy that would change their lives. Here is exactly what happened.

Later that afternoon as Alice was cleaning up the dining room and wondering why Frank was late getting home from work, the telephone rang. She recognized at once the voice of her next door neighbor, Bud Hachly, who also worked down at the airplane plant with Frank and who usually rode home at night after work with her husband. She could tell by the anxious tone of Bud's "Hello, Alice?" that something was wrong and her heart beat wildly as she answered, "Yes?"

"Alice, this is Bud. Now I don't want you to get excited, but we had a little accident coming home from work." "Oh, Bud, where's Frank? Is he hurt? Where are you now?"

"We're down at the city hospital. Frank's okay. He just banged up his arm. They have him in surgery now. I wasn't injured in the accident, and I called you as soon as I could get to a phone."

Alice could not restrain a feeling of fear that was growing inside of her, and she said to Bud, "All right Bud, I'll be down as quickly as possible, good by."

When Alice arrived at the hospital,' she learned that the car had been almost demolished. Both Frank and Bud were very lucky to be alive. Bud was a mass of bruises but he sustained no serious injuries. Frank, however, had his left arm pinned somehow, and it was mangled quite badly. The doctor assured her that they were doing everything in their power to save the arm, but he would not be able to tell for a couple of hours. It seemed like an eternity as Alice waited but finally a doctor approached her. "Mrs. Harper? I'm sure that Frank is going to live, but I'm afraid he will be without the use of his left arm for quite a while, maybe indefinitely. I'm very sorry." These few words began for Alice and Frank probably the most trying period of their entire lives.

In the next few months Frank's recovery was complete except for his inability to use his arm. The doctors told them that nerves had been severed in Frank's arm and using it would be virtually impossible. Frank's strong character enabled him to take this as well as could be expected but as time passed his strong desire to get back to his job kept him in an inner turmoil. He wanted to go to his boss and ask him for some kind of job, any job, just as long as he could work, but he was afraid that he would be rejected. He felt that maybe there was no place in industry for a man with one good arm, and this gnawing fact kept him away. However, Frank had Alice, and Alice also had fight and spirit. They talked it over seriously, and at last she convinced him to act once again like a man. She prayed that Frank would not give up and quit fighting to get back to normal.

Her prayers were answered, and as they walked up the stairs to the office of Mr. Martell, the business manager of the plant, she made up her mind that even if they failed she would not let Frank give up. Her courage was great; her husband's was superb. When they walked into the outer office they were surprised to find that they were immediately accepted and taken into Mr. Martell's office. Mr. Martell listened very attentively to Frank's story, and when Frank had told him everything and bravely proclaimed his wish to go back to work, he sat anxiously and waited for a reply.

Frank was in for a great shock as Mr. Martell began to talk. "My boy," he said, "I purposely did not contact you while you were recovering for two very goods reasons. Let me explain. You see, after I heard the news of your accident from your friend, Bud, I wanted to help you in some way. It had never been the policy of our plant to hire anyone with a physical handicap; but, thanks to your friend Bud, I was enlightened. He persuaded me to look into statistics and see for myself just why hiring handicapped people can be good business. I contacted our local committee on hiring the handicapped, and the information I received was astounding. Why, statistics show that handicapped workers, when put at a job they can do, put out slightly better work than their nonhandicapped coworkers. Their accident rates on the job are no higher than other people's who are not disabled, I also learned that insurance rates do not go up because of hiring handicapped workers. I had never given this much thought, but the man down at the committee office told me that actually a handicapped person does better work than a normal worker because of his intense desire to succeed and to prove himself. This sounded like very sound reasoning to me."

A big smile broke out on Mr. Martell's face as he continued, "I'm sorry if I seemed to get carried away. It probably sounded as if I were trying to sell you on the idea of hiring handicapped people but I must admit that my ideas on the subject have been greatly changed. A minute ago I spoke of two reasons for not contacting you. The first reason was that after Bud convinced me to look into the subject requiring a little of my time, but actually my first reason only helped me to think of a very good reason for not getting in touch with you. Frank, I wanted to see if what that man at the committee office told me was the truth. You proved it to me by showing me determination and a great will to succeed. You may not realize this, but today you not only did yourself a great favor but also many other handicapped people. From now on I am going to base our policy on you. If in the coming months you show me that you can do the job we give you, then I will never hestitate to hire another handicapped person with your spirit. I wish you the best of luck, and God bless you."

Frank and Alice were spellbound, but they managed to thank Mr. Martell gratefully. That day as they walked out together they were the two happiest people in the world.

In the coming month Frank proved his worth at the plant, and now he and Alice are back to living normal lives again. As for the plant itself, well, there are three new employees there, and they are all handicapped workers but doing a fine job nevertheless.

You may wonder where a story like this came from. Well, my only purpose in writing this is that maybe somewhere a man will hear it who is in a position to profit by it and to help others profit by it through hiring them. If through my writing this, just one handicapped person is given a

chance, then I shall call it a success. My interest in this is not primarily a personal one. Maybe this would be better explained if in closing I say that it was very gratifying to see my uncle Frank and my Aunt Alice finally being as happy again as they once were.

Does Frustration Cause Drinking?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1960, a very interesting article appeared in the Sunday Bulletin, of Philadelphia, Pa., regarding a young student in my congressional district. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the aforesaid article, which is as follows:

IN OUR TOWN
(By James Smart)

A Bucks County boy named Peter Frank drove a mouse to drink recently.

Most of the mice of my acquaintance are teetotalers, so I checked with Peter to find out what was going on.

Peter, who is 15 and lives in Yardley, is a senior at Pennsbury High School. He won first prize in the biological division of a science contest in his school district recently with a display on the subject "Does Frustration Cause Drinking?"

Peter set out to frustrate a mouse.

First he went to a store in Levittown and bought some white mice from the pet department.

Then he built a couple of cages and put one mouse in each cage.

Each cage had two drinking supplies, one of water and the other of vodka.

The two mice lived happily in their cages for two weeks while Peter made scientific observations of the normal behavior and kept a careful check on how much they drank.

Both mice, Peter admits, did take a nip now and then. None of us is perfect.

What the mice didn't know was that one of them was in a cage Peter had designed for purposes of frustrating the occupant.

The wire-mesh bottom rested on a board studded with nails, one nailhead under each square of the mesh. And to the nailheads was fastened a transformer.

The mouse in that cage could be given a harmless electric shock, just enough to make him uncomfortable. The mouse couldn't get away from the annoyance, and he never knew when it was coming.

After the 2 weeks of observing the normal drinking habits of mice, Peter started giving shocks to the one mouse every once in a while. It didn't take long to frustrate the critter.

Pretty soon the frustrated mouse began hitting the rodent cocktail (Peter's recipe—four parts vodka to three parts water).

"His alcoholic intake rose," reports Peter. "At the highest point, the mouse that received the shocks drank more than twice as much as the normal mouse."

The frustrated mouse never got drunk, Peter says. At least he never staggered around the cage or sang ribald songs.

But at times he began to show his liquor. "He would sit in the corner of the cage and you couldn't move him or excite him," Peter says.

After 3 weeks of this, Peter cut out the shocks but kept checking the behavior of the mice.

The frustrated mouse, he discovered, gradually drank less after the shocks stopped, but still drank more than the other mouse.

"I think I really proved that inescapable frustration causes drinking," Peter says.

Peter wants to be a doctor, like his grandfather. His dad is an engineer.

He read in the journal of the American Medical Association about a similar experiment conducted with cats, and that's what started him driving mice to drink.

Now that the experiment is over, he has sold the mice back to the store, where neither of them is likely ever to get a slug of vodka again.

A Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the recent issue of 25-year, 4¼-percent bonds by the Treasury Department, which resulted in a disappointingly small subscription, strengthens the plea of the Department for removal of the ceiling on long-term financing.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News of April 9, 1960, is persuasive, in my opinion, and I hope will be read with interest:

A FAILURE

A 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on new issues of Government bonds may have had some validity in 1918 when it became Federal law. In 1960 the ceiling is neither defensible nor functional. This was effectively demonstrated by the U.S. Treasury's disappointing attempt to sell a 25-year 4¼-percent bond. Investors' response to the offering was indeed limited.

In announcing plans for the bond issue, Treasury officials had expressed the hope that sales would run to $500 million and even said that subscriptions up to $1½ billions would be accepted. As it turned out, investors subscribed to only $370 million worth of the new issue.

The sale's failure buttresses President Eisenhower's argument for the need of removing the interest rate ceiling. Democrats in Congress had ignored Mr. Eisenhower's request for a year, finally agreeing earlier this session to modify the ceiling. Secretary of Treasury Anderson reluctantly accepted the compromise because it gave him a little more room in which to manage the national debt.

But even this compromise was headed toward oblivion when interest rates on short-term loans began their recent decline. Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, leader of the opposition to redoing the ceiling, pointed to the trend in the short-term money market as proof of his arguments. But the only thing that was proved by the bond sale was that his arguments were, as Mr. Anderson politely understated it, "not well-founded."

Yet the results of this week's sale have left Mr. DOUGLAS unconvinced. He doesn't charge the Treasury with having deliberately planned the failure. Nonetheless, he does suggest that if the Treasury "had planned for failure it would have not acted much differently."

But the Treasury's failure was also the failure of Mr. DOUGLAS and his group. For, in effect, the offering of the 25-year bond at the interest rate ceiling was their suggestion. Even the callable feature, to redeem the bonds after 15 years, was on the advice of the Democrats. Hence Mr. Anderson was obliged to test the reaction of investors. Not to have done so would have been to risk congressional censure.

Africa at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The permanent political alinements of emerging African nations will be the decisive balance in world politics.

This statement appears in a thoughtful editorial from the Boston Traveler of Saturday, March 19, 1960.

It is a quotation from a "Report From Africa," by President Harold C. Case, of Boston University, which was inserted in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of March 23, 1960, page A2626. I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

SUMMING UP AND LOOKING AHEAD

With the nations of Africa emerging from colonial status into independence with what amounts to the speed of light—politically speaking—there's naturally a good deal of talk about helping them out.

By and large, this comes under the heading of "aid to the underdeveloped countries." Everyone seems to agree that if their newfound freedom is to mean a better life—free from poverty, illness and misery—the African states are going to need billions of dollars in capital investments.

Billions for roads, dams, powerplants, factories, hospitals, railways, airports, docks, TV and radio networks. Billions to build a 20th century civilization out of the tropical undergrowth, tribal customs and hopes for tomorrow of a vast, untapped continent.

Of course, it depends on where you live whether you believe all those billions should be dollars or rubles.

Africa—enormous in size, bigger than the United States, China, and India combined, with 230 million people and the richest undeveloped resources on the fact of the earth—is certain to become one of the major arenas of the cold war.

The Communist struggle to win friends and influence people has already begun on the Dark Continent, despite warnings by both African and Western leaders on the hazards of extending the competition.

Among the most recent of those warnings was one sounded this week by Boston University President Harold C. Case, just back from a 2-month tour of Africa. He said:

"Africans are moving at a dangerous pace, around uncharted political curves, on undeveloped economic bush trails. They lack educated leadership. They are risking much. But they are determined. The magic word is 'independence.'

"We should not be maneuvered into the position where our assistance of any sort appears to be forced by the growing interests of the Soviets in African nations.

"On the other hand, to assert that Communist influence in Africa is negligible or that the Soviets are not utilizing all methods at hand to capitalize on this social revolution is to be both naive and blind."

One of the most obvious areas of Communist penetration in Africa is the small west coast nation of Guinea. When the French, angered because the natives voted against remaining in de Gaulle's French community, pulled out fast in 1958, they took everything with them, leaving an economic vacuum.

Reds—not just Russians, but representatives from Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and Red China—swept in almost overnight to deluge the new Marxist-trained Premier Sekou Toure and his people with good will, good offices and goods—consumer and capital.

As a result, Guinea last week became the first officially non-Communist nation to extend formal recognition to East Germany.

It was clear that the West had been bested, at least temporarily, in this important foray, even though Guinea's Toure insists he is neutral in the cold war.

Another thing that became abundantly clear during the past month was that Russia intends to offer a good deal more than material goods in her package of "aid to the underdeveloped countries."

Premier Khrushchev announced the establishment at Moscow of a university for African, Asian, and Latin American students, all expenses paid, including transportation and generous living allowances.

They'll start off with 500 students, he said, and work up to 3,000 to 4,000.

There's no question but what the opportunity for free higher education will appeal to the young people of Africa. As President Case learned there:

"Education is respected and sought more universally than any other modern influence."

And as the Boston University prexy warned:

"The quality, kind and philosophy of education will shape Africa's future. Whoever shapes the mind, will fashion the nation. * * *

"The permanent political alinements of emerging African nations will be the decisive balance in world politics."

It was against this background that Dr. Case proposed a better plan for U.S. aid to African education, with opportunities at the university level as its keystone.

"There are more than 1,900 colleges and universities in these United States," he said. "Unlike the Russian proposal of a future fulfillment, these well-established, accredited institutions could achieve an immediate educational victory by agreeing to accept an average of two African students for full-time study, each with tuition, board and room provided by the college for a period up to 4 years.

"Announced now, the plan could become effective in the fall of 1961. * * * The effect on African countries in a decade would be phenomenal."

Compared with the proposals that we and our allies—on one side—and Russia and the Red bloc—on the other—pour mountains of money into Africa to develop its industrial potentialities, Dr. Case's educational suggestion is a modest one.

But in both the long and the short run, it may prove just as effective.

It is in line with a plan of U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, who also emphasizes that men are more important than money and machines in developing and preserving free economies and free governments.

Aware of the tremendous need for competent administrators and civil servants in nations shaking free from colonial masters, Hammarskjold asks a special African fund to enable the U.N. to train such leaders among the natives and, until they are trained, to provide U.N. experts for the task.

Just as U.S. universities are admirably equipped for the educational program, so the U.N. is especially suited to furnish administrative and technical help—provided, of course, such an understanding never runs afoul the veto weapon.

Multiple Use of National Forest Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a penetrating editorial, "Quiet War Between Federal Agencies," from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of April 3, 1960.

The wisdom of the Congress in enacting Public Law 85-470, establishing the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, is evidenced once again as that agency, now studying the outdoor recreation resources of Federal lands, is identified as a prominent source of information needed by Congress to resolve emerging policy issues in the management of Federal lands.

The friendly rivalry between two major Federal agencies administering outdoor recreation has evidenced itself in various ways, and is reflected in pending legislation pertaining to multiple uses of national forest lands. I join with the editor of the Journal in hoping that the rivalry will not become disruptive or lead to unwise action inconsistent with worthwhile aims.

The editorial follows:

QUIET WAR BETWEEN FEDERAL AGENCIES

The American public is well aware of the competition among the three chief military branches, Army, Navy, and Air Force. Establishment of an overall Defense Department and Joint Chiefs of Staff has sought to minimize these differences, but nevertheless they continue, manifesting themselves in battles for the defense dollar and for ascendancy in our defense posture.

The public is less aware of the quiet war now going on between two civilian branches of the Federal Government, the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service. For the most part, it is fought with a great deal of restraint, and one has to keep his eyes and ears open to see the battlelines.

It has not disrupted friendships between personnel of the two services, and a great deal of mutual respect remains, but outsiders who know and like employees of both services sense that each is intensely loyal to his branch in those areas where they conflict.

The conflict comes in the competition for land to meet growing recreational demands caused by rapidly rising population and increased leisure time.

The Park Service is well along in its Mission 66 program, inaugurated when the late Douglas McKay was Secretary of the Interior. Its purpose is not only to improve existing parks and services but to expand its system. Some of the land it needs for expansion is in the hands of the Forest Service.

The latter does not look with favor upon parting with its land. It has its own Operation Outdoors program designed to improve and expand the recreational phase of Forest Service management. It fears that the Park Service wants to become the exclusive Federal recreation agency. It is determined to stay in the recreation business. This is one of the motives behind the recent Forest Service multiple-use bill which would give congressional authority to present Forest Service multiple-use practices, in which recreation has a prominent place.

The National Park Service has not made clear how much Forest Service land it wants, but a number of outdoor recreation organizations have made proposals for transfers, including vast acreage in the Oregon and Washington Cascades, which would add up to 10 million to 15 million acres. Some Forest Service people think the Park Service is covertly backing the outdoor organizations in these proposals.

The weapons in this quiet war are generally limited to dignified statements. They include debates over the terms "multiple use," "primary use," and "single use."

"Multiple use" is the watchword of the Forest Service, and some in this agency have been known to make disparaging remarks about the Park Service's policy of "locking up" land for "single use." The Park Service replies that "multiple use" is a misleading term, that every area has a "primary use," whether it be timber-cutting, grazing, or recreation, and other uses have lesser or nonexistent values. It contends there is really no such thing as "single use."

The term "multiple use" is ofen misunderstood. It does not mean the attaching of equal values. Here is a Forest Service definition which indicates the two agencies may not be far apart in their understanding: "A forest may have major value for saw log production with intermingled values for recreation, water yield, grazing by domestic livestock and wildlife and mining. Another forest may have little timber production but have vital recreation and watershed values. Actually there are innumerable combinations of use varying with the area and the combination of resources formed thereon."

The outsider is reluctant to take sides in this quite war. Because if he knows both agencies, he respects them both and sees great value in what they are trying to do. This newspaper has supported the proposal for a National Park Service seashore recreational area in the Oregon dunes. This would involved taking some 12,000 acres of Forest Service land, and the Forest Service opposes it. However, this is only one tiny battle of the overall war. The Journal would want to take a hard look at some of the other proposals.

Certainly it believes the Forest Service should remain in the recreation business. But it understands the need of the Park Service, which has a concept of recreation based on the preservation of some of the Nation's most outstanding natural features, to expand.

These are matters which, as Richard E. McCardle, chief of the U.S. Forest Service, has pointed out, will ultimately be decided by Congress, probably with guidance from the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, now making a study which will be completed in 1961. Meanwhile, one hopes that the waging of the quiet war will not prove disruptive in the attainment of airms which will be best for the country as a whole.

Ed Koterba Named Reporter of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, members of the Thirty Club, an organ-

ization made up of former employees of the Washington Times-Herald and the International News Service, both of which have passed on to a journalistic limbo, held their sixth annual reunion on March 18, 1960, here in Washington.

The highlight of this reunion is the award of a specially made portable typewriter to the newspaperman who is voted "reporter of the year." The award has been founded in perpetuity by the Royal-McBee Corp., and its presentation each year by the Thirty Club for outstanding reporting already has raised it in prestige to the point where it is a universally sought-after prize.

I am happy to report that the winner of the 1960 Thirty Club award is a young man whose hometown is also my native city, Omaha, Nebr. His name is Ed Koterba, and in winning the award he joins such other journalistic notables as Bob Considine and Edward T. Folliard.

Ed Koterba is well known here on Capitol Hill, where he spends most of his time when he is in this country, and his human stories about those of us who serve in this body are read throughout the Nation.

Ed was awarded the Thirty Club prize this year for an exceptionally well done series of articles out of Czechoslovakia which I am certain many of my colleagues will recall. These stories, as are all the others Ed Koterba writes, were penetrating, human and revealing. They afforded many of us a better insight into the emotions and feelings of those who live behind the Iron Curtain than all the straight news stories combined. Ed Koterba's ability to find and interpret news where others fail often affords the public a better understanding of the issues facing our Nation.

Although it would take far too much time and space to include the several stories Ed Koterba wrote out of Czechoslovakia, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a column of his which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on March 16, 1960. This column displays as well as anything I can cite the manner in which this young reporter from Omaha emphasizes some of the greatest dangers facing our Nation by means of journalistic portraiture—the painting of personalities who make the news.

His column follows:

SOUND DOLLAR MAN

(By Ed Koterba)

WASHINGTON.—Pick up the phone and ask the man at Treasury what the national debt is today. He reels the figure off as painlessly as a string of bingo numbers: $290,204,675,870.58.

That is the deepest we've been in the hole in all history. Tomorrow it may be even deeper.

You stop by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to check on the latest soundness of our dollar. You find the dollar, worth 100 cents in 1939, is now worth only 46 cents. It's never been worth less.

With a buck that's more than half shot before you earn it, and with taxes taking about a fourth of what's left after you get it, what are the people doing about it?

Nothing much, except complaining.

ONE-MAN PROTEST

One fellow out in Oklahoma City had been getting so worked up about it that he finally hopped on an airplane and came to Washington for a 1-day stay to do something about it.

He started up a national "I'm for a sound dollar" campaign.

Coming up to meet him, I expected to find a crackpot-type. A phony patriot the likes of which Washington often unwittingly plays host to. Instead, I found a lanky, wide-eyed, country boy type who honest-to-goodness hopes to rouse the country against wasteful Federal spending.

His name, Bayard Auchincloss. He is a science teacher, a World War II ace, 38 years old, the nephew of a U.S. Congressman, and a descendant of Peter Stuyvesant, the peg-legged mayor of New York when it was New Amsterdam.

CAMPAIGN'S OBJECTIVE

AUCHINCLOSS is wealthy but he's conservative with the dollar. Nevertheless, he's financing the campaign with his own dollars.

His big, wide, ambitious plan: To recruit every man and woman in the country who's against inflation into bombarding Congress every time the taxpayer spots a news story that tells about some proposal for wasteful Government spending.

This modest, soft-talking father of four small children actually started his self-financed organization going last month in Oklahoma City. He placed petitions in Oklahoma City banks, hotels, and other places, and in those few weeks got 5,864 signatures.

He's willing to send these petition-pledge forms to anyone writing to him in Oklahoma City. When he get 2 million or so signatures he'll photostat them and badger our lawmakers with them, proving how intently America wants a sound dollar.

CAR STICKERS, TOO

He's also sending out thousands of red-white-and-blue automobile stickers—which he paid for himself—that announce: "I'm for a sound dollar."

"They get people to thinking," he said, "and that's all I'm aiming for."

It's so rare that a truly conscientious and sincere fellow comes along aiming to help his country rather than himself, that you get suspicious about his motives.

Just what did he expect to get out of it for himself? "The satisfaction that I've done something worthwhile," he said.

I'm in his corner 100 percent. I hope he gets those 2 million signatures.

F.D.R.: An Assessment 15 Years After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt is one of the great constructive figures of history.

In my remarks, I include a splendid article about Franklin D. Roosevelt written by Henry Steele Commager, appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of April 10, 1960.

F.D.R.: AN ASSESSMENT 15 YEARS AFTER

(The author of the following article is one of the foremost historians in the United States. He gained such stature largely as a professor of history at Columbia University from 1939 until 1956; currently he is professor of history and American studies at Amherst College. He also is the author of a number of books in his chosen field, and is the editor of the 40-volume "The Rise of the American Nation," in process.)

(By Henry Steele Commager)

A whole generation has grown up and come to political maturity since the death of President Roosevelt 15 years ago—on April 13, 1945.

Already Roosevelt belongs to history, rather than to politics; already it is a bit difficult to understand the passions and the fears that he inspired; now we can assess him objectively, he who was the object of almost limitless execration and almost limitless admiration in his own lifetime.

Thus we can see now that Roosevelt himself was far from a revolutionary, or even a radical.

He was, in a very deep sense, conservative: conservative in his feeling for tradition; conservative in his passion for saving the land and the natural resources of the Nation; conservative in his sense of the obligation of the whole of society for the health of all of its parts; conservative even in his economic experiments.

The New Deal was just what the name implies: a new deal of old cards—a deal where the cards would not be stacked in favor of privilege and of wealth. Certainly the Rooseveltian program was a culmination of half a century of historical development, and of American development.

The two major contributions of the Roosevelt years traced their beginnings back to the 1890's: the growth of governmental regulation and of the welfare state, and the emergence of America as a world power. If we contrast the Roosevelt years with the 12 years of Republican rule that preceded it, this is not clear. But if we look back to the Populist Revolt of the nineties the Square Deal of Theodore Roosevelt, and the New Deal Freedom of the Wilsonian era, the historical precedents of the welfare state are clear enough.

And if we look back to the emergence of the United States to world power in the nineties—the Spanish War, the annexation of Hawaii, interest in the Panama Canal—and to the large policies of T. R. and the sense of power and of obligation that animated Wilson, the background of F.D.R.'s foreign policies are familiar, too.

FIVE GREAT DOMESTIC FEATS

What are the great and lasting achievements of the Roosevelt administration? We can distinguish five important achievements in the domestic realm.

The first was the restoration of confidence—"We have nothing to fear but fear itself"—and of vigor in government; the revivification of the national spirit, the restoration of interest in political processes, the reassertion of faith in democratic processes.

The second was the physical rehabilitation of the Nation: of soil and water and resources. Three million young men in the Civilian Conservation Corps planted 17 million acres in new forests, built 6 million check dams to halt soil erosion; the Resettlement Administration moved farmers off marginal lands; the administration planted a shelter belt of trees on the high plains 100 miles wide; the TVA—most important invention in the political arena of the century—became a laboratory for regional reconstruction not only in America but throughout the globe.

The third was human rehabilitation. Coming into office at a time when 10 million unemployed walked the streets in a vain search for work, when two-thirds of the banks had closed down, when farmers were becoming tenants, and homeowners losing homes, schools and libraries and public services closing down, Roosevelt adopted the principle that the Government was ultimately responsible for the welfare of society. Translated into legislation this meant large-scale relief, unemployment insurance, the

prohibition of child labor, minimum wages, and maximum hours, slum clearance, the guarantee of savings, aid to desperate homeowners, relief and support to farmers, support to public health programs and to school programs—in short the creation of a welfare state.

Fourth was the restoration of health to business and industry and finance—regulation of business and support to business, the devaluation of the dollar to put a stop to deflation and start income spiraling up; Government guarantees to banks; pump priming in industry—that whole body of legislation and policy which business itself fought tooth and nail but which contributed so much to the restoration of prosperity and which business now takes for granted: who now would repeal the securities exchange legislation or the provisions for guarantee of bank deposits?

The fifth major achievement was in the political arena, and embraces a number of important developments. It includes the steady trend toward Federal centralization; the strengthening of the executive power; the restoration of equality between the political branch and the judicial; the revitalization of the political parties; the strengthening of the civil service and broad governmental reorganization; some advance in civil rights—though not much; and the revival of interest in and participation in politics.

AN INNER LOGIC, COHERENCE

At the time much of this program seemed breathless and even haphazard; we can see now that it had an inner logic and coherence. For Roosevelt was confronted with two tasks that did not permit delay.

First with a desperate crisis in the economy—and through it in the social and political functioning—of the Nation, and second a 12-year lag in social welfare legislation. He had to move swiftly, and on a broad front.

But soon there was more to it than even this, for the rise of totalitarianism abroad made it clear that nations that lost their economic and social health quickly lost their political and moral health as well. As Roosevelt said in a fireside chat of 1938:

"Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity, of seeing their children hungry while they sat helpless in the face of Government confusion and Government weakness.

"Finally in desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

This Roosevelt and his associates did prove. And, however vehement the hostility to his measures at the time, no one now doubts their validity or desires their repudiation.

Social security is here to stay—and the Eisenhower administration boasts that it has extended its coverage. The TVA is here to stay, and no one proposes to dismantle it. No one would restore child labor, or abandon the regulation of Securities Exchanges, or go back to the primitive warfare between labor and capital that disgraced our earlier history; in fact, no single important part of the New Deal has been abandoned in the past 15 years.

Roosevelt is more than a national figure, he is a world figure—the only one to take his place with Washington and Lincoln and Wilson, the only one certainly known in Latin America and Asia and Africa for his contributions to democracy and freedom. The United States had retreated into isolation in 1920, and did not begin to emerge from the untenable position until the late thirties.

Roosevelt himself had not at first appreciated the gravity of the threat from military dictators in Europe and in Asia, or the extent to which the cause of freedom and self-government was linked together from continent to continent. The brutal invasion of Manchuria and then of China proper by Japan; the reckless destruction of constitutional government in Germany by Adolf Hitler, and his violent repudiation of international obligations and of morality; the rise to power of Mussolini who launched his planes against hapless Ethiopia, sent his legions into war-torn Spain, and tried to recreate in the Mediterranean the ancient Roman Empire—these developments brought home to Roosevelt the true nature of the crisis of our time.

THE ARCHITECT OF VICTORY

In his famous quarantine speech of 1937, Roosevelt tried to rally American opinion to active hostility to totalitarianism, but in vain. Only with the coming of open war in 1939 was he able to arouse Americans to a sense of the gravity of the danger that confronted them.

He persuaded Congress to repeal most of the neutrality legislation that helped only the aggressors; he threw the whole of our moral force on the side of China and France and England and the little nations that had been overrun; he devised the new technique of aid short of war—above all the remarkable invention, lend-lease.

None of this saved the stricken democracies of Europe, but it did two things: it bought time until the New World could step forth to the rescue and liberation of the Old and it united American opinion so that when the day of infamy arrived, the United States was ready to play her part in war and in the postwar settlement.

Roosevelt himself was, more than any other single wartime leader, the architect of victory. It was he who made the all-important decision to defeat Hitler first, rather than to defeat Japan first; it was he who had enough confidence to believe that the United States could fight a war in three areas—the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Mediterranean. It was he who understood the importance of the Atlantic lifeline; who got the supplies and arms to Britain; who realized the necessity of cooperating with the Soviet, which was engaging by far the largest part of Nazi might; who held off the invasion until the participating nations were ready; who saw the importance of the nuclear weapon and gave the word—and provided the money—to go ahead with it .

As he was the architect of victory, he was the architect of peace, or of such peace as was possible in a war and hate-stricken world.

During the years of war he managed to avoid most of the errors of the First World War. He associated intimately with our military allies and laid the groundwork for the United Nations. He did not postpone the practical details of international organization, but in a series of conferences worked out those details to their solution. Instead of antagonizing the Congress, he carried that august body with him; instead of making the United Nations a party issue he enlisted both parties in its support.

A RESPONSE TO COURAGE

What of Roosevelt himself?

He takes his place indubitaly in the gallery of strong Presidents, and of great Presidents. Coming to office at a time when the foundations of the Republic seemed threatened, he restored confidence and proved that democracy could act as efficiently as totalitarianism.

A liberal, he put government at the service of the people; a conservative, he pushed through reforms designed to preserve the natural and the human resources of the Nation.

He saw that politics could regulate the economy, not the other way around, and he saw, too, that politics was an art; perhaps that was because he was an artist. He repudiated isolation, unified the American people on the great international issues of the day, and furnished a war leadership that was bold and successful.

All this his countrymen understood, and four times they elected him to the Presidency. But they understood him and admired him not only on the exalted plane of principle.

No assessment of Roooosevelt that left out the man himself would be valid. The devotion which he inspired was a tribute to the palpable sincerity of the man. It was a response to the confidence and buoyance which permeated his public as well as his private character.

It was a response to courage, not only physical but moral. It was a response to inventiveness and ingenuity, to the quarterback technique, to boldness and audacity. It was a response to something that had been missing for many a year—to gaiety and humor, a sense of life and adventure. It was a response finally to Roosevelt's own high confidence in his fellow Americans.

To those qualities the American people still respond.

Joseph A. McLaughlin Teaches Youth the Meaning of Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the Carondelet section of St. Louis, Mo., Mr. Joseph A. McLaughlin, a retired civil engineer, has been striving to bring the meaning of the American flag to the children of his neighborhood, and to the grownups as well. With simple but meaningful ceremonies, Mr. McLaughlin daily raises and lowers the flag on his backyard flagpole. In these ceremonies he is joined by the neighborhood children who learn love of country and flag in this participation.

I had the privilege of obtaining for Mr. McLaughlin, in the early days of his project in patriotism, a flag which had been flown over the Nation's Capitol. I am proud to have been a part of his worthwhile endeavor.

At this point I would like to insert an article that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch describing Mr. McLaughlin and his efforts to encourage good citizenship:

HE TEACHES CHILDREN WHAT FLAG MEANS

(By James Millstone)

A crisp breeze whipped the flag atop the 22-foot pole in the McLaughlin rear yard. Mike Miano shivered in the December chill. He watched the flag for a minute, a worried look clouding his large, dark, 6-year-old eyes.

He turned to the white-haired man standing nearby.

"Mr. McLaughlin," the boy said, the words tumbling out, "I think the flag should be at half-mast because Walter Williams died, and my mother said he was the last Civil War

soldier, and President Eisenhower said that flags should be at half-mast."

The white-haired man looked into the thin, serious face. Then he said, "You're right Mikey. Let's you and I go take care of it. We'll take off our hats in honor of Mr. Williams, and you lower the flag to half-mast."

The ropes were low enough on the flagpole so the boy could reach them. The two of them—the white-haired man and the little boy—removed their hats as the flag came to half-staff.

Joseph Aloysius McLaughlin hardly felt the chill wind on his face because of the warmth that this simple act kindled inside. To think that this small child could care enough to notice the position of the flag.

To Joe McLaughlin, that was one of the most satisfying moments of his 67 years. It was concrete proof that he was making headway at his self-imposed life's project: Teaching children the meaning of the Stars and Stripes.

The idea had been kicking around in his head for a long time. To Joe McLaughlin, it seemed that too many people took their country and its emblem for granted. Children were growing into adulthood with no real understanding of their heritage.

The answer came to him last fall out of a fit of despondency.

"We had just come home from my brother's funeral," he related, "and I was depressed. I looked out in the rear yard. There was a golden sunlight shining in the yard, and I said to my sister, Mildred, 'Let's put up a flagpole.' She said, 'OK, let's get started.'"

McLaughlin went out and bought two lengths of pipe, coupled them together, applied a coat of gray paint and attached ropes.

The children in McLaughlin's south St. Louis neighborhood dropped by to watch him. He made no secret of what he was doing. The children wanted to help.

"They dug the hole," he said. "They took turns digging until they got to 3 feet. One of the littlest kids kept getting in the hole, and when her head came up to the top, we knew that was 3 feet. We set the pole in and poured concrete in the hole."

McLaughlin then gathered the youngsters together, fed them lemonade and ice cream and told them the purpose of the flagpole.

"I said, 'You're all going to learn what this flag stands for. You're going to raise the flag every morning and take it down at sunset.' I never dreamed they'd get so enthusiastic. They haven't missed a day since we started, except when it was raining. It's amazing how they took to that flag."

Sixteen children from 3 to 12 years old clamored for the honor of raising and lowering the flag. McLaughlin worked out a schedule assigning two children to the task each weekday and three on weekends.

Promptly at 8 a.m., the children on duty appear in the McLaughlin yard at 449 Dover Place. They hoist the flag to the top of the pole, and go about their business. They return at sunset to lower the banner, fold it as McLaughlin taught them, and deliver it to the youngsters who are on duty the next day.

The routine varies only on special occasions. The first of these occurred when the pole was dedicated last September 11. McLaughlin invited everybody in sight, including Congressmen, aldermen, and neighbors. The Congressmen sent their regrets, and the neighbors sent their children, some 70 of them.

The number tripled for the next occasion, George Washington's birthday. This time most of the youngsters brought their parents. Even McLaughlin was astounded at that crowd. A Marine Corps color guard led a parade around the block, and short speeches were delivered by Joe McLaughlin and Frank K. Harris, secretary of the Carondelet Improvement Association. McLaughlin's yard was too small to hold the throng.

"Oh, brother," McLaughlin said, "When I started this project, I thought if the kids in my neighborhood would learn the flag, I'd have accomplished a great thing. But when I looked out and saw them coming from all directions, it was more than I had ever hoped for."

Joe McLaughlin's little project has attracted attention. He has received letters of praise from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON ("I feel that it would be a fine thing indeed for our younger citizens to take part in such a program as you suggest."), Missouri Attorney General John M. Dalton ("This is a fine project and one that deserves the support of all good citizens"), and Mayor Raymond R. Tucker ("This is a delightful idea, and I am sure your ceremonies will be very meaningful and teach the children the meaning of our national flag.").

Strangers who have seen his picture on television or in the newspapers stop him on the street and say, "I know you. You're the flag man."

Veterans organizations have given him medals and citations. One group presented him with a 50-star flag.

Neighborhood organizations have asked him to speak on the flag, and he now spends several night each week giving 20-minute addresses on the meaning and proper display of Old Glory.

Letters lauding his efforts pour into his home at the rate of 75 a week.

Unknown to McLaughlin, 50 children from the neighborhood signed a letter telling the board of aldermen of his good work. Last week, the board adopted a resolution praising Joe McLaughlin for his outstanding Americanism.

All this recognition has left McLaughlin a little startled but far from speechless. Nobody ever accused him of having nothing to say.

His raspy voice was well known around the old United Railways Co., where McLaughlin worked for 25 years. For 8 years he served as supervisor of bridges for the city and later as a construction engineer for the St. Louis Housing Authority.

After he retired in 1957, florid-faced McLaughlin encountered competition from his sisters, Mildred and Rose. Chatty characters all, the three sometimes talk at the same time and tend to overwhelm a visitor with hospitality.

The McLaughlins share their 10-room house with 2 dogs, 2 parakeets, 2 canaries, and countless antiques. The house was built 53 years ago by their father. They are the last of four sons and daughters, none of whom ever married, all of whom spent most of their lives in the Dover place house.

McLaughlin has fired his sisters with enthusiasm for his flag-pole project. They help him to distribute literature, to answer mail, and to entertain visitors, large and small, who are attracted by the patriotic fervor of Joe McLaughlin.

Even strangers are inspired to lend a hand. There was the incident of the bell, for instance. As McLaughlin tells it:

"I figured we ought to have a bell to ring when the flag goes up and when it comes down, a bell to ring for liberty and peace. I went all over town trying to get one. Finally I paid $10 for a bell, but it was no good. It didn't ring loud enough.

"One day some fellow said, 'Well, I'll get you a bell.' So a few days later, I went out on the front porch and there was something with a sack over it. I thought maybe it was a bomb. I took the sack off, and there was a bell. It was so big I had to get my neighbor to help me carry it to the rear yard."

McLaughlin rigged up a stand for the bell, and now it is as much a part of the daily ritual as is the flag. The clear gong resounds throughout the neighborhood twice a day, pealing out the message of peace and liberty.

If McLaughlin is an inspirational figure to men and women of his own generation, he is no less effective with children. They are welcome in his house, and they flock there for treats such as lollipops and to listen to his talk of their flag, their forefathers, and their country.

Seven-year-old Joyce Kissel wrote to him and his sisters a few weeks ago, "I think you are the wonderfulest people in the whole world and I want to thank you for what you are doing."

McLaughlin's philosophy is simple.

"Children who know their flag and have a respect for it will know what their country stands for and will know their God," he said. "I would like to see a flag in every American household. Children who grow up knowing the flag will be good citizens."

Coal Mine Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, 3 years have passed since legislation was first introduced in the Congress which would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, thereby providing further prevention of accidents in small coal mines.

Under the present act, title 2 of the law requires major mining operations—employing 15 or more men underground—to comply with strict Federal regulations for mine safety for the purpose of preventing mine disasters. The law, however, exempts certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

Mr. Speaker, since January 1, 1960, 20 miners have died because of this exemption under title 1 of small mines—this figure includes the 6 coal miners who were killed on the 9th of April 1960, and I want to bring to the attention of the Members the recent newspaper stories on the two recent mine disasters.

If my bill, H.R. 1961, introduced on the 9th of January 1959, had been passed by the Congress, the lives of these 6 miners might have been saved.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1960]

THREE COAL MINERS KILLED IN CAVE-IN

KITZMILLER, MD., APRIL 9.—Three men were buried alive under 10 tons of rock and dirt today in the Paugh coal mine near this western Maryland town.

A son of one of the victims also was trapped by the debris, but was freed unhurt by fast working rescuers.

The victims were John L. Paugh, 50, owner of the small mine; his nephew, Leo Paugh, 21, and Allen Harvey, 40, all of Kitzmiller.

Paugh's son, Lawrence, 18, was dug out by another brother, Marvin J. Paugh, 21, and Joseph Harvey, who were near the disaster scene and heard young Paugh's cries for help.

The cave-in occurred within sight of the mine opening, police said.

Relatives said the elder Paugh had purchased the mine only recently. He and the others had been putting it into working order for the past 2 weeks.

The pit entrance is about 5 feet from another mine opening in which five men were killed several years ago in a similar accident.

State police, county officers, and officials of the State and Federal mine departments assisted in the rescue efforts.

The bodies were recovered from the debris by the Kitzmiller mine rescue squad, composed of coaldiggers from the area.

Lawrence Paugh, who was working close to the three victims, had his foot trapped under the dirt and rock. His brother, Marvin, was outside when he heard the debris come roaring down on top of the men.

He yelled for assistance and with Harvey, a brother of one of the victims, freed Lawrence Paugh in about a half hour.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 10, 1960]

TWO DIE, ONE TRAPPED IN MINE CAVE-IN

LOUISA, KY., April 9.—Two men were killed and a third was pinned beneath a huge piece of rock in a slate fall tonight at a small coal mine near remote Webbville.

The dead were identified tentatively as Marvin Hall, 50, of near Neon, and Harmon Short, 45, of Whitesburg.

State police said Arle Hall, 58, of Neon, a brother of one victim, was pinned under a piece of slate. Mr. Hall was reported conscious and able to talk to rescuers as they tried to free him with a drill.

Residents of the area said the mine had been opened only about 2 weeks ago by the three men. It had been dug only about 30 feet into the earth.

It Would Be an Act of Folly To Destroy the Dolly Madison House and the Other Historic Buildings Near the White House

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it would be an act of folly to destroy the Dolly Madison House and the other historic buildings on Lafayette Square near the White House in the Nation's Capital.

Many organizations are interested in preserving these historical buildings, among them the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the American Institution of Architects, the National Federation of Music Clubs, the AFL–CIO, the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner have sponsored legislation to save historic Carnegie Hall in New York City. Here in Washington, my able colleague from New Jersey, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., and I have sponsored legislation to save the Dolly Madison House and other historic buildings on Lafayette Square from destruction. Bills for the same purpose have been sponsored by Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, WAYNE MORSE, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., PAUL H. DOUGLAS, ERNEST GRUENING, and MIKE MANSFIELD.

I include the text of the bill which Congressman FRANK THOMSON, JR., and I have cosponsored:

TEXT OF THOMPSON-McDOWELL BILLS: H.R. 11678 AND H.R. 11691

A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide a study as to the best location for a new building for certain courts of the United States, to preserve the Dolly Madison House and other historic buildings near the White House for cultural and educational purposes in keeping with the national policy enunciated in the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Public Buildings Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 18. The Administrator is authorized and directed to conduct a joint study, together with the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of constructing in the area bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue on the north, Seventeenth Street on the east, New York Avenue on the south, and Eighteenth Street on the west, in the Northwest sector of Washington, District of Columbia, or near the Supreme Court of the United States, adequate facilities to house the Court of Claims, and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals of the United States. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall submit a report on the results of such study, together with such recommendations as the three agencies may deem advisable, to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"SEC. 19. (a) In keeping with the national policy of protecting and preserving historic American buildings and sites for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States, the Administrator shall preserve and maintain the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square near the White House in the District of Columbia for historical, civic, cultural, and educational purposes and to further the purposes of the Act of June 5, 1860 (12 Stat. 35) chartering the National Gallery and School of Arts; the Act of March 3, 1863 (36 U.S.C., 251–253), chartering the National Academy of Sciences; the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1093), providing for a National Conservatory of Music; the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1438), chartering the General Federation of Women's Clubs for educational, literary, artistic, and scientific culture; the Act of June 3, 1906 (34 Stat. 804), chartering the National Education Association of the United States; the Act of February 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 660), chartering the National Institute of Arts and Letters; the Act of April 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 51), chartering the American Academy of Arts and Letters; the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 457), chartering the American National Theater and Academy; the Act of October 26, 1949 (16 U.S.C., 468–468e), establishing the National Trust for Historic Preservation; and the Act of August 1, 1956 (36 U.S.C., 661–630), chartering the National Music Council. The Administrator is authorized and directed to restore the Belasco Theater to a condition at least equal to its condition at the time it was acquired by the Federal Government, and to accept contributions of money which shall constitute 'charitable contributions' for purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions for charitable, etc., contributions and gifts), for the purpose of assisting him in the restoration of the Belasco Theater.

"(b) The President is authorized to create such interagency committees and advisory committees as in his judgment may be of assistance in carrying out the purposes of this section. The provisions of section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134; U.S.C., sec. 691), shall be applicable to any interagency committee created pursuant to this section."

There's Not Much Fidelity in Cuba Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as an example of the Communist influence on the Castro regime in Cuba, the information included in the following article by Virginia Prewett in the March 29, 1960, issue of the Washington Daily News, should alert our country and people to a growing menace in our hemisphere and dispel any false notions about the nature of that regime. At the same time, it demonstrates how active the Guatemalan Communists are in Cuba. There are strong indications that their next goal is to restore free and democratic Guatemala to its former Communist-dominated status. If this should happen, it would be a prelude to further defections and a major disaster to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THERE'S NOT MUCH FIDELITY IN CUBA, NOW

(By Virginia Prewett)

Maj. Ernesto (Che) Guevara de la Serna, Cuba's economic czar, has created a regime within a regime at Havana with Cuban lieutenants he recruited while leftists ruled Guatemala in the early 1950's.

Guevara made his reputation as Russa's agent in the Guatemala adventure. Central American intelligence sources say he is now military commander of communism in the Caribbean.

NOT FIDEL

His henchmen are untouchable. When Premier Fidel Castro wanted to jail one Guevara man as a Trujillo double agent, Guevara not only prevented this but got his friend into Castro's secret police.

Guevara's men are picking teams of young Latin American exiles to be Guevara's nerve ends in new Castro-type regimes elsewhere.

Guevara's economic power makes recruiting easy. In Havana, an inexperienced Guatemalan, aged 28, was made "intervenor" in the American-owned multimillion-dollar Otis Elevator Co.

"Che" Guevara, an Argentine, came to Guatemala in the late 1940's while leftist Dr. Juan Jose Arevalo was President. Never a card carrier, he formed part of the upper Communist apparatus created earlier by the wily Russian Ambassador to Mexico and Guatemala, Constantin Oumansky.

STRATEGY

After President Jacob Arbenz succeeded Arevalo, Guevara fell out with Arbenz over the slowness of Guatemala's communization. Guevara then became "war plans" officer for Arbenz' agrarian reform chief, Maj. Alfonso Martinez Estevez. "El Che" there perfected the technique of having a Government representative lead—or order—landworkers to seize properties without legal processes. This is standard procedure in Cuba today.

The sauve, resolute New World commissar meanwhile formed his personal cadre of case-

hardened Communist Cubans. The "graduates" of the Communist takeover of Guatemala and later additions now so thoroughly control in Havana that, intelligence services say, Premier Castro could not shake loose from them even if he wanted to.

The bearded Premier is their psychological prisoner because they offer him the international power his ego ardently craves, say these informed sources.

The names and records of the Guatemala-tested Guevara shadow-government in Cuba trace back through the Caribbean legion even to the International Brigade in Spain. They include Eufemio Fernandez Ortega, former Arbenz bodyguard, who is the man Guevara put into Castro's secret police; and Alfredo Flores Alamo, sometime political terrorist, now in Cuba's Ministry of Government. Other key men include Julio Castello Dumas, writer for the Castro-lining La Calle, who is Guevara's agent among Dominican exiles.

Another is Guatemala alumnus Jorge (Nilo) Risquet Valdez, a top power in Cuba's Socialist youth movement, who is preparing the future for Guevara and Moscow.

CBR Weapons Gain Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith several very enlightening comments on the subject of CBR. These should help to dispel unrealistic agitation against the development of a proper defense in this field. I urge the careful reading of each of the following:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 3, 1960]

NERVE GASES GAIN FAVOR AS WEAPONS—CHEMICAL WARFARE IS REGARDED AS ATOMIC BOMB ALTERNATIVE

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—A public properly worried by the continuing threat of atomic warfare must unmistakably face the new but real possibility of still other types of unconventional warfare now coming to wider attention.

These others would employ exotic chemicals and germs, even the discussion of which has been so repugnant to civilians—and most military professionals—that there still is little public awareness of the existence of germ-chemical weapons.

But troubles are not ended by sweeping them into a corner, and within the recent past many thoughtful observers, hitherto silent, have reluctantly begun to discuss CBR (chemical-biological-radiological) warfare publicly.

USE OF WEAPONS FORESEEN

It is plainly suggested that if there develops a nuclear stalemate, as sometimes predicted, some nation will resort to weapons quite as effective in their way as the A-bomb, and in some respects much more so. These weapons, unmistakably, are the transportable germs and the incapacitating gases.

The burden of the discussion generally is that—as with gas-warfare preparations during World War II—the United States would not initiate use of the new gases or germs or radioactive materials, but that it must be prepared to defend its population against their use by an enemy.

And defensive mechanisms can be devised only by knowing intimately the deadliest forms of these materials; hence, the United States must first create them for laboratory study and subsequent defensive planning.

ACTIVE DEFENSE URGED

But beyond this preparation of masks, shelters, and other passive defenses from enemy C–B–R attacks, the military now states firmly there must be an active and substantial defense.

This would take the form of retaliatory resources, with which to counter enemy aggression instantly—that is, established C–B–R weaponry of the United States' own.

In this there is a parallel to the concept of the United States' present atomic-weapons, primarily as a retaliatory threat and very real deterrent to atomic war. The same concept prevailed in World War II with regard to poison gas; the United States had it on hand in case Germany or Japan should use it, but it was not employed—because the enemy did not use it, and also because other weapons were thought to be more effective anyway.

Up to a few months ago even the United States military referred to C–B–R projects with greatest caution, because of the known public antipathy to them.

TRUDEAU HERALDS CHANGE

There has lately been a change, heralded by the plainspeaking Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, military chief of Army research. Trudeau in a public address declared that, if humane considerations are to guide the Nation, it should know that newly developed gases are more humane than shells and bullets.

Dr. Herbert F. York, the Defense Department's civilian director of research and engineering, speaking last week before a Senate committee, mentioned without apology work upon "chemical and biological weapons capable of a wide range of effect from short duration incapacitation to lethality."

Facing an unpleasant reality with more courage than most civilian bodies, the American Chemical Society next Friday, in Cleveland, will hold a significant symposium on "Chemical and Biological Defense in Perspective."

Speakers will be Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, the Army's chief chemical officer; Dr. Leroy D. Fothergill, of the Biological Warfare Laboratory at Fort Detrick, Md.; Dr. Conrad E. Ronnenberg, chairman of the American Chemical Society's Committee on Civil Defense, and other experts in chemistry and public health.

"It is the intention to give the most comprehensive picture of the chemical and germ threats that has ever been given," said the society's announcement, "and to bring these threats into proper perspective with the radiological one." The last reference is to aspects of atomic warfare.

PERSPECTIVE SOUGHT

Abroad there has been somewhat more frankness about public discussion of chemical-biological weapons, possibly because of proximity to Russia, which has pointedly demonstrated its own prowess in C.B.R. techniques, including defense equipment issued to individual soldiers.

Even the gas horrors of World War I have been scientifically reanalyzed both here and abroad to show, for example, that after the initial panics of lethal gases in 1915, the combatant nations found it more profitable to use temporarily crippling gases.

Thus, Col. Donald E. Yanka, of the Army Chemical Corps, points out, in Army magazine, that of 46 chemical agents used in World I, only 5 were lethal. Further, that while "one third of all U.S. casualties during that war were caused by gas, only 2 percent of these died, compared to 25 percent who died from the effect of other weapons."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 4, 1960]

MILLENNIUM DEFERRED

If anyone is so optimistic as still to believe in a happy ending to the world's troubles in the immediate future his hopes must have been rudely shaken by Mr. Mark S. Watson's report yesterday in the Sunday Sun that should atomic warfare be banned, chemical, biological, and radiological warfare is ready to take over. We are told that methods are being perfected by which the germs of deadly diseases may be spread among an enemy and that there now is available a wide selection of gases varying in power and quality from those that paralyze to those that kill.

Once upon a time old-fashioned people resigned themselves to the world as a vale of tears from which man had no real escape until he passed elsewhere. That attitude of resignation was widely supplanted by reliance on the achievements of science. Well, science keeps on achieving all right, but the prospect of war and related discomforts is not notably abated. One comforting thing, though: if we learn to outlaw nuclear weapons we will have some experience on which to start outlawing germ, gas, and radiological warfare.

[From the Temple (Tex.) Daily Telegram, Mar. 30, 1960]

HIGHLY DEVELOPED GERM WARFARE COULD HELP DETER AGRESSORS

They come to Fort Detrick, the Army base outside Frederick, Md., from all parts of the country. They include scientists, teachers, clergymen, students, farmers, housewives. They quietly picket the 1,700 civilian scientists and 400 military personnel engaged in the Army Chemical Corps project of defending this country by preparing for germ warfare.

These earnest people want to halt germ warfare. That is exactly what the chemists want, too.

The Army way has proved the more effective. In past wars, the fact that we were prepared for gas warfare kept the enemy use of gas to a minimum. Germ warfare was banned by tacit consent, for the simple reason that we could have retaliated in kind.

We must continue to develop this capability, not because we want to use it, but to keep the enemy from loosing germs on us so long as he knows we could flood his country with the killers, too.

[From the Army magazine for April 1960]

MICKEY FINN ON THE BATTLEFIELD—SOME FACTS ABOUT CHEMICAL AGENTS THAT CAN KNOCK OUT AN ENEMY WITHOUT KILLING HIM

(By Col. Donald E. Yanka)

The concept of nonlethal, incapacitating chemical agents is not entirely new. Of the 46 chemical agents used during World War I, only five were truly deadly. A study reveals that one-third of all U.S. casualties during that war were caused by gas. However, only 2 percent of these died, compared to 25 percent who died from the effects of other weapons.

After World War II the potentials of nonlethal chemical compounds were not seriously considered. Attention was focused on the newer, highly devastating weapons. Such preoccupation is not unusual, as an incident from World War I will illustrate.

A British chemist suggested using mustard gas in 1915, 2 years before the Germans resorted to that gas in battle. "Does it kill?" he was asked. "No, but it will disable enormous numbers of the enemy temporarily." "That's no good to us," he was told. "We want something that will kill."

However, during the past 5 years, the U.S. Army Chemcal Corps has been spurring its

study of new drugs and compounds which are truly disabling; that is, agents that temporarily disable large groups, but these people will recover with no harmful long-term effects. One of the difficulties, of course, is to define what would be a military casualty in these terms.

The significance of incapacitating agents is worth serious thought. The possibilities of nuclear stalemate, and the probability of our being forced into limited wars, require a new look, especially at how to fight in areas that may be occupied by our friends.

Chemical warfare offers a possible solution. Unlike nuclear or high-explosive warheads, which destroy or maim both men and machines, chemical agents affect only man and not his resources. Furthermore, while lethal chemical weapons destroy humans, incapacitating agents disable them only temporarily. Consequently, they can be used in areas where friends and enemies have become mixed.

An incapacitating compound can be described generally as one which, when delivered in an effective dose, disables a soldier from performing his duties for a militarily significant period, but which will allow him ultimately to completely recover without medical aid. Some chemical compounds become effective after various times and remain effective over varying periods. For example, incapacitation may begin after seconds of exposure and last only until those exposed get back into fresh air. On the other hand, the onset of effect may take from minutes to an hour, and the period of disablement may range from 1 to 3 days.

Disabling chemical compounds fall into two broad classes: those which temporarily immobilize the mental faculties—in effect, neutralizing a person's will to resist; and those which produce physical distress for a significant period, such as severe discomfort, anesthesia, paralysis, or immobility.

An example of how an incapacitating agent works on the mental faculties is the famous performance of the drugged cat. The effects of this psychochemical completely changed the natural antagonism of this cat toward a mouse. As the drug wore on, the cat's character completely reversed. Highly terrified, it cringed and leaped about in the cage to keep its distance from the mouse.

Knowledge of a number of compounds of this type has become universal through published medical and chemical scientific literature. A derivative of lysergic acid (LSD–25) is the only one so far announced in this country. However, to show that we have no monopoly, Major General Drugov, of the Soviet Union's Military Medical Service, has said: "Special interest attaches itself to the so-called psychic poisons [mescaline, methedrine, lysergic acid derivatives] which are now used for simulation of mental disease."

However, experimental work with this type of material is still in the early stage. The military potential of these compounds, as well as methods for providing effective protective measures against their possible use on us, must be adequately explored.

These so-called psychochemicals, causing effects that resemble psychosis, or that serve as stimulants, tranquilizers, or sedatives, can produce psychological incapacitation. The manner in which disability is achieved, however, may be immaterial to a commander who is interested only in military immobility. He may desire different forms of incapacitation to fit certain tactical or strategic conditions. For example, if we can impair a man's ability to integrate time and distance, it could seriously interfere with his landing an aircraft, or firing a gun from, or at, a moving vehicle. On the other hand, a more subtle and less recognizable incapacitation perhaps might be more important if it impaired the effectiveness of a trained unit by transforming it into a disorganized group who would no longer obey orders or would obey them incorrectly.

However, psychochemicals are not the whole story. In some instances they could be the lesser story. Physically incapacitating compounds could also be used, perhaps to better advantage, in many situations. Since a soldier must think, see, hear, stand, lie, or move as needed, and work with his weapons or tools, it is possible to render him ineffective by interfering with any one of these physical functions. For example, severe watering of the eyes, as produced by tear gas, is a mild form of physical disablement. Other compounds are known which irritate the lungs, temporarily lower the blood pressure, induce severe vomiting, disturb body temperature, physiologically impair vision, or bring on involuntary bowel movement or temporary anesthesia. In battle these effects, in contrast to those of the psychological agents, are truly immobilizing since they produce an effect that is militarily measurable. Anesthesia or lower blood pressure may ultimately prove to be the most useful, since they physically immobilize an enemy.

While many compounds are already known which have incapacitating capabilities, these characteristics in themselves do not necessarily make them suitable for military use. To be significant in a military use, and to permit economy in employing them, they must produce their effects through very small doses. While the disabling dose should be very small, one which might result in permanent disability must be larger by many orders of magnitude. This is a significant characteristic that distinguishes incapacitating compounds from lethal agents. We must also be able to produce these materials in large quantities at relatively modest cost, from resources available to the United States. Further, the supply of materials must be constant over a significant period, since they must be on hand for immediate use when the need arises. It is also highly desirable that these compounds be difficult to detect by smell or sight, to protect against, and to counteract by medical treatment.

Since we do not now, and may never, know exactly what an enemy is going to use against us, or when, a program of surveillance, research and development is vital, regardless of the ultimate role that incapacitating agents may assume. Necessarily, some of this work cannot be made public at this time. It is clear, however, that our buildup of adequate defenses inevitably must be based on knowledge of all types of compounds that might possibly be used against us; how they act on the human system; how they might be disseminated; what means we can develop to obtain warning and detection of their use; how we can protect ourselves; and what antidotes or treatments can be developed for on-the-spot first aid that will pharmacologically reverse the process at will and defeat the enemy's purpose.

There is a definite military use for incapacitating agents. The Army's Chemical Corps is endeavoring to provide our country with adequate means of protection against such chemical weapons.

Pesach, 5720—Passover, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. For people who share the precious heritage of the Jewish faith, history, and cultural traditions, the Passover is, of all seasons of the year, perhaps the fullest of religious depth, historical significance, human warmth and youthful gladness.

It is a reminder, in the prescribed foods of the Seder, as well as in the four questions asked threat and their answers, of one of the greatest events of history, the delivery of the children of Israel from their bondage in Egypt.

It is a reminder of our reliance, then and now, upon divine providence. It is an exacting test of the knowledge and wisdom of the father, in replying to his son's four questions, and a stimulus to the faith and courage of all who share in the ceremony. In this religious ceremony, in this family meal, in this glad festival, families are drawn together, renewing their old bonds of affection, and resolving anew to live in the warmth of these human relationships and religious traditions.

In the singing and storytelling, in the ceremonial sharing of the wine, in the beautiful words of the benediction that concludes the Passover service, we feel ourselves brought together in affection and happiness—parents and children and guests, and all the broad world upon which we call down the blessings of redemption, and peace, and justice, and brotherhood.

Religion and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a copy of an editorial by David Baxter which appeared in the Extension, a national Catholic publication.

While Reverend Baxter is an Evangelical minister, many of his writings are published in national Catholic magazines which indicates his profound concern over the basic moral and spiritual responsibilities which our citizens should assume.

The editorial follows:

RELIGION AND POLITICS
(By David Baxter)

Just why most service clubs and other organizations ban discussion of religion and politics is a question. They should be the most discussed subjects instead of the least discussed. Religion is the most important interest in the world, for it directly concerns one's eternal destiny. Politics comes next for, in one way or another, it affects our everyday lives in this world, our homes, wages, living standards, and freedom.

Yet, mention religion and someone will remark, "Well, everyone to his own religion. It doesn't matter what you believe just so you live right." Such people do not seem to realize that living right depends on believing right, for, as the saying goes, "As a man thinks (believes) in his heart, so is he." Good works are based on something. There is a reason why one performs them—and that something is belief, or faith. St. James expressed it clearly in saying, "Shew me thy

faith without works, and I will shew thee, by works, my faith."

And politics. "I don't want to talk or think about politics," is a common expression. Yet these same ignorant people, who often pride themselves on being well educated, are among the first to bellyache when the tax bill comes in and they find their lives and affairs being regulated by other people who do think about politics.

People to whom religion and politics are taboo have no business pretending to be good Christians, in the first instance, or good citizens of the United States in the second, whether or not their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*. God disapproves of cold Christians ("the charity of many shall grow cold") and He utterly casts out lukewarm ones ("But because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of My mouth." Apoc. 3:16). Likewise, in political affairs the Apostle Paul warns: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but from God: and those that are ordained of God" (Romans 13: 1).

The hot Christian is also hot in obeying God, including subjection to and active interest in the powers that be. Pope Pius XII showed his understanding of this some years ago in declaring that Catholics should not be confined to the four walls of ecclesiasticism but should take an active part in citizenship and political affairs. Many great Protestant leaders have also made this point, refuting those who insist that religion has nothing to do with politics and that Christtions should confine themselves to spiritual matters only, remaining aloof from things political.

It so happens that in America the powers-that-be do not consist of rulers, as was once the case. The powers-that-be are the American people, self-governing through representation. The United States is not a lond of rulers and ruled (although it's getting to be, thanks to those who are willing to be ruled). It is a government of, by, and for the people. "We, the people," through our elected representatives, are the Government, Federal, State, and local. Everyone is, in effect, "the Government."

Now how is any good Christian American going to be subject to the powers-that-be, of which he is one, unless he takes an interest in his self-government and plays an active part in it? That's politics. The moment one becomes an American he's as much a part of the political system as anyone else. His opinion is important and his vote equals that of the President. To shirk his duties as a citizen is to shirk his duties as a Christian obedient to God's power and that which He has delegated to the self-governing American people. That the Founding Fathers understood this is clear from their statements and from such engravings on our coins as "In God We Trust," not to mention the oath of allegiance—"one nation indivisible, under God."

Morality follows religion. If we believe in morality, it leads us directly into politics. Moral government depends on a moral "we, the people."

Sometimes people are interested in politics the wrong way—the way of greed and jealousy. Many without much ambition or initiative have one idea in mind—to get something away from those who have "gotten ahead." Only an immoral candidate for office would represent such people in accomplishing their aim, so governmental offices, from Washington to Pumpkin Center, are often held by unscrupulous politicians. If a man is unprincipled enough to rob one citizen to benefit another who supports him, he will have no scruples about robbing his own class the first chance he gets.

On the other hand, let's say a man has, by honesty, initiative and thrift, been such a good manager that he has made a success of his farm, business, profession or art. One should manage his own affairs successfully before undertaking to manage the even more important business of the people. Therefore, the fellow who has a long and good record to show in his own life is the very one the people need to represent them and handle their business.

Here, too, immoral selfishness has often cost the people the best kind of representation. Some voters may not like a successful person because he's successful, is better off than they are and is not likely to tax others to support them in order to get their votes. In many cases, too, such men refuse to seek office because of their own selfishness. They can make five times as much money in their private pursuits than a political office pays. Election would be a sacrifice on their part and they don't want to make any sacrifices. That shows a lack of good citizenship.

Yet the offices are there and must be filled. When good men will not take them, bad men will—and greedily seek them. Add that up and you come out with the vilest kind of political system. That is why Christians of high morality must also be good political citizens, according to the divine admonition, applying Christian ethics both as voters and candidates for office. They simply can't escape the fact that, in America, they are the powers that be, ordained of God.

"The wages of sin is death." That goes for political sin, too. One reaps what he sows. A certain State office, let us say, is to be filled. Henry Thorndyke, a devout churchman and successful citizen, isn't interested. He's busy and doesn't want to make the sacrifice. So John Criminalis, a racketeer, runs for the job and is elected. John promptly creates more State jobs and bureaus to hand out booty to his henchmen, calling for more State expense. Thorndyke, who has earned his money, finds bigger and bigger chunks of it being taken away from him by men who never earned a nickel in their lives. He paws the air and denounces "crooked politics," but whose fault is it? He reaps what he helped sow. Instead of becoming more active politically and making a little sacrifice, the worse he gets hurt the more apt he is to shout, "Politics are rotten. I don't want anything to do with politics." The less he has to do with the system to which he was born, the more will he be harmed by unscrupulous men who do.

I know a State representative who has been in office over a dozen years. Few of his constituents outside of his hometown have ever heard of him. Yet in the capitol, in legislating, he is their representative, their mouthpiece, acting in their name. He has not accomplished one outstanding thing for his district in all those years. He simply is paid by the taxpayers. Some legislation he's voted on has even been injurious to many of the folks back home. Still, they get what they deserve in not discharging their duties as Christians and political citizens.

This representative has been opposed but once. Able men haven't wanted the post because it would be a small sacrifice on their part. The man who does hold it is a lawyer. He represents special business interests among his clients in his home community and his chief interest is to keep an eye on legislation that might affect them. Thus, the job is profitable to him. He simply represents special, selfish interests and not the common people of his district. It is not his fault. It is the failure of people who aren't interested in politics—but are certainly interested in their tax bills, increased farm costs, and the like.

Christian youth especially should be taught the American political system and develop a liking for it. They should be shown how Christian morality can in the most vital way be applied to politics as a service to humanity. They should learn the original basic principles of the major parties and make a choice. As they are committed to the spiritual teachings of their church, they should likewise be morally committed to the great principles of their chosen party, even if those principles have been betrayed now and then. They must see that religion and morality are inseparable partners and that morality must be used in self-government, in obedience to God.

How really important is all this? Well, it happens to have this significance: the only alternative is communism, in which the people are not the government and the government itself is not the "powers-that-be," ordained of God. The Communist government says it is God. I needn't add that if Christian Americans do not take any great interest in politics, Communists certainly do.

Grassroots Thinking To Create an Imaginative Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, more than ever before in our history our American citizens are thinking and talking about our relations with other countries and peoples of the world. This exercise of our basic democratic birthrights has made our country the leader of the free world. Only by continuous vigorous exercise of these rights shall we remain free and democratic.

A recent example of grassroots thinking on foreign policy matters was sent to me. I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both for the purpose of informing the Members of the Congress of the constructive proposals as well as to lend encouragement to all citizens in our country to think deeply about the problems of our times and speak out on their proposed solutions to these problems:

KENSINGTON, MD., *April 7, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN FOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The foreign policy statement developed by the Democratic precinct workers of 13–40 was prepared by a committee of the following: Sanford (Sandy) Gottlieb, chairman, Bob Adams, Phylis Jason, Anna Leder, and Doris Lutzky. Sandy Gottlieb brought up the subject at our November 23, 1959, precinct meeting. His idea of the Democratic workers in the precinct going on record with their views on some of the crucial problems facing our Nation met with overwhelmingly favorable response. I have never seen such enthusiasm at a precinct meeting.

The committee met several times during December and January and came up with a statement at our precinct meeting of January 25, 1960. There was much discussion of and modification of the committee work before it was unanimously approved and referred back to the committee for final drafting.

We have sent copies of the statement to all the Democratic precinct chairmen in Montgomery County as well as the members of the Democratic State Central Committee for Montgomery County. We hope to introduce this statement at the next meeting of precinct chairmen with view toward its ultimate adoption by that body. We hope that

our views can climb up the ladder of the Democratic Party and be of some assistance at the national convention this summer. Anything you can do, JOHN, to help us in this effort to serve our country and our party will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

H. ROWLAND LUDDEN,
Chairman, 13–40 Democrats,
Montgomery County, Md.

BUILDING A LASTING PEACE

(Foreign policy statement of Democratic precinct 13–40, Kensington, Md.)

If the Democratic Party is to win the 1960 elections, it must respond to the peace issue with imaginative and practical proposals. Expressions of good will must be translated into positive programs if freedom is to prevail in a world without war. Building a lasting peace requires more than brinksmanship, personal diplomacy, and muddling through. The foreign policy of the United States must be stabilized through wisdom and careful planning based on analysis of our interests and our power. Platitudes are no substitute for policy.

A Democratic policy for peace must be based on a realization that both Communist and non-Communist nations share a common interest in the will to survive. Unless ways are found to settle outstanding conflicts and permit the rival systems to compete in peace, both sides face the risks of an uncontrolled arms race leading to levels of tension where the slightest error could bring mutual suicide.

We believe the United States, in conducting the struggle with the Communist countries, should emphasize use of diplomatic, economic, and ideological weapons. This would help remove the dangers of the arms race and permit us to wage more vigorously throughout the world the struggle for freedom.

In staking out the ground rules for our foreign policy, we find four areas of fundamental importance: (1) Total diplomacy, (2) the conclusion of disarmament agreements with adequate inspection and control, (3) economic aid to underdeveloped countries, and (4) strengthening the United Nations.

1. TOTAL DIPLOMACY

Since the conflicts that have formed the substance of the cold war are real and not imaginary and since the problems that mark the transition of colonial peoples to independence are potentially explosive, renewed efforts of total diplomacy are needed to lessen international tensions. And all-out effort at adjustment and accommodation by all available diplomatic means must be undertaken and carried through on a long-range basis.

Summit meetings are only one method of trying to resolve international conflicts. They may prove useful either to negotiate settlements or to announce agreements reached through hard, professional bargaining by trained diplomats. It should be recognized that meetings of heads of government are no cure-all for the profound problems mankind now faces.

Increased use should be made of the United Nations as one of the diplomatic channels for resolving conflicts. We must constantly search for ways and times in which the U.N. can be most profitably utilized.

We also call upon the United States to take the lead in submitting international disputes to the World Court. This is a step in the direction of extending the rule of law in international relations. Our Government can make a practical show of good faith by abandoning its present position that it alone can determine whether a dispute falls within the jurisdiction of the World Court.

2. DISARMAMENT

We enthusiastically endorse the statement of the advisory committee on science and technology of the Democratic Advisory Council that, under the present "balance of terror" policy, the triggering of a nuclear war by mistake, by misadventure, or by miscalculation is a constant danger. These scientists have called for worldwide disarmament agreements incorporating proper safeguards which would made a sudden, devastating attack impossible, whether by atomic, biological, or chemical weapons.

An important first step toward this ultimate goal would be the conclusion of an agreement to stop the testing of nuclear weapons, under a worldwide network of monitoring stations.

Arms control agreements of this kind would establish the machinery of international inspection, lessen tension and distrust, and permit the diversion of resources into the long-range fight against poverty, disease, and illiteracy in the underdeveloped countries—countries which are fast becoming of crucial importance in the world.

We welcome the Democratic Advisory Council's proposal for the establishment of a National Peace Agency as a permanent planning group to draw up blueprints for disarmament and aid to the underdeveloped nations. This would help fill the almost complete vacuum in the area of planning which has characterized the Eisenhower administration's approach to foreign policy.

3. ECONOMIC AID

Underdeveloped countries the world over are trying to raise the funds to create 20th century economics. They obviously do not have all the capital needed to finance schools, hospitals, roads, powerplants, factories, water supply, and communications systems, ports, and railroads.

The Communists, as in China, are raising capital by squeezing it out of the labor of an already impoverished people. This coercion, plus Soviet aid, may well build a modern economy for China, but in the absence of political and personal freedom.

Free countries, such as India, are making great sacrifices but still need outside aid if they are to establish sound economies. If they do not succeed, their young democratic institutions will not survive.

To help the underdeveloped countries establish self-sustaining economies without which they would fall prey to the pressures of totalitarian communism, we urge increased, long-term foreign aid from the United States and its allies. So that this aid may be given and received in the most mutually helpful manner, increased attention should be given to channeling it through the United Nations. In addition to calming the fears of possible political "strings" being attached to the aid, use of the U.N. would allow the maximum planning and sharing of the burden and of the fruits of economic aid.

4. STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

Greater reliance on the United Nations to help meet international problems of all kinds would give the world organization more "muscle," permitting it to function more meaningfully in the future.

The U.N. Trusteeship Council has already been serving with great success as "midwife" in the birth of new nations from trust territories in Africa. Such specialized U.N. agencies as the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and UNICEF have provided invaluable guidance and assistance in meeting basic human needs. Continued and expanded use of the U.N. and its agencies can help bridge the gap from disease to health, from poverty to plenty, and from illiteracy to knowledge for untold millions.

Within the present structure of the U.N. it might be possible to establish one institution which could help maintain world peace in specific situations: a permanent U.N. peace force which could serve as a buffer has been proven by the U.N. presence in the Gaza Strip between Egypt and Israel. A U.N. peace force could be lightly armed and staffed by technicians trained for observation and inspection. Such a group might be linked to the inspection machinery of disarmament agreements.

CONCLUSION

These recommended policies and areas of endeavor do not spell out a complete program for the United States in these difficult times. They merely indicate certain desirable main guidelines. They also indicate that there are no easy solutions and no cure-alls.

Peace cannot be bought in a bargain basement. Increased efforts are needed from all segments of our society. An expanding economy is needed to provide the sinews of a better life and the tax base to foot the monetary bill. Constant vigilance, planning, and leadership must come from our public officials.

But even active leadership is not enough. Hard thinking and intelligent political action by the people must constantly guide their elected representatives.

Shrimp Import Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Mobile (Ala.) Press of Friday, April 8, 1960, which gives a good statement on shrimp import controls. Well, it is certainly timely. This editorial gives the facts, and I shall not add to them. We have had hearings before the U.S. Tariff Commission on this matter. Our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am vice chairman, and chairman of its Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife, handles commercial and sport fisheries, and held hearings on some phases of this problem. We have sent a group from our committee to sit in at the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, and I know we will work out something there on fishing rights in the waters of each nation. There certainly will have to be some controls on shrimp imports, if our own people are to survive, and they will survive. I have also introduced a bill, H.R. 8926, as the shrimp industry in my district has been badly hurt by cheap foreign imports, and some of our fishermen have been obliged to sell their boats as they could not afford to sell their shrimp at the prices they were offered.

I also include a press dispatch (UPI) which appeared in the Mobile Press under date of April 9, 1960, "U.S. Shrimp Industry Peril Cited." The figures cited in this article show that shrimp imports supply 47 percent of the U.S. market now, compared with 4 percent in 1939, and that imports have doubled since 1955; from 53,800,000 pounds to 106,600,000 pounds in 1959.

The articles follow:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press, Apr. 9, 1960]

U.S. SHRIMP INDUSTRY PERIL CITED—BRIEF IS FILED WITH TARIFF BOARD BY THREE GROUPS

WASHINGTON.—The three domestic shrimp industry organizations have told the U.S. Tariff Commission that increasing imports could virtually eliminate shrimp fishing in the United States.

The National Shrimp Congress, Inc., the Gulf Shrimp Canners Association, and the National Shrimp Breaders Association filed a joint brief yesterday with the Tariff Commission. The brief backed up testimony given by the groups at Commission hearings last month. Shrimp importers also appeared at the hearing to argue against the domestic industry's claims.

The Tariff Commission has been directed to report to the House Ways and Means Committee by May 9 on the effect of shrimp imports on the domestic industry.

The brief summarized the arguments given in the March hearings, citing statistics that showed:

Shrimp imports supply 47 percent of the U.S. market now, compared to 4 percent in 1939.

Imports have doubled since 1955: from 53,800,000 pounds to 106,600,000 pounds in 1959.

A projection of imports shows that foreign countries will be sending 303,000 million pounds, or 99 percent of the U.S. market, by 1965.

"Imported shrimp consistently undersell the domestic catch in virtually all categories," the brief said. "Together, these facts will force a virtual elimination of domestic fishing for shrimp."

The brief called for a system, under which each importing country would be given quotas. Imports over a country's quota would be charged a 50 percent duty under the industry proposal.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press, Apr. 8, 1960]

SHRIMP IMPORT CONTROLS APPEAR IN ORDER AT THE PRESENT TIME

There is much merit in currently considered Federal legislation to control shrimp imports.

Such a step is needed to prevent the domestic shrimp industry from economic collapse.

Identical bills introduced in both houses of Congress do not seek to prohibit or cut back imports, but actually to expand them in orderly fashion.

Spokesmen for the domestic shrimp industry readily concede the need for continued imports, since American shrimpers can supply only about 60 percent of current market requirements. H.R. 8769, the industry-backed bill, provides not only for continuation of imports at the highest historical levels, but for steady, substantial increases beyond those levels in the future.

Approximately 50 countries export shrimp to the United States. The domestic industry is concerned over the prospect that unrestricted imports may bring about widely fluctuating prices and wreck both the United States and traditional foreign suppliers such as Mexico, Panama, and Ecuador.

Many south Alabamians, Mississippians, and Floridians have large investments in boats and other shrimp facilities. It would be unfortunate to place these people in jeopardy of being forced out of business by foreign imports.

We strongly urge passage of this law protecting an important division of the gulf coast's economy.

Advisory Board Supports C. & O. Canal National Historical Park, H.R. 2331

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, the membership of this distinguished group of American leaders unanimously supported the passage of H.R. 2331 "To create the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park and Parkway." I take this means of bringing the full report of the Board to the attention of the Members of Congress:

ADVISORY BOARD URGES TWO NEW UNITS FOR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Creation of a new national historical park and a new national monument has been recommended to Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

The Board, which met in Washington, D.C., March 21–23, today forwarded to Secretary Seaton the following recommendations:

1. Early enactment of legislation, now before Congress, which would authorize establishment of a 15,000-acre Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, from the Nation's Capital through the mountains of Maryland. Secretary Seaton previously endorsed the legislation.

2. Designation of a Missouri area as Ozark Rivers National Monument. The Department of the Interior is now reviewing a National Park Service report which asks that the proposed monument include some 113,000 acres along about 190 miles of the Current Jacks Fork, and Eleven Point Rivers.

The Advisory Board also commended the Department for its efforts to secure congressional cooperation to provide essential protection of Rainbow Bridge National Monument, Utah, against "irreparable physical and esthetic damage as the result of the construction of Glen Canyon Dam," and urged that this effort be continued and implemented in every possible way.

A statutory body created by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the Advisory Board is composed of 11 nonsalaried members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The act specifies that the membership "include representatives competent in the field of history, archeology, architecture, and human geography."

In addition to commenting on Rainbow Bridge, the Board forwarded six recommendations to the Secretary.

The C. & O. Canal recommendation noted that the advisers were reiterating their 1955 call for protection of the historic waterway. They said the canal park unit is needed "as a memorial to America's westward expansion and a monument to the canal area." The Board said it "hopes that enactment of the pending legislation will enable the Nation to realize this park opportunity without further delay."

The advisers also commended and supported the position of the service with respect to zoning Yellowstone Lake in Yellowstone National Park and recommended "that the three lower arms (of the lake) be closed to power boats as proposed in the plans of the National Park Service." The Service plans to restrict power boats from a portion of the lake to retain that area's wilderness nature.

Another resolution noted that, as fine as the National Park System is, it is not complete and there are significant areas of scenic, scientific, and historic significance that should be considered on a systematic basis for suitability and eligibility for inclusion in the system. The Board urged that "a national park system more nearly adequate for the foreseeable needs of the United States * * * be planned and appropriate measures taken to acquire and conserve these irreplaceable portions of our national heritage before they are lost."

Under the Park, Parkway, and Recreation Study Act of 1936, the Park Service cooperates with other Federal and State agencies in planning for adequate facilities. Regarding such surveys, the Board particularly commended the Park Service for its seashore and Great Lakes shore surveys made with donated funds. The Board urged the Department to take all appropriate means so that the experience and findings of these studies may be made available to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and to other agencies of the Government and the public "at the earliest practicable date."

The Board also commended the Service's State park cooperation program and asked the Department to strengthen and expand it "since adequate and sound State park conservation programs are perhaps the backbone of park conservation in the United States."

Members of the Advisory Board are: Frank E. Masland, Jr., of Carlisle, Pa., Chairman; Harold P. Fabian, Salt Lake City, Utah, chairman of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission, Vice Chairman; Dr. Edward B. Danson, Flagstaff, Ariz., director of the Museum of Northern Arizona, Secretary.

Also Dr. E. Raymond Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Dr. John A. Krout, vice president and provost, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.; John B. Oakes, New York City; Earl H. Reed, Chicago, Ill., Fred Smith, Newark, N.J.; Carl I. Wheat, Menlo Park, Calif.; Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; and Sigurd F. Olson, Ely, Minn.

Father Thomas L. Farrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, Father Thomas L. Farrell, pastor of St. Lawrence Roman Catholic Church in Jessup, Md., passed away to his eternal reward. On March 15 in the historic Cathedral-Basilica of the Assumption in Baltimore, where Father Farrell had been ordained by the now deceased Archbishop Michael J. Curley in June 1936, a solemn pontifical Mass was offered by His Excellency Archbishop Francis P. Keough of Baltimore, for the repose of Father Farrell's soul which climaxed his full and priestly life, with His Excellency Bishop Sebastian and over 100 priests and monsignori participating in this beautiful and impressive ceremony before a basilica filled to its very doors with former parishioners, loved ones, and friends of Father Farrell from all walks of life.

Father Farrell was only 50 years of age when he died; but in those 50 years he lived a full and fruitful priestly life. Prior to his ordination he studied at Georgetown University and St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. After his ordination in 1936, he served as a curate at St. Mary's in Govans, at St. Mark's at Catonsville and the last 3 years as pastor at St. Lawrence's at Jessup.

In 1940, Father Farrell volunteered for military service as a chaplain and for 5 years was the beloved padre of the 36th Field Artillery Group through seven battles in the invasions of North Africa, Italy, Southern France, and then Germany. When he returned home, he remained active in the military Reserve, holding the rank of lieutenant colonel at the time of his death.

While at St. Lawrence's at Jessup, Father Farrell had the care of the Maryland House of Correction for men, the reformatory for women, and the Patuxent institution.

Father Farrell was a priest's priest, a gallant and courageous soldier, a GI's padre, and a Christlike servant of God's children—the sinless and the sinful, the poor and the rich, the weak and the strong, the sick and the healthy—indeed everyone, of whatever station, race or creed, in need of God's comfort and consolation.

I was deeply impressed by the eulogy to Father Farrell delivered at the Solemn Pontifical Mass at the Assumption Cathedral by Father Thomas M. Brew of the Society of Jesus, Rector of the Jesuit Retreat House "Manresa on the Severn" at Annapolis, and Father Farrell's lifelong friend; and I am including this eulogy as part of my remarks so that my colleagues may read this moving, heart-warming tribute to this hero-priest on that solemn occasion:

"Being made perfect in a short space, he fulfilled a long time" (from the "Book of Wisdom," ch. 4, verse 13).

Most Reverend Archbishop Keough, Most Reverend Bishop Sebastian, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignors, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, Good Sisters, loved ones, and friends of Father Farrell:

At a time like this, when many hearts—mine included—are heavy with sorrow, I realize only too well that human words can be pretty futile. But it is only proper for the consolation of the living, the many friends and relatives of Father Farrell here present this morning, that some final thoughts in memory of this devoted and beloved priest be spoken.

It has been my good fortune to have known Father Farrell as long as I can remember. He was my best friend. His death is a great personal loss to me as it is to everyone who knew him. I find consolation—as you can and must—in the firm belief that God's ways are not our ways; that Father Farrell's priestly work is finished and that Almighty God in His wisdom has called home this priest to an eternity of peace and happiness with Him whom Father Farrell loved and served so devotedly and faithfully in his relatively short life here.

Of worldly goods, Father Farrell has left behind mighty little but to each and every one of us here today—priest, religious sister or brother, lay person—man, woman, child, he has left something much more precious and valuable. He has left us example of his priestly life, a life which was completely dedicated to the love and service of God and his fellow man.

As Father Farrell's mortal remains lie here before the altar, his priestly life has now come full circle. It was here in this historic Basilica of the Assumption that he was ordained a priest in June 1936; here with his ordination classmates he cocelebrated with Archbishop Curley his first mass as a newly ordained priest of God. This morning the solemn pontificial Mass offered by His Excellency Archbishop Keough, for Father Farrell and for the repose of his soul climaxes his full and fruitful priestly life.

Little did the newly ordained Father Farrell dream on that bright morning in June nearly 24 years ago that his priestly duties would take him far beyond parish limits—to foreign countries as an Army chaplain—and here at home—into hospitals and prisons. Little did he realize when death came so suddenly the other day that through his priestly ministrations, so many people had been helped by him and brought closer to God. Little did he realize, while living, the full value and impact of his work for God. Such was the humility of this great priest.

Recently, His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, in an address to the Rome Synod made reference to the acts of the Council of Trent concerning priests as follows: "Nothing is more effective for encouraging piety and the worship of God among Christian people than the life and example of those men who have dedicated themselves to the divine ministry." In a remarkable way, Father Farrell's life and example have advanced the Kingdom of Christ on this earth.

In that same address which was an explanation and amplification of the priestly character as outlined by the Council of Trent, the Holy Father went on to point out that the three basic elements of the priestly character are to be found in the head, the heart, and the tongue of the priest. I submit that Father Farrell's life and work as a priest are a fulfillment of the statement of the Holy Father.

To begin with the head, and in the words of the Holy Father, "It is by the head that one measures the doctrine, the prudence, the good judgment of a man of the church, of a priest of Christ." Father Farrell's preliminary studies were made at St. Joseph's Parochial School and Gonzaga High School in Washington, D.C. Then followed St. Charles and Georgetown University. His philosophical and theological studies were completed at St. Mary's Seminary. Through it all, while he was not the most brilliant student, he was never far from the top of his class. In his student days, he proved himself to be an energetic, steady, and consistent worker, a trait that was to be much in evidence throughout his priestly career. Father Farrell realized that there was no easy way to be educated, that studies had to be worked at, and he applied himself accordingly with the thought that here was his professional knowledge, the tools with which he must work to be a successful laborer in the vineyard of the Lord. He never forgot that the priest in order to be an effective instrument in the hand of God, must never cease studying. Consequently, even though his days were busy and the time for reading limited, he made the most of his opportunities to keep himself well-informed, well-educated.

That he had the requisite qualities of mind spoken of by the Holy Father is evident from his prudence as a curate, his good judgment under pressure, as an Army chaplain in the heat of battle, and his administrative ability in his later years as a pastor.

God gives to all of us certain talents to use in the living of our lives and the working out of our salvation. Sad to say, some of us never discover what our talents are, or knowing them, fail to use them to the fullest extent. I think that one great reason for Father Farrell's effectiveness as a priest can be found in the fact that he recognized his talents and made the best use of them for God and in God's work.

One such talent was his athletic ability. He not only played on the teams during his school years but he was able to teach young people the fundamentals of football, baseball, and basketball. He recognized full well that athletics were a means to an end. He made use of competitive sports and games to teach the young people entrusted to his care the important and necessary lessons of teamwork, self-discipline, courage and manliness. Also, he taught them how to be graceful winners and good losers. Father Farrell, with his teams at St. Mary's, Govans, and at St. Mark's, Catonsville, was wisely building natural virtues to achieve supernatural ends. He had a marvelous way with young people.

One phase of Father Farrell's priestly life is not too well known. Like most men who have known the heat and fury of battle, who have seen men wounded and die, he talked very little of his war experiences but they were many in the 5 years he spent in the service of his country as a military chaplain. In 1940, when war had broken over Europe but before this country was drawn into World War II, Father Farrell left St. Mary's, Govans, for military duty. The next 5 action-packed years were spent far from home at Fort Bragg, N.C., England, in the invasions of North Africa, Sicily, Italy, Southern France, and finally Germany, during the course of which he won seven battle stars—the soldier's field uniform for a time replaced the cassock. The man of peace had become the beloved Padre of the 36th field artillery group. This was the outfit he joined at Fort Bragg and with it he remained all through the war. There was more than one brush with death. One day in Africa the jeep in which he had been riding struck a land mine only seconds after he had gotten out of it. The GI Chaplain's Assistant was killed, but Father Farrell had been mercifully spared. His work was not yet done.

As a priest Father Farrell preached numerous sermons—from the pulpit in the church—in military camps, in hospitals and prisons but he had no illusions about his eloquence as a speaker. What he had to say was said in a simple, sincere and straightforward way and consequently had a deep effect upon his hearers. Though he did not realize it, his best sermon was his own life. His most effective work involving the priestly tongue was done in the confessional, in the instruction of converts, in informal and personal meetings with those who had a problem or needed encouragement. For one in trouble or burdened with sorrow, he always had a kind and encouraging word. In all the years I have known him, I cannot remember his speaking ill of anyone.

But it was in the realm of the heart that the priestly character of Father Farrell preeminently stood out. He was a priest after the heart of his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Selfless devotion to duty best describes this priest as he went about his Father's business. He had a special care for the sick—whether it was a sick call late at night or in the middle of dinner, or whether it was bringing Holy Communion to one with a lingering and crippling illness. No matter how busy he was or how much he might have been inconvenienced where his own comfort was concerned, he would drop everything at a moment's notice if anyone wanted or needed him. He was friendly and approachable: the young, old and middle-aged equally felt at home with him. To all he gave a genuine interest and a sympathetic

understanding such as is found in few men. He was patient, with human weakness, and kind with a kindness he must have inherited from his dear mother, where the people committed to his care were concerned, be they young or old, rich or poor, learned or uneducated—all had an equal claim on Father Farrell. He was everybody's priest.

Thousands came to his wake. They came from far and near. Grown men surreptitiously brushed back a tear: a young person whom he helped years ago wept openly and unashamed. They came from his parish, St. Lawrence, Jessup, where he spent the last 3 years of his life as pastor of that growing parish and endeared himself to the hearts of his people. While at Jessup, he had the care of the Maryland House of Correction for Men, the Reformatory for Women and the Patuxent Institution. Father Farrell was equally at home with the prisoner, the teenager and the elderly person. Still others came from St. Mary's, Govans, where he began his priestly work. Many more came from St. Mark's Catonsville, where he spent 10 busy years ministering to all classes of people. Fellow soldiers of the 36th Field Artillery Group, came considerable distances for a last rendezvous and prayer for a comrade in arms. Many sisters and fellow priests paid their respects. Truly, Father Farrell was the layman's priest, the soldier's priest and the priest's priest.

As I watched them come and go, the question kept coming back to my mind—what is the secret motive, known only to himself and to Christ, our Lord, that impels a Father Farrell so consistently to go far beyond the call of duty, to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to toil and not to seek for rest, to labor, and not seek for reward save that of knowing that he is doing God's will?

In trying to discover that secret, I took a last look around Father Farrell's room in the rectory at Jessup. I saw on his desk a pen and pencil set with this inscription—"Father Thomas L. Farrell—We miss you—The Catonsville Midget League, June 21, 1956." Near one of the shelves of the bookcase was a baseball autographed not by big leaguers, but by the St. Mark's 1948 C.Y.O. Champs. These items told their own story but still I had not found the secret of Father Farrell.

Next I turned to the bookcase and removed his well-torn copy of the New Testament. What appeared to be a bookmark actually was a neatly folded but often-used piece of paper on which was typed "The Prayer of a Soldier in France," by Joyce Kilmer, and I read:

My shoulders ache beneath my pack
(Lie easier, cross, upon His back.)
I march with feet that burn and smart
(Tread, Holy Feet, upon my heart.)
Men shout at me who may not speak
(They scouraged Thy back and smote Thy cheek.)
I may not lift a hand to clear
My eyes of salty drops that sear.
(Then shall my fickle soul forget
Thy agony of bloody sweat?)
My rifle hand is stiff and numb
(From Thy pierced palm red rivers come.)
Lord, Thou didst suffer more for me
Than all the hosts of land and sea.
So let me render back again,
This millionth of Thy gift. Amen.

I reread it and then it suddenly dawned on me—those last four lines—"Lord, Thou didst suffer more for me than all the hosts of land and sea. So let me render back again this millionth of Thy gift."

And there I believe is the secret of Father Farrell.

May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace. Amen.

Address by the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, at Appomattox Day Observance Evansville Civil War Roundtable, Evansville, Ind., April 9, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address made by the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, at Evansville, Ind., before the Evansville Civil War Roundtable, on Appomattox Day Observance, April 9, 1960.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEWEY SHORT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT APPOMATTOX DAY OBSERVANCE EVANSVILLE CIVIL WAR ROUNDTABLE, EVANSVILLE, IND., APRIL 9, 1960

My friends, it is indeed a pleasure to join with you this evening in observance of the anniversary of the peace established at Appomattox 95 years ago. I also deeply appreciate the honor conferred upon me by being asked to address the same group which has previously heard such profound students of the Civil War as Bell I. Wiley, Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, and Bruce Catton.

Last fall I was deeply disappointed when I found it impossible to come to Evansville to be with you at your 96th anniversary program commemorating Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. I had fully intended to be here for that event, but unfortunately the "battle of the budget" was at its height then in the Pentagon, and now they are still waging it with intense ferocity on Capitol Hill, so I am lucky even to be with you tonight. I admire "Bish" Thompson for his unrelenting tenacity, however, for it was through his efforts that I return to the great Hoosier State.

"Bish," as a fellow alumnus of Baker University, it is good to see you and thanks again for inviting me to be with you here tonight.

I approach the subject of the Civil War—and particularly Appomattox—in utmost humility because I do not believe a man has ever been born who fully understands the cause, the conduct, and the consequences of the Civil War. The most expert and impartial historian finds it difficult, if not impossible, to fathom the bottomless depths and to assay the real meaning of this most terrible of fratricidal conflicts. Once a great philosopher said: "The day is deep and deeper than the day can dream." Life goes deeper than logic and the heart has reason that it knows not of. Maybe this is why a study of the War Between the States has so many devotees such as you and me. It is endlessly interesting, always absorbing and ever challenging.

Since a youngster, I have been a voracious reader of accounts of the Civil War and, as I grow older and the more I read the less I seem to know and understand about it. If you are like me, I am sure that often in baffling moments you are tempted to give up in despair, but then there is always a tug to draw you back to the difficult task of trying to interpret its true meaning and profit by its lesson.

No American can consider the events which transpired at McLean House in Appomattox Courthouse, Va., on April 9, 1865, without being profoundly moved. Moved by the dignity, the simplicity, and solemnity of the scene—moved by the realization that the leaders of two great and brilliantly led American armies had met to end the strife that had rent the Nation assunder for more than 4 terrible years. Each side had fought long and desperately for a cause it believed to be right, be it the right of the State to govern itself or a faith in the preservation of a United States. And each side tragically left behind a toll of honored men who gave the last full measure of their devotion.

Yes, the scene that Sunday afternoon 95 years ago was a somber one. One Union officer describing it wrote: "We walked in softly * * * very much as people enter a sick chamber when they expect to find the patient dangerously ill." The contrasting appearances of Grant and Lee further provided an interesting historical footnote to the setting. General Grant, with his mud-spattered uniform which, except for the shoulder straps, would have indicated a private, was of careless appearance. His stubby brown hair and beard, his comparative youth and lack of height were not commensurate with what one might ordinarily associate with the supreme commander of the U.S. Army. On the other hand Lee, distinguished in appearance, erect in his military bearing, impeccable in his faultless uniform, presented a striking contrast.

The conference itself reflected the great understanding 4 years of war had brought. It was reserved and dignified and yet at the same time warmly and wholly human. Grant's terms of surrender embraced the bare necessities, tempered with justice and imposed in such an atmosphere of conciliation as to minimize the humiliation of the vanquished. Officers and men of Lee's command were to be released on giving their paroles not to take arms against the United States until exchanged; all arms and public property were to be relinquished.

At this point Grant's eyes, resting momentarily on Lee's splendid sword, said: "This will not embrace the sidearms of the officers, nor their private horses or baggage." Lee was visibly touched by this concession, which, he said, would have a happy effect upon his army, and accepting Grant's magnanimity, he asked if his soldiers might also keep their own mules and horses. Grant acceded to this, saying they would need their animals to work their farms. He went on to offer to supply rations to Lee's army, which had just about reached the ends of its stores. General Grant thus was generous in his terms, avoiding any appearance of exultation and showing a genuine respect for the feelings of his erstwhile foe.

The confrontation at Appomattox was one of gentlemen acting in a way befitting the dignity of man, and it is an occasion upon which all Americans may look with pride. Appomattox is also just another fascinating part of the story of the Civil War, and in our planning for the centennial of that great conflict we must constantly bear in mind that it must be a centennial of commemoration and dedication for all Americans, for out of the drama and strife of that war we will find lessons that will guide us today.

One hundred years ago this Nation was plunged into civil war. Though 1860 was still a year away from actual battle, the decision had already been made and America was hopelessly, helplessly, yet manifestly and inevitably moving toward war. This decision, it is obvious, had been reached sometime before; when, no one can say. No specific incident nor circumstance can be singled out as the cause of this state of affairs.

Some would point to William Lloyd Garrison, others to John Brown; and yet others to the intractability of the slaveholders of the great southern plantations. But no man

nor any single event can specifically be named as the causal factor for the dread decision. The decision was the product of the time; a time when America was growing up—bursting, as it were, its seams in boundless expansion—a time when America was beginning to realize that individuals must cooperate if this mighty Union of States was to assume a position of preeminence in the world. It was inevitable that the Nation should have growing pains in such times; it was unfortunate that they resulted in war.

But out of the holocaust, heartbreak, misery, horror, and tragedy of civil war was born a new unity. Never before had so much hell—both during the war and after—been endured for an accomplishment so magnificent. That this Nation was to become a leading world power was its destiny; that this Olympus was to be achieved with such honor, integrity, morality, and valor is testimony to the strength and determination of the American people.

Now a century has passed into eternity. Today our problems are much as they were then. The details are different, the disputes not the same; but the mosaic of events is strikingly similar. Today, we do not have bleeding Kansas or John Brown's raids, but today we do have Berlin, Korea, and Matsu and Quemoy.

Today our outlook is based on a framework of nations within a world structure rather than just a community of states within a single nation. Now the question at issue is the very same that it was a century ago, and that question—as then—is freedom. Before the Civil War it was freedom of men, freedom of States apart from the national whole, and freedom of geographical segments to determine their own ends. In that debate each side believed sincerely, deeply, and emotionally that its arguments were completely valid. The South was thoroughly convinced that it should be allowed to secede from a union it no longer understood and whose laws and attitudes were working to dissolve a system long held honorable and viable. The North, just as determined, held that a nation destined for world leadership should not be at odds when history was grooming it for the dawn of greatness.

Many historians have sought explanations for the mighty conflict. They were many, complex, and imponderable—but the chief cause, no doubt, was the fight for extension of the slavery system. After his election to the Presidency in November 1860, Lincoln wrote to Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia with whom he had served in Congress and who later was to become Vice President of the Confederacy: "You think slavery is right and ought to be extended, while we think it is wrong and ought to be restricted. That, I suppose, is the rub. It certainly is the only substantial difference between us." This same sentiment was clearly expressed in Lincoln's first inaugural address.

Today we are locked in a struggle with an ideology that is attempting to destroy our concept of freedom. When we look at the Communist leadership in the Sino-Soviet bloc, we see uninhibited dictatorship. There is no step, no risk, no course that they are not willing to take to carry out their avowed intention to bury us. Communist philosophy, to our way of thinking, refutes itself before it fully matures into a philosophy. We know and understand that a philosophy with no consideration for humanity is a philosophy that should not and cannot long exist.

America's philosophy is one that we have embraced since the beginning of our country. It is a philosophy that we share with our allies today, and it is one that we can believe in and fully trust. The belief that every man and every country should be free to choose its own course is one of the most basic, yet most noble verities given man. It is a belief that we have entered war to uphold. And when I think of our Civil War, I think one of its most magnificent aspects was that each side, in its own way, was fighting to uphold the principle of freedom.

The brilliance, the determination and the courage of such men as Lee, Jackson, Lincoln, and Grant must inspire us as we recall their efforts. Often as I sit in my office in the Pentagon, I find myself glancing up at the fine portico of General Lee's mansion to recall the difficult decision that he made there and the strength of character, patriotic devotion, and the great spiritual resources he brought to that trying moment. Certainly for these traits and for the brilliance and humanity of his leadership, he deserves his sacred place in the hearts of all Americans. For these were values found on both sides of the conflict, even when the division it symbolized was at its deepest. That these men and these values should be applauded and held up as truth by this Nation is something that is as fine as it is unlikely.

But these characteristics went well beyond the minds and souls of the war leaders; they extended, to a large degree, to every man engaged in the Civil War. Be they generals or privates, be they one man fighting for the Union and his brother cast as a rebel, be they great thinkers or determined farm boys; they all felt the religiously emotional impact of this struggle. At Seven Pines, the Wilderness, Manassas, and Bull Run, they were compelled by this impact and they fought battles whose description is at once horrible and magnificent.

But, though we can admire and praise the many fine things that sprang from the experience of Civil War, we must never forget that this was America's great essential tragedy. As do all great tragedies, it bred false hope in the form of 90-day enlistments and a picnic atmosphere. "One rebel can kill six Yankees any day," they cried in the South, and in Washington people packed picnic baskets to go watch the Union quickly defeat the South at Bull Run. With banners flying, fifes shrilling, and spirits soaring they touched off what was to become the most horrible war in history. Through incredible hardship, near starvation, and gruelling warfare the men of the North and South fought a war for 4 years that they were promised would be over in 6 months at most. They saw two generations of Americans lose half of its number to death or injury; they saw families split, towns wiped out, traditions wrecked, and records lost. They saw the democratic process losing its force, and, in doing so, wrecking the dreams of this country's ancestors. They knew that "war is hell" long before William Tecumseh Sherman told them that it was, for they could see in this war the tragedies of great men becoming doomed and a nation finding itself smashed on the rocks of malcontent.

America, which had historically been so strong, was lost. The fabric of union had been irreparably rent and no one could be found to weave an acceptable pattern. But more than this our Nation was caught up in a conflict that in many ways made no sense, had no pattern or justification. At its nadir it was an emotional experience comparable to the Dark Ages of Europe. There was little hope and less reality. This was compounded by the fact that nearly everyone in this country felt the real, personal effects of war.

The totality of this experience shocked America to the point that its memory was indelibly engraved on the American mind. The people looked back and saw an ordeal that might have been avoided, and they vowed that this country would never again become similarly involved. Out of ashes, out of terror, out of confusion this country once again became bound together. The weavers of union used a much more viable thread this time and wove a fabric that has withstood the greatest financial crisis, the most devastating depression, and the greatest two wars of history. America entered the Civil War and adolescent and came out mature. She felt the impotence that is war and determined that America could no more afford such folly. The mature America gathered strength and confidence and in a relatively short time parlayed her new-found unity and stability into a position of world power.

What are the implications and lessons of this darkest chapter in our history? The most astute and renowned historians would perhaps say there are not and cannot be any final and conclusive answers as to what the war really meant. As Bruce Catton has so well stated: "We are brooding over a deep, haunting enigma; over a riddle that can never quite be solved." We do know, however, that slavery and secession were the great bones of contention before this savage struggle and we also know that today slavery has been abolished and that the Union has been preserved. Slavery no longer exists, the Union does.

Often I have said, and I still believe, that all beauty is born of pain and that the deepest understanding in life comes through suffering. I hope no one here will think me sacrilegious when I say that at time I feel that the Civil War was America's Gethsemane and Calvary. Of course there were hotheads on both sides of this conflict but many good people, both in the North and the South, wanted to avoid bloodshed and earnestly prayed that this cup of woe, if it be God's will, might be taken from them. Yet, if it were necessary to abolish a great evil, and particularly if it were necessary to preserve the Nation and save the Union, they were willing to go through the tortures of war, the agony of the cross, to achieve these goals.

Anyway, the war came with its thrilling and saddening story of heroism and meanness, of wisdom and folly, where the best and the basest in men were born. Through the fiery furnace of the Civil War much of the dross in our national life was destroyed and on the hot anvil of armed conflict were forged the hard links in a chain of unity born through a common suffering and loss. All discord did not disappear with cease firing but through a shared sacrifice which both sides well understood, there came a sympathy and understanding never known before. Appomattox may have spelled the end of the Confederacy but it also gave birth to a new united and stronger Nation. After the Crucifixion came the Resurrection of a new purified, unified and glorified power. The greatest victory General Grant ever won was when he allowed Lee to retain his sword and his men to keep their horses. Never before or since has the vanquished been treated by the victor in so noble a manner.

So the Civil War that was begun rather gaily and lightly, which many thought would soon be over, was ended only after 4 long years of bloody struggle which had led more than 600,000 men through disillusionment, pain, and hardship, to death. The war did not divide this country because the country was already divided; in a strange, inexplicable and mysterious way the Civil War actually united the North and South through a great common sacrifice and tragic experience.

As we plan to commemorate the centenary of this war, it seems to me that our first task must be to communicate these lessons to all Americans. We must cast our commemoration in the same die that the war was cast. It must be a sober affair, one that will try to define the intensity and tragedy of that great war. We must fight those who would wish to clothe the Civil War in a gown of romance, because if this were to happen we would be prostituting and destroying one of this Nation's noblest experiences. We must try to recreate the emotion and in-

tensity that went into this effort and try to explain that the horror of war came because our country was unprepared to tackle the problems that confronted her squarely and honestly.

By following these rules I feel we can achieve a double purpose. First, we will be commemorating the Civil War in a way which will reflect judgment, sobriety, and determination of purpose. We will be doing much to destroy false notions about the war, and we will replace them with a conception that will give strength and dignity to the event as well as to the people of the Nation. No one can ask, no one will ask, more of us than this. And by achieving this first purpose we will necessarily achieve the second.

I mentioned earlier that we are facing today many of the problems that confronted this country at the outset of the Civil War. We face an implacable foe determined in purpose; and that purpose is our destruction—moral, economic, physical, and intellectual. In this struggle we have the strongest weapon of all and that is conviction. With conviction weak nations have wrecked mighty empires; without conviction great states have fallen.

America added conviction to her arsenal after she found unity from war. In binding together in the spirit of Appomattox, in founding an ever-stronger Nation, she proved to herself and to the world that, by God, under God, and with the help of God our American constitutional Republic is the finest form of government the world has yet seen. Of this we are convinced.

In our centennial, then, let us insure that all Americans learn how we gained this conviction; by doing so we shall be shoring the foundations of our country at a time when we need all the strength and unity we can muster. We have learned our lesson—and at what a price. Today America is "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

My friends, we have a great and noble task before us; a task that in many ways will help to strengthen this Nation in her purpose and perspective. Surely it is worthy of our most profound effort. God help you and me to preserve America because America is God's best chance to save the world.

The Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks I include an advertisement in the Cotton Trade Journal of April 8, 1960, entitled "The Explosion." This article is signed by my lifelong, fabulous friend, the one and only Donald Comer, whose father was the Governor of the great State of Alabama, and who also served in the U.S. Senate. Donald Comer also has another great and good and brilliant brother, Hugh Comer. Every word Donald Comer says in this great article in my judgment is more than true.

In 1957 we imported over 4 million yards of cloth to put our mills out of business. In 1958, just a year later, Mr. Comer states that we imported over 8½ million yards, and in 1959, 82½ million yards. These figures, as I understand, came from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Please note what one of our largest newspapers has to say, the Birmingham News, of Birmingham, Ala., of February 25, 1960. Also please note what the Underwear Institute of February 24, 1960, has to say. Please note what the Cotton Trade Journal of February 26, 1960, said where they quoted what that great leader, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, had to say on this subject. Mr. Charles A. Cannon of the Cannon Mills is quoted by the Southern Textile News of November 7, 1959, as saying:

It's plain murder. Foreign products can take your jobs, and that is too high a price to pay for cheap goods.

I know we all agree with Mr. Cannon. Something has to be done not only to protect our way of life, but to protect our industries not only in the textile business, but in every business we have. There is absolutely no way to compete with the prices they are paying labor in Tokyo. My committee and I held hearings there just before last Christmas. I was amazed to find that Tokyo is the largest city in the world—larger than New York City or London. I talked to many people there. The women, so I was told in the presence of many other people, were getting 50 cents a day, and started to work at daybreak and worked until dark. It is the same in Hong Kong, Formosa, Pakistan, and India.

This article, entitled "The Explosion," speaks for itself, and I think we have already had the explosion, but there is still time to protect our industry and the thousands upon thousands of men and women working in these mills, not only in our beloved State of Alabama, but in practically every State in this Nation.

The advertisement follows:

The explosion of textile imports can destroy the vital U.S. textile industry just as surely as can the explosion of an intercontinental ballistic missile. Cotton cloth imported from Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, Formosa, and Korea is threatening to destroy the great American textile industry—and the rate of acceleration of textile imports is still rising.

In 1947, 4.1 million yards.
In 1958, 8.6 million yards.
In 1959, 82.5 million yards.
(Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.)

NATIONAL COMMENT

Memphis Press-Scimitar, April 1, 1960:

"WASHINGTON.—Representative E. C. GATHINGS has asked the U.S. Tariff Commission to help him fight increasing cotton product imports which, he says, are driving domestic cotton farmers in the Memphis area out of business. 'A whole area of new countries has entered our markets. With the lower cost cotton available to their mills and with their cheap labor, it is not possible for our domestic industry to compete with them,' Representative GATHINGS said."

Southern Textile News, January 30, 1960: "Over 115 million square yards of gray goods alone came into this country from foreign mills during 1959, compared to 50 million yards during 1958."

The Corset and Brassiere Association of America, February 24, 1960: "In 1957, exportation of brassieres from Hong Kong to the United States began. The volume reached approximately 540,000 in 1958, about 1,400,000 dozen in 1959. Over this period, exports from the Philippines have risen to more than 600,000 dozen."

New York Mirror, January 22, 1960, Victor Riesel:

"JAPANESE INVASION HITS GARMENT FIRMS

"ROCHESTER, N.Y.—President Eisenhower's Cabinet has been concerned over another invasion of the United States—by Japanese beautifully hand-tailored men's suits, Hong Kong men's shirts, women's blouses, pajamas for old and young and ladies' unmentionables. This invasion is costing our garment manufacturers well over $200 million a year—and our needleworkers tens of thousands of jobs."

Birmingham News, February 25, 1960: "In Alabama it is essential that concern about such (textile) imports is emphasized—it means bread and butter on many a cotton mill worker's table."

Underwear Institute, February 24, 1960: "Imports from Hong Kong of knit underwear, nightwear, and knit shirts in 1959 were 223 percent greater than in 1958."

Daily News Record, February 18, 1960: "Census Bureau figures through last November show that between 1958 and 1959 imports of cotton cloth increased by 70 percent from all countries."

Daily News Record, March 15, 1960:

"WARNS OF STRANGULATION FROM UNLIMITED IMPORTS

"CHARLOTTE, N.C.—An official of the Nation's largest textile organiaztion warned Monday that the domestic industry 'is in danger of strangulation from foreign imports if they are permitted to come into this country in unlimited quantities.' "

The Cotton Trade Journal, February 26, 1960: "Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, said he believed Congress would be derelict in its responsibility to the American people 'if we do not compel the State Department and other agencies of Government to take some action to assure the survival of what is left of our textile industry.'

"Senator JOHN PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, warned that if this Nation does not become more realistic in its trade policies the domestic textile industry cannot survive."

Associated Press report, New York: "Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, has prepared a second revision of his bill to protect American industries from low-wage import competition. This is part of the fight against excessive imports of textile fabrics and apparel."

American Textile Reporter, January 28, 1960: "In 1958, imports of shirts from Japan and Hong Kong had amounted to 2 million dozen. In the United States, an average plant producing 1,000 dozen shirts per week (50,000 dozen per year) employs 150 persons. Imports from Japan and Hong Kong, therefore, represented the production of 40 average American plants employing 6,000 persons.

"Total imports of cotton dress and sport shirts from Japan and Hong Kong in 1959 had been running 10 percent of U.S. domestic production of those items, and over, undermining American standards of living and damaging responsible American manufacturers."

The Thread Institute, Inc., February 19, 1960: "We are vitally interested in this entire import problem, particularly in connection with the flood of apparel and other textile imports in which thread is used. To the extent that these finished articles displace domestic production, thread consumption in the same proportion would be curtailed and American jobs jeopardized."

Southern Textile News, November 7, 1959: "Just plain murder. That is why we were glad to see Charles A. Cannon, of Cannon Mills, give some straight talk on this subject. He said, 'It's plain murder. Foreign products can take your jobs, and that is too high a price to pay for "cheap" goods.' "

The New York Times, February 18, 1960: "The textile and apparel industries in this country are in grave danger because of a flood of foreign imports, their leaders warned yesterday. Meeting here to discuss the cost of helping to free world trade, representatives of a score of associations in the field joined to urge speedy adoption of high import barriers and extra duty payments on imported goods.

"They said that such merchandise enjoyed an unfair competitive advantage because of substandard labor practices. The industrialists agreed that strong action must be taken to preserve the domestic industry."

DONALD COMER,
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Avondale Mills.

Diplomatic Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during the next 8 or 10 weeks several important diplomatic conferences will be held. The world is entering a fateful period, and what happens at these high-level talks between world leaders could well determine the course of history during our lifetime.

Recently Premier Khrushchev, of Russia, ended a visit to France. Prime Minister Macmillan, of England, made a hurried trip to Washington to confer with President Eisenhower. President De Gaulle, of France, is scheduled to visit the United States soon. And in May, the summit conference, bringing together the heads of state from the world's major powers, will be held.

There is a feeling of cautious optimism in Washington. Perhaps, after almost 15 years of intense cold war during which the world has lived on the brink of atomic war, a break is in sight and a tentative beginning can be made toward reaching a new understanding.

No one here expects all of the many serious world problems to be solved overnight. Nor can we look forward to the Russians discarding their expansionist policies for one of sweet reasonableness.

But at least there are indications that Russia wants to reach an accommodation and to ease some of the tension. They have made the overtures. The United States and its allies must explore the possibilities.

Certainly it does no harm to talk with the Russians provided we are not taken in by the Russians and allow our defensive strength to deteriorate. It is possible the Russians are aware of the fact that the hydrogen bomb and fantastic new delivery systems built around long-range missiles have made it entirely too dangerous to substitute bluster and bluff for serious diplomatic negotiations. The consequences of touching off a war through a miscalculation of American intentions are too horrible to contemplate.

At present, the United States and its allies are talking with the Russians about a suspension of nuclear weapons testing. Both sides have made concessions and according to the President there is a fair chance of reaching an agreement backed up by a sound, self-enforcing inspection system.

Such an agreement would be a long first step toward disarmament. Negotiations are also underway looking toward a disarmament agreement but the progress here has been slight to say the least.

I am sure everyone would like to see a workable plan agreed upon to enable the nations of the world to put an end to the arms race. The world is spending hundreds of billions each year on arms. As long as the Russians remain a serious threat to world peace, we have no other choice.

We would rather devote the money we are forced to spend on arms to more useful purposes. And I am sure the people would solidly support disarmament if we could be assured it would be accepted universally and that it would be enforced.

Until such a plan can be agreed upon and put into effect, we will have to continue our defense program, regardless of cost. We cannot let up. If we relax for one minute the Russians could well take advantage of the opportunity and launch a surprise attack.

We can remain strong and yet let Russia and the rest of the world know that we are ready at all times to reach an understanding through diplomatic channels.

That is why I am glad to see President Eisenhower agree to talk with Mr. Khrushchev at the summit and to visit Russia later on. We have to persist in our efforts to find a peaceful solution to the world's problems. We can talk with the Russians without appeasing them or permitting our strength to wither away.

Statement of American Federation of Technical Engineers Regarding Settlement of Bethlehem Shipyard Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the letter received from Russell M. Stephens, president, American Federation of Technical Engineers, in Washington, D.C.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1960.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts toward the settlement of the east coast Bethlehem Shipyard strike by being signatory to the resolution submitted to the President of the United States, calling upon him to establish a factfinding board for the purpose of seeking solution of the dispute.

While I have not seen the President's official reply to your resolution, it has been reported in the press that he will not intercede in this controversy except upon the direct request of the parties which must reach an agreement. It has further been reported that should the parties jointly request that the President designate a factfinding board to assist him he would give serious consideration to such a request.

On behalf of my organization, the American Federation of Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, representing 850 striking draftsmen at the Fore River Shipyard, Quincy, Mass., I have dispatched the following telegrams to the President:

"Mr. David W. Kendall in his announcement of your decision to take no action upon the petition of 106 Members of Congress to establish a Presidential Factfinding Board in an attempt to aid in settlement of the Bethlehem Shipyard labor dispute, inferred that there is a possibility of your intercession upon the direct request of the disputing parties.

"The American Federation of Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, representing 850 striking draftsmen at the Bethlehem Fore River Shipyard, Quincy, Mass., hereby makes such direct request upon the basis as outlined in the above mentioned petition.

"By copy of this telegram, Bethlehem management is urged to join with us in requesting your good offices in an attempt to expedite an honorable settlement."

Knowing of your sincere wishes to be of assistance in settling this dispute I respectfully request your assistance in urging the Bethlehem Steel Co., Shipbuilding Division, to join us in our request to the President for the establishment of a Factfinding Board as outlined in your resolution.

Thank you for this and past favors.

Sincerely yours,
RUSSELL M. STEPHENS,
President.

Import Duties on Certain Coarse Wool

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9322, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, would make permanent the existing suspension of import duties on certain coarse wools used in the manufacture of carpets, papermakers' felts and certain other products.

The Committee on Ways and Means held public hearings on this bill and, as amended, the bill enjoys the support of all segments of the wool industry including the carpet industry, the papermakers' felt industry, the wool growers and the wool trade.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of this bill.

As I have indicated, there is presently in effect a suspension of duties on certain coarse wools imported under bond for use in the manufacture of rugs and carpets. This suspension was provided in Public Law 418 of the 85th Congress and continues until June 30 of this year.

The rug and carpet industry has traditionally enjoyed the privilege of duty-free importation of the coarse wools necessary in the manufacture of carpets. Because of the change in competitive conditions in the world market and the declining availability of certain types of coarse wools, the Congress broadened somewhat the types of coarse wools eligible for duty-free importation by the carpet industry in enacting Public Law 418 of the 85th Congress.

When the Committee on Finance of the Senate reported favorably the legislation that subsequently became Public Law 418, it also called on the U.S. Tariff Commission to make a thorough study of this whole subject. The amendments adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means to H.R. 9322 reflect certain considerations brought to the attention of your committee by the report of the U.S. Tariff Commission as well as by representatives of the domestic industry that appeared at the public hearings which the committee held.

The committee adopted two amendments to the bill. First, it extended the duty-free importation privilege with respect to the coarse wools under consideration to the papermakers' felt industry. Thus, any competitive disadvantage that the papermakers' felt industry might face in competing with the rug industry for the supply of coarse wools available in the world market, would be removed.

Secondly, the committee removed a limitation in existing law which has prevented the Secretary of Agriculture from developing and promulgating new and improved standards for the grading of imported wools. This amendment was supported by the Department of Agriculture and by the domestic wool-growing industry.

Thus, as reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 9322 has the support of all segments of our domestic wool industry.

I urge enactment of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Naturally I am suspicious of any proposal to take articles off the dutiable list. May I ask the gentleman if representatives of the Wool Growers Association testified before the committee?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; they did. They appeared in the hearings. The gentleman understands the wool industry has been concerned about the inability of the Secretary of Agriculture to have authority to promulgate these new methods of classifying wool. In the interest of taking care of their problems, the committee adopted this second amendment to which I have already referred. The wool growing industry is very anxious to have that particular provision enacted into law.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman advise the Members of the House if there is any of this coarse grade of wool produced in this country?

Mr. MILLS. The carpet industry has always had to obtain its coarse wool from the world market. As I pointed out, the industry has always been able to do that duty free. There is very little if any of this type of wool grown in the United States, so that this action would not, in the opinion of those who testified before the committee, pose any threat whatsoever to the wool growing industry here in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that my State of West Virginia is building up its wool industry. We are anxious to know whether this is going to be beneficial or injurious to our efforts in the State. Apparently there is no danger in this legislation in that connection.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think there is anything adverse to that industry in the gentleman's State in this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It should be noted that one of the primary objectives of the legislation is to make raw materials not available in the United States available to our domestic manufacturers so as to improve the competitive position of domestic products of the United States in world markets. This legislation represents an endeavor to do something to put our producers in a better competitive position.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman's point is well taken. It is one of the very important reasons for the adoption of the bill.

To Abolish Capital Punishment, H.R. 870

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 870, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following compilation which has been forwarded to me by Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins, of Westport, Conn.:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

1. WHAT ARE OUR CHURCHES SAYING?

United Presbyterian: "Condemns the death penalty as tending to brutalize the society that condones it, and in 1959 went on record accordingly."

Protestant Episcopal resolved that "the taking of human life is the province of God and not within the rights of man."

Union of American-Hebrew Congregations resolved, "There is no crime for which the taking of human life by society is justified."

United Lutheran Church is now making a study of this question.

Roman Catholic Church: "You ask me the stand of the church on capital punishment. Well, the following extracts from Mr. J. D. Conway's excellent article on the subject in the Catholic Digest of May 1959 in answer to this question are worth remembering:

" 'Is capital punishment licit in our modern advanced society? Do we need it to protect us from crime? Is it effective as a deterrent to the criminal? Should it be abolished?

" 'The question is raised by some shocking crime. Our calm reason is perturbed by vivid pictures of life and death, of violence and vengeance, of justice or atrocity. We discuss the subject with our instincts and sentiments rather than with good sense.

" 'In answering your question, I would like to propose the thesis that the church is naturally inclined, by history, doctrine, spirit, and example to favor abolition of the death penalty in our modern society.

" 'The church's history should give her little sympathy with the death penalty. Our Divine Founder was the victim of an execution which was expeditious, arbitrary, and unjust. His death brought great benefits to us, but no Christian would want to be identified, even remotely, with Pontius Pilate. When we inflict the death penalty we are cast vaguely in his role.

" 'A few years ago the discussion of this subject became intense when a reprieve from the Governor of California arrived at the prison 2 minutes late. Those 2 minutes meant eternity for the victim in the gas chamber.

" 'Her divine master advocated only one kind of severity: rigorous control of self. His message was always one of forgiveness. He brought people back to life on various occasions, but He never put anyone to death or recommended that anyone be executed.

" 'And it is worthy of note that those States which have discarded the death penalty have lower rates of capital crimes than similar States which retain the penalty.

" 'The same can be said for the 30 nations of the world which have abolished this penalty; nearly all of them report decreases in crime. It is significant that the only great nation to restore it is the U.S.S.R. Russian leaders boasted loudly of their advanced social thinking when they discarded capital punishment in 1947.

" 'The church has never exacted the death penalty by her own authority.

" 'The United States hangs on to this traditional punishment more tenaciously than any other advanced nation.' "

2. WHAT ARE OTHER PEOPLE SAYING?

Lewis E. Lawes, warden of Sing Sing: "A poll of wardens show that 90 percent thought capital punishment should be abolished."

Charles Dickens wrote: "Not all their united efforts pursued through all our united lives could persuade me that * * * executions are a Christian law."

Thackeray said: "I came away from Snow Hill that morning with a disgust for murder, but it was for the murder I saw done. * * * I pray to Almighty God to cause this disgraceful sin to pass from among us, and to cleanse our land of blood."

F. L. Hoffman, LL.D., Prudential Life Insurance Co., said: "No evidence can be produced to show that capital punishment acts as a deterrent, or hindance to even the worst of murder records conceivable. The death penalty, rather to the contrary, acts as a deterrent to swift and adequate justice; imposes heavy burdens upon taxpayers as the result of long trials, fosters sensationalism of the worst possible type, and stains the civilization of those who enforce it."

British Parliamentary Select Committee, 1929–1930: "Our prolonged examination of the situation in foreign countries has increasingly confirmed us in the assurance that capital punishment may be abolished in this country without endangering life or property or impairing the security of society."

The American Political and Social Science "Annals" states: "The presence or absence of the death penalty makes no particular difference in the amount of murder * * * the death penalty is inconsequential as a deterrent."

The Royal Commission (of England) studied this question in 1949–1953, and reported: "The general conclusion which we have reached is that there is no clear evidence in any of the figures we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has

led to an increase in homicide rate, or that its reintroduction has led to a fall."

3. WHAT ARE THE UNDISPUTED FACTS?

(a) That in the States wherein capital punishment has been abolished the homicide record for each 100,000 persons has run from sixth-tenths of 1 percent to 2.5 percent, whereas in the States where it still exists it has run from 5 percent to 11.8 percent; and

(b) That during 1956–58 there were 21,324 municipal murders of which only 1,362, or 6.31 percent, have occurred in the abolition States (a decrease of 11.65 percent), while in the States retaining capital punishment there has been 19,962, or 93.66 percent (an increase of 19 percent).

Water—Our Most Important Natural Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation held recently in Dallas, Tex., one of the most timely papers was presented by James T. McBroom, Chief, Branch of River Basin Studies, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. McBroom is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on the use of our water supply, both as a natural resource and as a means of outdoor recreation.

The reception of Mr. McBroom's statement met with such great acclaim by the delegates to the convention that I want to commend it for the reading of my fellow conservationists and sportsmen.

The statement follows:

PRESERVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL VALUES IN THE FACE OF OTHER DEMANDS FOR WATER

(By James T. McBroom, Chief, Branch of River Basin Studies, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., at the Annual Meeting of the National Wildlife Federation, Dallas, Tex., March 5, 1960)

Water is our most important natural resource.

We often hear this statement, and it very likely is true.

But is it—really?

How about the human resources of the Nation? It may be said that human resources are not natural resources in the usual sense of the word. But few will deny that the welfare of the Nation depends most of all upon human resources of the body, the mind, and the spirit.

I submit that any program for the use of water or any other material natural resource is seriously deficient if it does not adequately serve these vital human resources. Unfortunately, most of us take water for granted, as if it were air. We assume that there will always, somehow, be plenty of it around. As we are rapidly beginning to realize, this may be an unhappy delusion. It is dawning upon us to our dismay, that water is not as limitless as air—that it is available only in a fixed and limited quantity—that its quality in terms of fitness for human uses is the concern of everyone.

The United States has always been proud of her capacity for growth and development. With our enterprise and with our storehouse of natural resources, we have seen ahead nothing to limit how far we could go as a nation. So if we run short on any product of the soil, the forest, or the mine, we'll import it or develop new methods or substitutes and keep right on going as the most powerful and richest Nation on earth.

But what'll we do if we run short of water? We can't very well import it. We have made much progress in learning how to manufacture it from the oceans. However, the extent to which it may supplement natural water supplies very far inland is problematical. Inland brackish waters are another possible source.

Nevertheless, it is a pretty sobering question we have to ponder as to whether we shall bump our heads on the ceiling of our water supply in our growth and development as a Nation. If and when we do, we can grow no more. Will we run short on water first, before we run out of enough food, minerals, and forest products? Think about that one.

Nobody needs to get alarmed about this—at least, not yet. We are told that we are not short of water. There is still plenty of it for the country as a whole. Our water problem is simply that there is not enough in the needed place at the needed time and the needed quality, which can be made available at the needed price. Even so these problems are serious at the affected places and the affected times. Witness the restrictions we have seen in cities where cars have gone dirty and lawns have gone to destruction for lack of water. Witness also the acres of farmland which have reverted to desert, because water got too scarce, too expensive, or too impure.

One of the sobering facts, of course, is that water demand is growing at a rate of about three times the rate of population increase even though our population, like that of the rest of the world, is exploding. But here again there is no cause for immediate alarm. A good part of this demand is for nonconsumptive use; that is, the water performs its service and is returned to its stream or river with little loss of quantity. But here the problem is quality. Many nonconsumptive uses may fundamentally change the physical and chemical characteristics of the water. Here we could witness the plight of 12 cities on the Neosho River in Kansas. According to Russell G. Lynch, in his excellent booklet on "Our Growing Water Problems" written for the National Wildlife Federation and published last year, these 12 cities all take water from the river. Lynch reports that at times in the 1953–54 drought, the entire intake from the river to each city's waterworks was no more than the sewage discharged by the city next above.

In view of these difficulties, it is not surprising that water has long been a No. 1 problem child in the natural resources management of the Nation. Recently, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources listed and summarized the commissions and committees which have been organized to deal in whole or part with the National water problems. It is an amazing list.

It all began when, under the influence of George Washington, commissioners were appointed to consider plans for improved navigation on the Potomac River. That river must be the holder of some kind of record because it is still being studied, and some of our neighbors around Washington, D.C. call it now the most undeveloped major river system in the United States.

Then, beginning in 1808, Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin undertook the preparation of his report on roads and canals, which is said to have ushered in the waterway policy of the United States.

In just this century there have been no less than 21 commissions, boards, subcommittees and similar groups which have been concerned in one way or another, in whole or in part, with solving the Nation's water problem. Incidentally, not until the report of the Senate Select Committee on Investigation of Executive Agencies of the Government in 1937 is there any mention of fish and wildlife in relation to the water problem in the summary prepared by the present select committee.

It may be well at this point to take a brief overall look at the nature of our water supply. For this purpose we can refer to the information provided to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources by Dr. Luna Leopold, Chief Hydraulic Engineer of the Geological Survey, and the son of the famous Aldo Leopold, the revered father of modern wildlife management.

As we all know, our water supply comes from rain and snow. According to Leopold, "If the total quantity that falls on the United States within an average year were spread evenly over the country, it would stand 30 inches deep." About 21 inches returns to the atmosphere through evaporation and transpiration. The other 9 inches draining from the land surface and seeping into the ground constitutes the useable supply. From it, we now withdraw about 3 inches, says Leopold, of which 2 inches returns back to the stream network. Of the 3 inches of water withdrawn for use, 80 percent is from lakes and streams, and the remaining 20 percent is from wells.

Forty-six percent of our total water demand is for irrigation; a similar percentage is utilized by industry; and public uses like cities and towns take the remaining 8 percent. Irrigation accounts for 80 to 90 percent of all water consumed. At the present time, the Nation is using about 270 billion gallons per day. By 1980, we will be using more than twice as much—or almost 600 billion gallons. Most of the increase will be for industrial purposes in the eastern part of the Nation.

In some parts of the country water is being mined by pumping it from the ground at a far faster rate than it is being replenished. We are told that, in 1958, ground water was removed from a 25,000 square-mile area in the high plains of Texas here and in New Mexico 140 times faster than it was being replenished.

It will be clear, however, that despite localized water shortages in time and place, the Nation is not about to run out of water. But we do have a water problem—or rather, several of them—that is getting more and more serious as time goes by. And we are doing something about solving the problem aside from organizing commissions and committees to deal with it. Most important, we are developing our river systems through the construction of dams, reservoirs, canals, and other control works. We are also engaged in a large program of water quality improvement.

The water resources program of the Federal Government is a very large one. The budget for fiscal year 1961, for example, calls for an appropriation to the Corps of Engineers alone of $936.4 million for civil works; to the Bureau of Reclamation of $313.9 million; and to the Department of Agriculture of $42.8 million for its watershed program. Added to these sums are many millions of dollars which will be expended at the same time by licensees of the Federal Power Commission, local groups that cooperate with the Department of Agriculture in the small watershed program, and others.

Everywhere, at an ever-faster rate, men and machines are busily engaged in either (1) changing the characteristics of rivers, lakes, bays, and estuaries from those provided by nature or (2) changing the undesirable characteristics of these water

bodies caused by man back toward the way nature made them.

In January of 1954, there were 1,300 reservoirs of 5,000 acre-feet or more in the Nation, with a total capacity of 278 million acre-feet and a total surface area of 11 million acres. By 1969, there will be several hundred more reservoirs with a total additional area of 4 million to 7 million acres.

Now let us get down to how outdoor recreation values, specifically those related to fish and wildlife conservation, fit into the picture of these pressing water problems and the tremendous water resources program which is underway to cope with them.

As the scramble for water grows keener, and the water resources program grows larger, the job of preserving a place for fish and wildlife in cutting up the water resources pie grows evermore difficult and complicated.

The members of the National Wildlife Federation along with hundreds of thousands of other citizens are convinced that fish and wildlife are living natural resources of great value to the Nation. Like other living things, fish and wildlife must have adequate, suitable water. The demands of our growing population and economy for water in industry and agriculture and for municipal purposes threaten to take away the water living-space of fish and game. They must have a share of the Nation's water if they are to survive. Much is at stake in that survival.

We measure progress, in our fast-moving civilization, in terms of growth of our cities and towns, expansion of industrial output, new housing starts, high birthrate, and increases in gross national product. We are a prosperous, bustling Nation. At the same time, we are shocked by the physical and emotional breakdown of men and women in their prime, resulting from the stress of modern-day living. Adequate opportunities for fishing and hunting and related forms of outdoor recreation are the finest antidotes for stress. Fish and wildlife conservation equates very closely with the conservation of human resources, as we have said—the most important of all.

The people of the Nation realize that. The recreational demand for fish and the wildlife is spiralling upward at a tremendous rate. A recent issue of Life magazine devoted to recreation and use of leisure time aptly described the demand for water-based recreation as a kind of "aquamania."

It was brought out that expenditures by Americans for leisure-type activities has now reached an amazing $40 billion a year, or more than 8 per cent of the gross national product. Much of this is based on the availability of water resources for recreation, which, in turn, depends in large part on opportunities for fishing and, to a lesser degree, hunting. According to Life magazine, the recreational boating business was a $2 billion industry in 1959. It has grown to this size from a level of less than a third of that amount in 1951. According to statistics published by the Outdoor Boating Club, the principal trade association of the boating industry, somewhat more than half of the reasons given for boat purchases is that the new owners eventually use their craft for fishing. Thus, each activity is stimulated by the other.

In 1955, there were 25 million fishermen and hunters over the age of 11, who spent $3 billion in pursuit of their sports; they traveled 10.4 billion miles in their automobiles. The importance of fishing to the economy of a State is suggested by the fact that, according to Life, Florida's deep sea fishing industry, including sport fishing, is nearly as large as her citrus and cattle industries combined. As much money, it is said, is spent on dogs as is spent on legal services by the people of the Nation.

The numbers of fishermen and hunters in the Nation are increasing at a rate far faster than the popultion. Between 1948 and 1958, population increased by 18.7 percent. During the same period, the sales of fishing licenses increased by 43.3 percent, and those of hunting licenses by 29.6 percent.

The basic problem for those who contend for a place for fish and wildlife in dividing up the water and related land resources is a difficult and compounding one. It is this: the demand for adequate opportunities to enjoy fish and wildlife rsources is growing at a rate far faster than the population increase itself. At the very same time, the natural water and related land habitat for fish and game is being destroyed or altered at an increasingly rapid rate to serve the needs of an expanding population and economy.

As the adverse demands of civilization have marched farther and farther into the natural domain of fish and wildlife, much has been accomplished for their conservation by the Federal and State agencies who are charged with this responsibility. Federal and State hatcheries supply nearly 15 million pounds of fish and annually for stocking of lakes and streams. The National Wildlife Refuge system comprises a total of nearly 18 million acres devoted primarily to the conservation and welfare of wildlife. Other millions of acres devoted to same purposes are contained in State refuges and other wildlife management areas.

However, these installations, important though they are, cannot maintain the fish and wildlife resources of the Nation by themselves. It is not possible or feasible to assign the entire responsibility for fish and wildlife conservation of this Nation to the refuges, the fish hatcheries, and the wildlife management areas of the State and Federal Government and then forget about it, assuming that it has been adequately taken care of. These facilities can represent, at best, only the nuclei for the fish and wildlife conservation needs of the Nation.

What is needed—and what is a must—in order to maintain fish and wildlife in the national way of life and economy is for the Congress, the State legislatures, and the agencies and organizations of the country who deal in land and water resources programs, to give genuine recognition to the needs of fish and wildlife in the planning and construction of facilities and projects.

Project units in the water resources program cannot and should not be built on the basis of plans designed to serve the interests of navigation, irrigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power in the most effective, efficient, and least costly manner for those purposes alone. It may be necessary to forgo the ideal development for these purposes in order to develop all of the water and related land resources of the Nation so that the project may be somewhat less efficient and a little more costly from the standpoint of navigation, irrigation, flood control, and power. This may be necessary to order to preserve and enhance the living natural resources and their associated recreational and commercial values. These can no longer be dismissed or brushed aside with only token consideration in the name of progress.

It must also be recognized that fish and wildlife conservation in water resources development cannot be accomplished free or even cheaply. Substantial sums, though moderate in comparison to other project costs, must be devoted to means and measures to conserve and develop fish and wildlife resources in water-control projects.

There is one strong point of view in this Nation that those who would develop our rivers for economic uses by man, such as irrigation, navigation, hydroelectric power, and flood control, have some kind of special right to the Nation's waters. To some who hold this point of view, water tumbling down its natural channel is sinfully going to waste. Those who like to keep rivers as Nature made them are usually branded by these people as reactionaries who want to lock up our natural resources. Any suggestion that the project developer spend project funds to develop and conserve a stream's fish and wildlife resources for the benefit of outdoor recreation many times meets with a reaction ranging from mild shock to outrage.

This attitude will have to be changed if fish and wildlife resources as we know them are to be conserved in connection with water resources development. It will have to be replaced by full and free acceptance of the idea that fish and wildlife values may be as important as irrigation or hydroelectric power and that the costs of providing for the protection of these resources is just as much and just as appropriately a part of project costs as those for turbines and generators. In a few cases, indeed, there must be acceptance of the idea that a river, as Nature made it, contributes most to public welfare in its natural state—that it should be left that way because damming it or diverting it would create less public benefits than they would destroy. What we need to strive for is optimum water resource development, rather than maximum water resource development.

A recent example in Arkansas illustrates the point. It is the case of the Greers Ferry Dam, now under construction on the Little Red River to provide for hydroelectric power and flood control. The Fish and Wildlife Service, cooperating with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, completed a report in 1957, long before construction of the project was undertaken. In this report, it was forecast that the reservoir behind the dam would significantly increase fishing opportunities over the stretch of river it would flood out. But it also noted the substantial value of the warm-water fisheries in the 79 miles of stream below the dam. It was recommended that multiple-level outlets be installed in the dam in order that this warm-water fishery could be preserved. The dam, as planned, will have low-level outlets which will discharge cold water into the stream, and it is expected that this will destroy the existing warm-water fishery. At the same time, neither the water nor the stream will have conditions suitable for a trout fishery except on an expensive put-and-take basis. It is not expected that the stream can maintain itself as a trout fishery.

This recommendation for multiple-level outlets met with resistance because of its cost. That cost was estimated at $600,000, and this seemed to the construction agency to be much too high, even in view of its relation to the total estimated project cost of $50 million. Despite strong representation at high levels, the project is being built as planned, without provision for the downstream fishery. In citing this example, I do not wish to appear critical of any agency or person. I merely use it to demonstrate the evidence of a prevalent attitude of those in control of our water resources program that fish and wildlife conservation is a fine thing as long as it costs little or nothing. As I have said, we have somehow got to get accepted the proposition that such costs are a legitimate and appropriate part of overall water resources costs.

This brings me to my final point. It is how conservation is brought about, whether it is in connection with the water resources program or otherwise. Nearly everyone is in favor of conservation. It is one of those nice, comfortable concepts, like home and mother that no one can be opposed to. Then why is it that conservation accomplishments usually involve such a struggle? Why do organizations like the National Wildlife Federation have to battle so hard for conservation victories?

To begin with, conservation is public business, generally carried on by public agencies of the Federal or State Government. In saying this, we don't overlook or underrate the excellent conservation accomplishments of many forward-looking private industries, although, taken together, these are on a far narrower scale than the conservation programs of the State and Federal public agencies.

Ours is a Government of law, not of men. This means that the most imaginative and efficient administrator of a State or Federal conservation agency may do only what he is authorized to do, and no more. Even though it is clearly apparent to him that a certain course of action should be taken to accomplish conservation results, he may not follow that course of action unless he is authorized to do so by his legislature or by the Congress.

This, then, means that conservation legislation is the key to conservation as a whole. Without effective conservation legislation, the administrator is shackled and hobbled in carrying out his program.

Here's another fact: conservation means some sacrifice or relinquishment of privilege on the part of interests who make use of natural resources. These interests, acting from very human motivations, are naturally reluctant to make these sacrifices or give up these privileges. In the democratic way, they make their influence felt in the Nation's legislative halls. This is one reason why conservation legislation is not easy to come by, and why conservation is such a battle.

In any event, legislation is essential to conservation. Without legislation, conservation can only be an exercise in the creation of slogans and catch phrases, and the raising of banners and armies to joust with windmills. All of us in the conservation field might just as well face up to that fact of life, despite the problems it may create.

One of the fundamentals in our Nation is that water is public property. The right to use it is derived from a government, mostly the State government. The manner in which water is divided and developed is controlled by law, whether that law be a State water code, or an act authorizing the construction and development of a huge project by the Federal Government. How those laws are written will determine, in the final analysis, whether water development needs for flood control, hydroelectric power, and agriculture can be met without sacrificing outdoor recreation values.

Interest Rate Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, Friday, April 8, 1960, entitled "The 25-Year 4¼s."

The editorial follows:

THE 25-YEAR 4¼S

The Treasury has included in its program of new financing an issue of long-term bonds, the first of its kind to be undertaken in almost a year. The new offering will carry a coupon rate of 4¼ percent and will mature 25 years hence.

Reading this announcement some persons may have asked themselves: "What about all this controversy between the administration and the Congress over the interest ceiling of 4¼ percent on new issues with maturities of 5 years and longer, which, we have been told, has effectively debarred the Treasury from the long-term market now for close to a year? Was that a fact?"

The interest-rate ceiling is no less a fact in April than it was in January, or, let us say, in June 1959. What has happened is that the market's views on security prices and yields, which are always in a state of change, have undergone an exceptionally sweeping change within the past 2 months. This has been conspicuously the case with respect to the changes that have taken place between yields on interest-bearing securities on the one hand and equity securities on the other.

Anticipating the business recovery of 1958 and stimulated by fears of inflation and momentary doubts concerning the U.S. dollar, the investment-speculative community launched a veritable stampede into equity securities early in that year, which was to produce in its advanced stages an "inverse spread" between the market yields on common stocks and interest-bearing securities of almost unparalleled dimensions and duration. During the greater part of 1960 we have witnessed much evidence that this situation was reversing itself and that the traditional pattern (in which interest-bearing securities normally sell at yields substantially below those of common stocks) was being restored. This tendency has been marked by both rising yields on equities and declining yields on bonds.

The impression seems to have gained considerable support from these changes in bond yield evaluations that the yield patterns of 1958–59 are now a thing of the past; that the Treasury is at last free to issue long-term securities regardless of rate, that the issue of the bond-rate ceiling is now dead. Such conclusions might prove eventually, though not necessarily permanently, justified by events. It is highly premature to say more than that at the present time.

Forand Followup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 10, 1960, I included in my extension of remarks an editorial from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press opposing the Forand bill. As a followup, I now include an editorial from the Binghamton Press of April 9, 1960, which is self-explanatory. Also included is an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 8, 1960.

The editorials follow:

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, Apr. 9, 1960]

ALTERNATIVE TO FORAND BILL NEEDED

Whether or not any final action is taken on the Forand bill at this session of Congress, medical care for the elderly is beginning to look like one of the major issues of the election campaign.

That is regrettable because the issue is real and it deserves a wiser and more intelligent approach than that of partisan politics pointed at luring votes.

Republicans, including Vice President NIXON, are reported trying to put together a health-insurance-for-elderly plan that will blunt the vote-appeal of the Democratic-sponsored Forand bill. A health insurance plan in the image of the Forand bill would prove a trap for Republicans, not an advantage.

An alternative to the Forand bill should omit its excessive costliness and actuarial unsoundness. It should omit the Forand bill's compulsion, its inequities, and its certainty of evolving socialized medicine. Even if health insurance for the elderly were to be part of the social security system, it could be associated with it to cover need that really exists and obviate the socialization and paternalism that the Forand bill portends.

What the elderly need is health insurance at fair and reasonable rates that can't be cut off by insurance companies in the beneficiaries' later years when they most need it. Group health insurance should be convertible to individual policies upon a worker's retirement.

Persons over 65 on average require 2½ times the medical care of persons under 65. Insurance rates need to be raised to a level where those under 65 help to meet costs of those over 65.

Or instead of a Forand bill, the Government could subsidize such private insurance, thus guaranteeing coverage at rates within the means of the beneficiaries. The overall need is not for a Government insurance structure that would bypass Blue Cross, Blue Shield and existing private insurance in general.

The Forand bill does not provide coverage for more than 4 million elderly persons outside of the social security system. The insurance structure it proposes would cost many times the current estimates. Linked with rising costs of social security, the costs would be so excessive that the solvency of social security itself could be undermined.

Medical care for the elderly poses problems calling for studied approaches beyond merely the demagogues' lure of votes built around the image of offering something for free. Americans in or approaching their latter years deserve something better than the illusion, the unsoundness, and the demogogic fraud of the so-called Forand bill.

And if the Republicans are enamored of the vote-getting potentialities of an insurance-for-the-elderly plan, they'd better forget it, or come up with an alternative that makes fiscal sense and is really aimed at the social problem rather than just at luring votes.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 8, 1960]

DIRECTING THE AID TO THE NEED

The Senate subcommittee on problems of the aged and aging early this year reported that, "The No. 1 problem of America's senior citizens is how to meet the costs of health care." Its hearings produced poignant testimony of the need for help in paying for medical care after retirement.

The subcommittee recommended a course that has since been endorsed by three candidates for nomination for President and has become the subject of an intensive campaign by organized labor: That the old-age and survivors insurance system under the Social Security Act be extended to provide medical service benefits for all persons eligible in that program.

This proposal, as typified in the Forand bill which has been defeated in the House Ways and Means Committee but may yet be pressed in the Senate, contemplates an addition of one-fourth of 1 percent to the

payroll taxes presently collected for OASI, which are scheduled to reach 9½ percent in 1969. Whether such an additional tax would finance the plan is problematical.

But several points are clear. One is that nearly 14 million beneficiaries and probably an additional 2 million surviving dependents would immediately become eligible for hospital and nursing home care under the bill. Another is that all the participants in the old-age insurance program, constituting approximately 9 out of every 10 Americans, would be taxed whether they wished it or not for what some describe as an entering wedge of compulsory socialized medicine.

And after all this, there would remain almost 2 million men and women who do not have the benefit of coverage under OASI but who are on old-age assistance or general relief in the various States. These people probably have the greatest need of aid in meeting their health bills but they would not be helped by the Forand bill. Others who are working beyond the age of 65 because they have to or choose to would presumably have to retire to qualify.

Meanwhile, in order to help those whose old-age benefits are not enough to cover doctor bills, the OASI aid would also be given out of the payroll tax to some beneficiaries who have independent resources or private pensions. This expensive blanket method is not the only way of achieving the purpose.

The administration, through Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is exploring possibilities of aiding the expansion of voluntary medical and hospital insurance in some way which would give the greatest assistance to those least able to pay and would avoid underwriting the bills of those with ample means. Eight Republican Senators have filed a bill to assist according to need in paying the premiums on voluntary insurance for the elderly.

One point should be kept clear in the controversy over medical care for the aged. The fact that certain groups oppose the shotgun methods of the Forand bill does not necessarily signify that they are against doing anything whatever for the ill and needy. It may signify that they believe there are more effective ways of channeling the aid where the need is greatest.

April Is USO Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this month has been designated as "USO Month." Most people have associated USO with parties and shows for our men in uniform. But to us who have had the privilege of serving in our armed forces it means more than that. It means a deep and abiding concern by our people on the homefront for those whom they have sent to the four corners of the world in our defense.

This organization, made up of voluntary groups, has immeasurably assisted in the religious, spiritual, social, recreational, and educational needs of our men and women in the armed forces. It has provided much needed services; community and travel information, counseling on personal and family problems, housing bureaus, discussion groups, craft classes, games, snack bars—to mention only a few.

Truly, it has provided our men and women in uniform "a home away from home."

Its services have tremendously boosted the morale of our men and women in uniform which, in turn, has placed them in combat readiness which is essential in moments of tension.

USO activities are not confined alone to our armed forces personnel here at home; it extends to such places overseas as Anchorage, Fairbanks, Kodiak, Balboa, Cristobal, Nice, Paris, Casablanca, Athens, Salonika, Rhodes, Istanbul, Naples, Rome, Seoul, Guam, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu.

Needless to say, the USO has, since its inception in 1941, done and is continuing to do immeasurable service to the Nation, particularly to armed forces personnel.

It is fitting, therefore, that on this occasion of USO Month all Americans give their unstinting support to a worthy cause being performed by these unsung heroes.

I earnestly hope for the USO more power and continued success.

Secretary Mitchell's Program To Upgrade American Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from yesterday's New York Times has reference to Secretary of Labor James Mitchell's proposal for the protection of farmworkers of America. I commend its reading to my colleagues:

PROTECTION FOR FARM LABOR

Secretary of Labor Mitchell deserves support in his efforts to improve the conditions of American farmworkers, especially of those migrants whose lot he has called "ultimately intolerable in a society wealthy enough to correct it." Two moves in this campaign, of which he spoke in an address last week, are evidence of progress being made—and promised.

In February 1959, Mr. Mitchell cited a minimum wage for farmworkers as an essential first step toward lasting economic improvement and said that the Labor Department would make a special study of the "desirability and feasibility" of taking that step. He now says that the findings, which will be released before the end of this month, will be strongly favorable and firmly buttressed by facts.

He also reported on his efforts to limit the mass importation of Mexican workers under Public Law 78—some 450,000 of them each year—which has a depressing effect on the wages and working conditions of American farm labor. This was the conclusion of a group of distinguished and impartial consultants whom he had appointed to study the situation. They have also made recommendations for the improvement of the Mexican farm labor program. These will be the basis for proposals by the Labor Department before the present law runs out in June 1961.

Meanwhile, Mr. Mitchell is waging a strong fight to block amendments to the law, backed by influential growers, which would weaken what protection is now given to American workers and would bog down the law's administration by a sharing of powers with the Department of Agriculture. Such amendments should not pass. Nor should any bill extending the law be approved that does not strengthen its safeguards of the wages and working conditions of our own farm labor. We await with interest and concern Mr. Mitchell's proposals as to how that should be done.

Foreign Service Institute Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify some of the confusion over the Foreign Service Institute training, I am inserting with my remarks three items:

First. The analysis of the vacancies in classrooms on the days the Appropriations Committee investigators made their reports.

Second. A comparative survey of cost estimates for language training at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington with those of other educational institutions.

Third. The "Report on Language Training in the Foreign Service Institute" prepared by J. Milton Cowan, director, division of modern languages, Cornell University; Henry Grattan Doyle, former dean of Columbian College, George Washington University, and secretary treasurer of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations; Stephen A. Freeman, vice president and director of the language schools, Middlebury College; and W. Freeman Twaddell, professor of linguistics, Brown University, and past president, Linguistic Society of America. May I call special attention to their conclusions that—

We are in unanimous agreement that the Department's language training needs cannot be met more economically or effectively by nongovernmental facilities.

An analysis of the days on which the Appropriations Committee investigators made their count of classrooms in use at the Foreign Service Institute shows the following:

First. Many vacancies were due to the fact that Air Force sections had been released for flight duty.

Second. A number of the hard language—Arabic, Russian, and so forth—students were in area studies during the time of the investigation.

Third. A number of classrooms had been contracted for by the ICA for a large language training program, which was later withdrawn.

It is my understanding that the investigators made four separate checks on 4 different days. Explanations were provided them as to why the classrooms

were vacant, but this information was not used.

There follows the language training cost estimates:

A survey has been conducted in the interest of comparing the cost estimates for language training at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington with those of other educational institutions. Letters were sent out to 12 reputable institutions requesting estimated costs of training based on prescribed specifications in accordance with quality control procedures established by the Institute in connection with contract services rendered to it. The replies varied considerably in the amount of information received. Some institutions submitted quotations based on FSI's specifications; some quoted but with admitted omissions. Three universities declined to bid and therefore are not listed on the table.

The comparison of costs is based strictly on a calculation of the cost per section hour for up to six students and does not necessarily mean that the instruction, services and facilities are in each case comparable. While quotations were submitted in various ways, the costs have been calculated to a standard unit; namely, the cost per section hour of training.

The costs quoted by the universities and commercial schools were not supported by detail showing the elements of expense which they included. The institute's costs include, first, tutor and linguist salaries; second, salaries of language laboratory staff; third, costs involved in the development and preparation of language training materials; fourth, other staff salaries; fifth, training supplies and equipment; sixth, administrative supplies, equipment, and reproduction costs; and, seventh, rent. The Institute's costs do not include a portion of certain standard centralized administrative support costs such as those of the Office of Personnel, Office of Finance, Office of Budget, and some general service operating expense. The results of this survey indicate that none of the universities or commercial schools has quoted a cost for comparable training below the cost of training by the Foreign Service Institute.

I include also the following cost estimate per section hour of language training at the Foreign Service Institute in fiscal year 1959 compared with estimates submitted by commercial schools and universities:

	Foreign Service Institute	Commercial school A	Commercial school B	Commercial school C	University A	University B	University C	University D	University E	University F
I. Common languages (world): French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish	$6.77	$9	$7	$7.55	$17.78	$11.16	$9.17	$9.05		
II. Less common languages (hard):										
Bulgarian	6.43	10	8				9.17	9.05		$7.65
Burmese	7.53	12					9.17	9.05		
Cambodian	7.66	12					9.17	9.05		
Chinese	7.67	10	8			11.16	9.17	9.05	$10.20	
Czech	6.59	10	8		17.78	11.16	9.17	9.05		7.65
Finnish	7.20	11	8				9.17	9.05		
Greek	7.27	10	8				9.17	9.05		
Hausa	5.84	12						9.05		
Hebrew	6.14	12				11.16	9.17	9.05		
Hindi/Urdu	6.78	11	8			11.16	9.17	9.05		
Hungarian	7.54	10	8			11.16	9.17	9.05		
Indonesian	6.35	11	8				9.17	9.05		
Japanese	7.04	10	8			11.16	9.17	9.05	10.20	
Kurdish	6.22						9.17	9.05		
Persian	7.47		8				9.17	9.05		
Polish	6.40	10			17.78	11.16	9.17	9.05		7.65
Russian	6.99	9	7	8.55	17.78	11.16	9.17	9.05		10.18
Serbo-Croatian	7.10	10	8			11.16	9.17	9.05		7.65
Thai	6.48	11					9.17	9.05		
Tagalog	6.97	11	8					9.05		
Turkish	6.19	10	8			11.16	9.17	9.05		
Vietnamese	7.62	12	8				9.17	9.05		
Visayan	5.93							9.05		

A REPORT ON LANGUAGE TRAINING IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A panel composed of Stephen A. Freeman, vice president and director of the language schools, Middlebury College; Henry Grattan Doyle, former dean of Columbian College, George Washington University, and secretary-treasurer of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations; W. Freeman Twaddell, professor of linguistics, Brown University, past president, Linguistic Society of America; and J. Milton Cowan, director, division of modern languages, Cornell University, in response to a request by Assistant Secretary of State, Lane Dwinell, made a survey of the langauge training conducted at the Foreign Service Institute (Arlington Towers, Virginia). Messrs. Twaddell and Cowan were able also to visit and observe the FSI Arabic training in Beirut, Lebanon, while they were in the Middle East on other business. The panel was specifically requested to bear in mind a statement of the House Appropriations Committee in action on the Department's fiscal year 1960 appropriation, to wit:

"Instances were also uncovered where the cost of teaching certain languages appeared excessive. The Department is again directed to ascertain if these languages cannot be more ably and more economically taught in existing reputable educational institutions."

Members of the panel conferred with officers of the Department and the administration of the FSI. They were provided with full information concerning policy and practice. All facts and information requested were provided by the staff of the FSI and in every respect the panel had full cooperation. Panel members visited classes in practically all of the languages offered at FSI, discussed teaching problems with the staff linguists and tutors, and talked with the student trainees. They also examined the teaching and testing materials prepared at FSI, observed examination techniques and audio-visual facilities. These activities, together with the considerable information available to the panel prior to the visits and the ready cooperation of everyone at the school, enabled the panel members to obtain a comprehensive view of the problems involved. Members of the panel shared their experience through continuous reporting and discussion and arrived at a high degree of unanimity in their judgments.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The task of the FSI is to provide high-quality training in a wide variety of languages for a wide range of trainees. There are inherent difficulties in operating such a program. There is the difficulty of recruiting and holding a competent staff against the attractiveness of university jobs. Many first-class people have left FSI in recent years for university posts. There is the necessity for preparation and constant revision of teaching materials needed for very special requirements. There is the problem of distributing staff time efficiently under conditions where the student input is irregular and frequently unpredictable. Irregularity of student input, both as to numbers and starting dates, is at present outside the control of the FSI. Certainly the FSI has a greater collective experience in dealing with this difficult situation than any other institution in this country.

Despite the complexities of the FSI operations, the panel notes from a comparative study that the instructional costs per section hour at FSI are below those quoted for courses of a comparable number of contact hours of instruction by commercial language schools and universities in the Washington area as well as by other universities throughout the country. It is well known that few universities are interested in handling contract work in intensive language instruction unless they can be guaranteed a relatively large number of students coming at regular intervals preferably coinciding with the regular semester opening dates. It should also be emphasized that universities are highly specialized in their language offerings with very few able to handle more than the common languages. Universities have found the costs of maintaining a standby staff of native tutors and professional linguists for the training of a small number of students in out-of-the-way languages to be prohibitive. Commercial language schools may give the appearance of offering a wide range of languages, but this is done without the distinguishing characteristics of modern high-quality intensive language teaching, namely, control of the operation by a professionally trained linguist and utilization of linguistically sound materials.

We are in unanimous agreement that the Department's language training needs cannot be met more economically or effectively by nongovernmental facilities. We see no

evidence that the teaching of certain languages can be accomplished more economically outside the FSI without a loss of quality in the instruction. Any attempt to fragment the program by farming out some languages can only aggravate the overall problem. Our recommendation is that every effort be made to improve and strengthen the program of the FSI.

The remainder of this report is devoted to factors which influence the definition of such terms as efficiency, economy, effectiveness, etc., in language teaching, as well as to concrete suggestions for improvement of the teaching program at the FSI.

POLICY QUESTIONS

The FSI is a service agency for the Department and incidentally for other agencies. It must stand prepared on short notice to begin instruction in any of a large number of languages for varying numbers of trainees, the latter often of widely varying language-learning ability. This means that it must at least have standby staff for these languages and, during periods when no instruction is offered, these people can be engaged in research and implementation which will make instruction, when offered, more effective. Thus, the FSI must have an extremely flexible program.

The ideal language-teaching-learning situation is one where approximately six students of roughly equal ability begin an intensive clas sat the same time. Economically such a class is a basic unit. It requires one full-time tutor who is a native speaker of the language and the part-time supervision of a professional linguist. If there are four such units under supervision of the linguist, the picture is fully rounded out. The out-of-class activities of the tutors and the linguist are devoted to the preparation of class materials and other operations, such as testing, supervised study, etc. Such a program allows for sectioning of students according to ability as the course progresses. Any deviation from such a program shows a loss both in economy and effectiveness.

We recognize the difficulties in arranging assignments of Foreign Service personnel, but we strongly urge that the Department do all it can to stabilize starting dates for language courses and insure that reasonable class sizes are maintained. To the extent that this is not done, the Department must be aware that reduced effectiveness of instruction and an increase in costs and possible inefficiency are an inevitable result.

Another question which we wish to raise is the extent to which other agencies use FSI facilities. There is an advantage to this so long as it makes use of standby staff. However, it is conceivable that such operations might actually work to the detriment of the Department's best interests, especially at times when there is a shortage of professional linguists. The whole matter should be reviewed from time to time.

We have no criticism of the Department's policy of training in the "world languages," French, German, Spanish, regardless of whether or not the person trained is to be assigned immediately to an area where the language is essential. However, the Department must at all times work for an assignment policy geared to the training activities. Language training is expensive, chiefly because the salaries of the trainees amount to approximately twice the actual cost of instruction. Any training in a language prior to assignment to an area where it is needed is a real investment.

Criticism which arises when a trainee, upon completion of a language course, is assigned to an area where he has no use for the newly acquired language skill pertains to the Department's assignment policy mentioned above and not to the operations of FSI.

ACADEMIC NATURE OF THE TEACHING OPERATIONS

The FSI is an educational operation and must continue to be understood and defined as such. The language-teaching profession in this country has been pleased to note that the Department has so handled its language-training facility. The employment of professional linguists, their participation in professional meetings, conferences, and other activities, the production of scientifically sound teaching materials and, more recently, the possibility of having these materials made generally available through the center for applied linguistics, are all welcome developments. Without these the FSI would quickly atrophy into a sterile teaching operation in the hands of untrained native speakers.

In order to maintain its leadership in the field, the Department will have to continue in competitive recruitment with colleges and universities for linguists and tutors. It must be able to attract and hold these in terms of salaries, workload, job security, job satisfaction, and advancement. We are prepared to support requests for additional budgetary provisions especially for linguist-supervisors. The most noticeable shortcoming we observed in the teaching at FSI was inadequate supervision of the native tutors.

It is important to recognize the fact that an academic operation is not a clock-punching operation. Full-time workers in educational institutions devote their time to a number of different activities. No teacher in an intensive language program can put in 8 hours effectively in the classroom. We incline to view the figure of approximately 6 hours a day, which is current FSI practice, as too high. When one considers the number of tasks which have to be performed before effective classwork can be conducted, it is clear that both linguist and native-speaking instructors must devote a large portion of their time to activities outside the classroom. Job descriptions for linguists and teachers must be broad enough to include the creation of all kinds of teaching materials, supervision of study periods, attendance in the language laboratory, testing, training of new teachers, grading, office reports, and so forth.

The materials problem is perennial. For the kind of work being done at FSI there are no entirely adequate materials even for the languages commonly taught in our schools. The foreign language texts which commercial publishers find it profitable to produce could cover at most the first 2 months of an intensive course. Since FSI must provide continuation training, it is often better to build from the very start in order to have a coherent total program. For the hard languages the work has to start from scratch because of the dearth of usable materials. The preparation of systematic day-by-day practice materials is a formidable task, but without these materials classwork does not attain full effectiveness. The FSI program also needs extensive, carefully planned tapes, audiovisual materials, and a wide variety of readings.

It might be expected that there would ultimately come an end to material preparation. Experience has shown, however, that no materials are ever perfected once and for all. Improvements in the scientific analysis of languages, in teaching techniques and changes in the needs of trainees constantly require larger or smaller changes.

The academic atmosphere may at times appear to certain observers to be somewhat lag, but it is in reality very productive because it induces people to focus on getting a job done for the sake of the job. This is the goal sought after in highly organized industry where all too often people conform to the prescription of getting a job done for the sake of conforming to the prescription.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

We have talked over in some detail with the staff of the FSI proposals which might lead to improvement of their program. The suggestions which follow are based on a more liberal interpretation of utilization of the time of the native speaking tutors than is currently being made. There seems to be developing in auditing and accounting an interpretation that the tutors are only earning their salaries when they are actually teaching in class. We have already indicated that we consider this to be a wrong interpretation and one which could lead to neglect of those all-important preparatory functions which provide maximum utilization of class time.

We feel that there should be more outside preparation on the part of the trainees for the time spent in class. We would like to see experimentation with the reduction of the number of classroom hours. This would afford more time for supervised study and work with recorded materials in the language laboratory. Such an arrangement would make possible more training for reading proficiency in those languages which have an alphabetical writing system. Coverage of larger quantities of informative reading would contribute appreciably to the improvement of students' ability to perform in class.

We recommend cutting the six class-hour day to four hours for classes which have only one or two students with a corresponding increase in the amount of outside individual study. Tutors could be made available for this purpose. Experience with these small classes may point the way for revisions in the plan for larger classes.

We felt, on the basis of our observations, that better utilization could be made of the time of the linguists. Their greatest contribution is in supervision of classes and it seemed to us that they were too much involved in administration.

In conclusion, we believe that the Department should consider making a usable command of a "world" language a requirement for entrance into the American Foreign Service.

Community Facilities Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 years ago the President's Special Assistant for Public Works Planning advised him:

In almost every category of public works, severe shortages have arisen. Our highways, water and antipollution facilities, hospitals, transit systems, school buildings and others have fallen, on the average, below minimum acceptable requirements.

The report to the President cited two specific examples—highways and water supply—to dramatize the extent and urgency of the Nation's public facilities needs.

With regard to highways the President was told:

The Nation has fallen so far behind in highway construction that 80 percent of the highway needs for the next 10 years are really backlog.

The President's reaction was to recommend a substantial cutback in high-

way construction. Congress did not agree and has enacted legislation designed to assure an adequate program of highway development.

With regard to water, the President was told:

To meet our needs for water, conservation is the order of the day. We cannot manufacture this necessity of life. We must store and use it more efficiently, learn to convert saline waters, and find ways to improve the distribution of it. Most important of all, our rivers will have to be cleaned, and adequate treatment facilities installed to prevent upstream pollution. To accomplish this job, we need almost 8,000 municipal treatment plants alone, and, in all, some 17,000 facilities, public and private, to insure that all of the potential sources of pollution are adequately controlled.

The President's reaction was swift. Within 6 months he recommended that Federal aid to communities for the construction of needed waste-treatment facilities be cut back by 60 percent and terminated altogether by 1960. Congress again disagreed and enacted legislation expanding Federal aid in this vital field, only to have their efforts thwarted by a Presidential veto.

As a member of the House Committee on Public Works I am especially interested in these two areas of public works—highways and water pollution control. But the public works problem does not end there. As the President's public works planning assistant further advised him 3 years ago:

These examples are unfortunately typical ones. In almost every field in public works—hospitals, schools, civic centers, recreational facilities—shortages are the rule, not the exception. In almost every category we are falling farther and farther behind in meeting even current demands. Backlogs, inadequate replacement schedules, urgent new requirements are characteristic of public works problems across the Nation.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the lack of adequate community facilities has become the most critical domestic problem we face today. According to Walter Lippmann in a recent article:

This is the central issue of our time, and no one who is interested in public life can ignore it.

To meet this issue, and it seems all others, the President and his advisers recommend that we reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Federal Government. In their view, it seems, the purpose of our economy is to make bigger and better automobiles with higher and wider tail fins and other shining consumer baubles and gadgets. This philosophy was expressed recently by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers when he said:

As I understand an economy, its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers.

Maximum consumer consumption is a worthy object, Mr. Speaker, but is it truly our ultimate purpose? Does our national strength increase in a direct ratio to the number of television sets or souped-up automobiles that are purchased each year? Have we become so affluent, smug, and self-satisfied that we think we can lead the world to peace, with justice and freedom for all, on our Detroit-made chariot viewing the latest adult western?

The sacrifice of public needs to private consumption has left its scar across the length and breadth of this Nation. The President's own expert on public works confirms this. In certain specific areas such as highways, water pollution control, education, airports, and housing the Congress has attempted to enact adequate programs designed to cope with the problem, and fill the needs in these areas. Without exception the administration has thwarted these efforts with vetoes, threats of vetoes, and reduced budget requests.

In the general field of community facilities, also, legislation has been delayed by administration opposition. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is our duty to the American people to consider and enact a bill designed to encourage and stimulate local community facilities construction. Our local communities are unprepared for the new demands being placed upon them for additional public services. They are simply unable financially to support them. It is essential, therefore, that we institute a program on a national scale which will provide these communities with loans at reasonable rates of interest with which to finance these projects.

Apart from the social and community aspects of such a program, Mr. Speaker, its enactment would greatly bolster and strengthen our economy. As was pointed out recently by the Committee on Banking and Currency under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]:

By providing long-term financing on extremely favorable terms, local governments will be encouraged to undertake community facilities and public works which will have a strong generating effect on the economy.

According to reports just received, Mr. Speaker ,the economy needs such a boost. Unemployment for March shows 4.2 million unemployed. Instead of a seasonal increase in employment usually realized the past month showed instead an actual increase in unemployment. Other economic indicators show a dangerous softening in our economy that we must begin to cope with now before it is too late.

I have today introduced a bill to accomplish this purpose, Mr. Speaker. It would authorize Federal loans to municipalities for public works construction with major emphasis on hospitals, nursing homes, water and sewer works, and other community facilities. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following section-by-section summary of the bill:

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1960—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

SHORT TITLE

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the Community Facilities Act of 1960).

COMMUNITY FACILITY LOANS

Section 2 extensively amends title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 so as to expand the public facility loan program presently provided by that title.

Section 201 of the new title II sets forth the congressional policies which form the basis for the expanded program embodied in the bill. After expressing the long-established policy of the Congress to assist and encourage the development of well-planned and healthy communities (an objective which in many instances would be thwarted by the community's lack of financial resources without such assistance), and finding that the immediate construction of essential community facilities (including nonprofit hospitals and nonprofit nursing homes) would enhance the public health and welfare and contribute substantially to achieving the steady economic growth essential to a full-employment economy, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of the new title II to extend credit to aid municipalities and other political subdivisions of States in providing essential community facilities (and to aid in the modernization and construction of nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes) where such credit is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms.

Section 202(a) authorizes the Community Facilities Commissioner to make loans to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States (including purchases of their securities and obligations) to finance the construction, repair, and improvement of specific community facilities, and to make loans to nonprofit hospitals and nonprofit nursing homes (including purchases of their securities and obligations) to finance specific projects for hospital or nursing home construction, repair, or improvement.

Section 202(b) sets forth certain restrictions and limitations upon the Commissioner's authority to make these loans:

1. No loan may be made unless the assistance applied for it not otherwise available on equally favorable terms and conditions (and no securities or obligations may be purchased unless they cannot be disposed of at public sale on equally favorable terms and conditions). All loans must be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment; and participations are permitted.

2. The maximum maturity of any such loan is 40 years.

3. Any such loan will bear interest at not more than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt, as computed on the preceding May 31 or November 30; except that loans made for projects in communities of 5,000 or less will bear interest at the rate applicable to REA loans.

4. The total amount of funds available for such loans at any time will be allotted to States (i.e., to communities within such States) in proportion to their population. Amounts allotted to any State but not used can be reallotted by the Commissioner after a reasonable period (not less than 2 years).

5. Of the total amount of funds available for such loans at any time, at least 25 percent will be reserved for water and sewer works and at least 25 percent for hospitals and nursing homes. These reservations are computed without regard to State allotments under paragraph 4.

6. Of the total amount of funds available for such loans at any time, at least 33⅓ percent will be reserved for communities of less than 50,000. This reservation is computed without regard to State allotments under paragraph 4 or the special reservations under paragraph 5.

7. The amount of any such loan may not exceed the development cost of the project or (except in the case of a hospital) $5 million.

8. A loan for a hospital or nursing home may be made only after the Surgeon General has certified that it complies with certain provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. Loans for hospitals or nursing homes in

metropolitan areas which are covered by approved area-wide hospital plans will have a priority. Funds to be used for hospital or nursing home projects will be allotted among the several States on the basis of population, relative need, and other pertinent factors.

9. Loans for water and sewer works and other public facilities (except hospitals and nursing homes) will be granted under a system of priorities based on financial and community needs, with primary consideration being given to need for more adequate water and sewer facilities, particularly those which would serve rural areas, areas with small financial resources, and suburban areas adversely affected by extensive construction (existing or proposed) of federally insured or guaranteed dwellings.

10. No loan may be made for a publicly owned public utility which would compete with a regulated privately owned public utility unless the State regulatory agency determines that the community requires an increase in service which the existing utility cannot meet.

Section 203 authorizes appropriations aggregating not more than $1 billion which, together with loan repayments (including repayments of loans made under the old title II), would constitute a revolving fund to be used by the Commissioner in carrying out the program.

Section 204 provides that the Commissioner shall have the same functions, powers, and duties for purposes of this title (in addition to those specifically vested in him by law) as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has for purposes of the college housing program, to the extent delegated to him by such Administrator.

Section 205 contains definitions of terms used in the new title II—"Commissioner," "State," "community facilities," "hospital," "nursing home," "nonprofit hospital," "nonprofiit nursing home," and "development cost."

Section 206 provides that the Commissioner shall require the application of the Davis-Bacon Act and the payment of time-and-a-half for overtime on all projects assisted under the program.

RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

Section 3 of the bill amends section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase by $50 million the amount which may be appropriated to the revolving fund which is established under such section 702 and from which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator makes advances to public agencies for the maintenance of a reserve of planned public works.

Moral Principles Should Be Paramount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, not only does the United Arab Republic continue to violate international morals and the resolutions of the United Nations but it also is now stirring up trouble in countries in the Western Hemisphere.

There is more than ample evidence that Nasser's agents are operating throughout the Caribbean, in Cuba and in the Republic of Panama, as well as elsewhere. We will never be able to make him behave nor prevent other Nassers from cropping up all over the world if, on the one hand, we condemn by moralistic resolutions their conduct, and, on the other hand, make grants and loans to them so that they can carry on their nefarious conduct.

It is quite true that the grants and loans are always made for purposes and projects which are in complete harmony with our desire to improve the standards of living and the economies of free peoples the world over. But when foreign countries misuse their own funds for the building up of war materiel for purposes of aggression, we aid their unjust and immoral cause by freeing their own funds for that purpose as we make other funds available for peaceful purposes.

The recent World Bank loan to the United Arab Republic is a typical example of how the free world should not act with reference to a country that has established its immorality in international affairs by flaunting everything that is good and decent.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 12 is most apropos:

THE SUEZ BLOCKADE ISSUE PERSISTS

If U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold were a man given to bluster and denunciation, his recent statement on Egypt's blockade of the Suez Canal against Israeli shipping would merit little attention. But precisely because Mr. Hammarskjold customarily avoids the slightest indication of annoyance or displeasure his assertion that the detention by the Egyptians of the Greek ship *Astypalea* "goes against the principle upheld by the United Nations" has all the force of a rebuke to Cairo.

That the rebuke will go unheeded is a reasonable assumption, for President Nasser has so far ignored all efforts by Mr. Hammarskjold to obtain either an end to the United Arab Republic's blockade or a least a modification which would permit Israeli cargoes in foreign-owned ships to pass.

Mr. Hammarskjold, discouraged though he has every right to be by Nasser's rebuffs, indicated in his statement that he intends to pursue his efforts to arrive at workable practices in the Suez Canal. We're glad he hasn't given up. But we would like to see him get some positive support from those nations—especially our own—which have an interest in maintaining freedom of navigation in general and preserving the peace in the Middle East in particular. Even Prime Minister Nehru of India, who is currently entertaining President Nasser, could do worse than bring up the subject of Suez in his conversations with his distinguished guest.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress will shortly be asked to act upon H.R. 11001, a bill sponsored by the State and Treasury Departments to provide for the participation by the United States in the International Development Association which is being created as an arm or a division of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, often referred to by its initials "IBRD" and more commonly known as the World Bank.

In connection with that bill, I have suggested that the World Bank Board of Governors adopt, by Board action, a policy which would enunciate the principle that no member who declares itself to be at war with another member could borrow money from the Bank. The startling answer came back that for the Board of the World Bank to enunciate such a policy would in effect be an admission that they made a mistake in granting a loan to the United Arab Republic. I accordingly am urging an amendment to H.R. 11001 which will provide, in so many words, that no loan shall be made by the International Development Association to any member which claims to be at war with any other member.

There can be no sound objection to such an amendment. The Departments undoubtedly will urge, as they have already done, that such a provision will require a renegotiation of the underlying agreement. The answer is that no matter how long it might take for such renegotiation, the United States, which claims to be the leader of the free world, has no right to sacrifice moral principle because it might take a little time to negotiate what is morally right and proper, and, above all, sound in international law.

What has already happened with the United Arab Republic might very well happen in the Caribbean, in Central America, or in South America. We would be the laughing stock of the world if we contributed our gold to the World Bank to be loaned by it to countries bent on destruction of world peace.

Can any American in his right mind condone the making of a loan to the Republic of Panama if it attempted to seize the Panama Canal? All of the trouble we are having now with reference to the Panama Canal is directly traceable to what Nasser did with the Suez Canal. If Egypt had a right to violate its international obligations and take the Suez Canal, the Republic of Panama has the right to do the same with the Panama Canal.

Both the Republic of Panama and Cuba are members of the World Bank and are signatories to the underlying agreement sought to be approved by H.R. 11001. Most of the Central and South American countries are also members and signatories. Shall we permit the World Bank to make loans to Cuba if it seeks to invade any of these countries? Will we permit the World Bank to make loans to any of these countries who attacks a neighbor? The questions answer themselves.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Citizens Action Committee, I am inserting herewith the resolution which is self-explanatory, commending the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs in the matter of foreign aid.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the question of the character and extent of foreign aid given by the U.S. Gov-

ernment, its planning and administration, have long been the subject of great concern to many Americans; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives has recently submitted its report, after having inspected foreign-aid installations in 17 countries, involving over 40,000 miles of travel; and

Whereas that report finds that there is evidence of careless planning and lax administration in many of the areas visited; and

Whereas the economy of American taxpayers and the prestige of our Government in the eyes of distant countries suffer seriously as a result of extravagance and maladministration in those fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Citizens' Action Committee of Nassau and Suffolk Counties, N.Y., at its executive board meeting of April 6, 1960—

(a) Commends the operation of the aforenamed subcommittee and the intention to scan carefully the expenditure of taxpayers' money in foreign aid, and

(b) Urges that the International Cooperation Administration plan only for such projects as will positively promote practical improvement in the living standards of the people who receive our assistance and enable them to be self-supporting as early as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the subcommittee, to Long Island Representatives and to Senators JAVITS and KEATING.

Smaller Business Association of New England Recommendations to the Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a few of the recommendations of the Smaller Business Association of New England to the Congress:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

TAXATION

Tax deduction for plowback investments

Here is our program for taxation. During the next 15 years, the United States must create 20 million new jobs in order to support our expanding work force. If small businesses are to contribute their share of these jobs, they must have more capital funds to reinvest for expansion and modernization. The only possible source of this capital is income which a business receives after taxes. May we remind you again of the parallel between the family-owned New England business and our relationship with Uncle Sam? Many old New England firms have faded away because members of the family took away too large a portion of the earnings, leaving the company in a state of economic anemia.

A good farmer regularly plants a section of his acreage in clover and then plows it under, thereby enriching the soil so it will produce a bigger crop. Similarly, plowback of additional earnings after taxes will generate additional taxable income, resulting in more revenue for the Treasury. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, for each 1 percent of economic growth, the Federal Government gains a billion dollars in additional revenue.

The need for tax exemptions to provide incentives for more invested capital in small businesses has long been recognized by Congress. A series of bills have been introduced over the past few years which are designed to furnish such incentives. A typical provision in these bills allows a deduction equal to the additional investment in the business for the taxable year. That deduction would not exceed $30,000 or 20 percent of the net income of the business; the lesser amount to be the deduction. We strongly urge legislation permitting such a plowback deduction, primarily for capital invested in equipment needed to expand and modernize.

More flexible depreciation rates on purchases of new and used equipment

Our present standard of living has been achieved by incorporating technological advances into our industrial economy. We have outproduced other nations because our industrial plan has been considerably more efficient.

This is no longer true. Today, the industrial efficiency of Western Europe and Japan is approaching our own, while their wage rates are a fraction of those which we pay. Our present system of depreciation allowances is hampering improvement of our industrial efficiency. The United States is the only major industrial county which has failed to modernize tax laws relating to depreciation (table 1). Canada with rates twice as fast as our, Great Britain with 30 percent in the first year, West Germany with high rates in the early years and a maximum ir 10, Denmark allowing 50 percent in the first 5 years, France with an inflation adjustment; Belgium, Italy, Sweden, Argentina, Chile, and Japan, all have modernized their depreciation allowances, either to allow for replacement costs, or to provide rapid depreciation, or both. As a result of our unrealistic depreciation policies, all businesses are hard-pressed merely to replace wornout equipment, let alone to expand and modernize their plant facilities. The smaller the company, the more acute the problem.

Table 1

Canada: Twice U.S. rate.
Britain: 30 percent first year.
Denmark: 50 percent in 5 years.
West Germany: 10 years or less.
France: Inflation adjustments.

Inflation alone has made our depreciation allowances inadequate. The Lithographer's National Association, for example, points out that a press which cost $31,400 in 1935 would cost $128,000 to replace today.

Our depreciation allowances are based on long machinery life, a concept which may have been valid in the 1930's, but which is not applicable in today's rapidly evolving technology. Obsolescence has become a much more important factor in depreciation than wear and tear. A recent study by Johns Hopkins University revealed that a modern machine tool has an obsolescence cycle of 5 to 10 years, yet our present depreciation policies require companies to take 15 to 20 years to write off such equipment. According to a McGraw-Hill survey made in 1958, out of a total of $300 billion in U.S. capital assets, $95 billion of plant equipment was considered obsolete.

Technological obsolescence is the result of research; the greater the research, the faster the obsolescence. Consequently, fixed rates of depreciation are no longer practical. We believe that the rate at which an investment in equipment is written off should be left to the discretion of the company involved, rather than being dictated by the Government by law.

A bill introduced in February for the Secretary of the Treasury would require that profits from sales of depreciated equipment be taxed as ordinary income instead of capital gains. According to Secretary Anderson, this will make it possible for the Treasury to allow more flexibility in writing off plant equipment. We are inclined to go along with Secretary Anderson's proposal, but before we agree to support it we want more than a vague promise of flexible depreciation. We recommend that depreciation rates be left to the discretion of business management and urge that this provision be so stated in the law. Such a provision is not merely a concession to business. It is essential to the expansion of our economy.

Uniform application of judicial decisions by the Bureau of Internal Revenue

The Bureau of Internal Revenue frequently produces uncertainty in business operations by refusing to be bound by decisions of the lower courts concerning enforcement of tax laws. We urge your support of legislation designed to provide uniform application of judicial precedents in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws, thereby reducing this uncertainty which hampers business growth.

Tax exemptions for voluntary retirement plans by self-employed individuals or partners

We believe that the self-employed are entitled to the same kind of security provided to those who are employed by others. At present, professional men, and others who are self-employed, cannot make any tax deductions for amounts that are set aside for their retirement. In the interest of basic fair play, we urge legislation to correct this situation. We hope that the Senate will complete the work already started in the House where a bill providing for such an allowance has been passed.

SMALL BUSINESS SHARE

In August 1959, the Senate Committee on Small Business reported that small business' share of prime contracts had dropped 7.7 percent in 1958, and that it appeared to be Defense Department policy to emphasize the role of small business as subcontractors rather than prime contracts, in weapons system procurement. Yet the same report reveals that small business' share of subcontracting had declined 4.1 percent since 1955.

Certainly, measures should be taken to insure that qualified small businesses receive a bigger share of Government contracts, both prime and sub, for manufacturing and research. In the public interest, more use should be made of the facilities and know-how which are available from small companies. Procurement officials should be reminded that the operators of small businesses are not small in intelligence, ability, or imagination, and that their operational efficiency is not necessarily lower than that of big business.

PROCUREMENT

Require SBA approval of facilities contracts

One of the major detriments to small business subcontracting is the issuance of facilities contracts to major prime contractors without sufficient review of the available capabilities of small subcontractors in the same area. In many instances, the Government is providing capital funds to prime contractors for purchase and construction of facilities and services which are already available in competent small shops. If the prime contractor subcontracted some of his work to these small firms, such capital investments would be reduced. As a result, not only would small businesses be strengthened, but the contract could be completed at lower cost to the Government.

We suggest statutory authority for the Small Business Administration to approve or disapprove requests for facilities contracts. Such authority would parallel that now in effect for Certificates of Competency, a program which is being effectively administered by the SBA.

Strengthening of SBA's set-aside program

Although the SBA's set-aside program is making progress in increasing participation of small firms in prime contracting, it is not yet as effective as it should be. The intent of this program is that all invitations to bid be reviewed by SBA representatives before issuance, so that certain items can be set aside for qualified small businesses. Such review is now permissive rather than compulsory, however, and many invitations to bid are sent out by the procurement agency before they can be reviewed by SBA. Consequently, contracts are frequently awarded before SBA can act.

Bishop James Walsh: A Symbol of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the world was shocked and horrified on March 18 when the Chinese Communists brutally sentenced Bishop James Edward Walsh, the last high foreign prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in mainland China, to 20 years in prison on charges of conspiring to overthrow the Red regime.

The announcement came just 24 hours after the Communists had sentenced Bishop Ignatius Kung Pin-mei of Shanghai and 13 other Chinese Catholics to terms ranging from 5 years to life.

Bishop Walsh had been in China at the end of World War I and returned in 1948. He remained at his Shanghai post after the Communists took over the next year. He refused an offer to return home in 1955. "Should I be the one to constitute an exception just because the situation is bad in this combination graveyard and kindergarden?" he wrote on 1956. "Our good friends will have to throw me in or throw me out."

The ridiculousness of the Chinese charge against the ailing prelate was set forth by Secretary of State Herter in a strong statement heartily approved by the entire country.

Bishop Walsh was a missionary and a man of God concerned with the souls of the Chinese people, not with their inhuman and tyrannical political institutions. One of the finest tributes that has been paid to this wonderful man appeared in the Tablet, the newspaper published by the Diocese of Brooklyn. In an article on April 2, 1960, entitled "Bishop James Walsh: A Symbol of Our Time," Father Albert J. Nevins, M.M., portrayed the magnificent spirit of this great human being.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this most significant article in the RECORD.

BISHOP JAMES WALSH: A SYMBOL OF OUR TIME

(By Father Albert J. Nevins, M.M.)

MARYKNOLL, N.Y.—Bishop James Edward Walsh, of Cumberland, Md., is the happiest man in Red China today.

For when the Communists sentenced the frail, grey-haired, Maryknoll prelate to jail 2 weeks ago they helped him fulfill the ambition of a lifetime of walking more closely in the footsteps of his Master.

If the Communists think they can intimidate the 69-year-old missioner with trumped-up charges and a 20-year prison sentence, they are making a big mistake.

They are making a mistake because Bishop Walsh's values are completely opposed to their own atheistic philosophy. They cannot understand the depth of his spirituality, and because they cannot understand, they give Bishop Walsh the very things he wants.

DOES NOT FEAR PERSECUTION

The former Maryknoll superior general (1936–46) is not a man who fears persecution. Rather he welcomes it as a servant of his own cause. Ever since the anti-Christian program of the Chinese Reds was first launched in 1949, the aged bishop has time and again reiterated his intention of remaining in China and sharing the lot of the beleaguered Chinese clergy.

One of the rare letters from Bishop Walsh reached Hong Kong in 1956. In it, he unequivocally stated his determination to remain at his post in Shanghai as long as possible:

"Here in Shanghai I share the lot of Chinese clergy who cannot leave, who must bear the brunt of all pressure and annoyance. They are the key factor in the church situation in China these days. There is some good, I think, in giving them a little help or encouragement, if only a moral gesture. I like to be with them. I don't like to do anything to separate myself from them of my own volition.

"I've been in some comedies in my day, but I've never seen anything to match this outside of Leon Errol in the 'Mexican Spitfire's Baby.' I think my useless old hulk is made into a propaganda item to indicate liberty of religion but is that something to worry about? I believe our clergy is very anxious to do what is right and are very good in general, and are presently struggling hard to keep the church in operation and uncompromised.

"Moreover, the principle urged on all here for 6 years, and urged very much by me, was that nobody should budge. Should I be the one to constitute an exception just because the situation is bad in this combination graveyard and kindergarten? The place is one thing and the dear, patient people another.

"Thus our good friends will have to throw me in or throw me out. What does it matter in the case of an old fellow in the sere and yellow leaf like me? To put up with a little inconvenience at my age is nothing, it seems like a privilege to me. 'I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come.'

"Besides there's another thing. I am as meek and as mild as the next person, at least I try to be. But I am a little tired of being pushed around on account of my religion. My religion is all right; I don't see anything wrong with it. Anyhow, I don't feel inclined to get off the earth just because some people dislike it. I don't hold it against them. But what I say is—let them come and put me off."

WHY HE IS PERSECUTED

Some observers are speculating that the recently intensified Red drive to establish an independent church for Chinese Catholics is connected with the bishop's imprisonment, and that the Reds may have tried to use him to accredit their schismatic movement. It is feared here that Bishop Walsh—who is the last remaining foreign missioner in Red China—along with the Most Rev. Ignatius Kung Pin-Mei, bishop of Shanghai, may have been subjected to severe brainwashing efforts in preparation for a nationwide Communist propaganda move. Having failed in their attempts to coerce the two bishops into cooperating with the Red church setup, in desperation the Communists, it is surmised, retaliated by punishing both prelates with long prison sentences.

Word reaching the Maryknoll mission in Hong Kong indicates that the Communist regime has been stepping up its efforts to widen the breach between the Vatican and the patriotic Catholic Church of China. The Communists claim that already 32 Chinese validly ordained priests have been consecrated bishops without formal appointments through Rome. This is considered as the foundation of the schismatic movement.

The elimination of Bishop Walsh as a genuine representative of the Vatican in China would just about ring down the curtain on the successful destruction of the church in China.

From this standpoint of sheer Red propaganda it would have been highly advantageous to have had a nonoriental bishop who, as an official Vatican representative, would either condone verbally, or actively participate in, the consecration of more schismatic bishops.

Obviously any participation by Bishop Walsh in the Communist plot to separate the church in Red China from Rome could have been accomplished only if the Reds had been able to destroy, through brainwashing, the personality of the aging American bishop.

Meanwhile, radio broadcasts out of Communist China continue to boast that a dangerous American spy has been apprehended and punished. In sentencing a 69-year-old man already in feeble health, to 20 years in a fetid Communist prison, the Chinese Reds know they are sentencing him to death. But again they play into the hands of a man whose lifetime wish has been to follow Christ completely, even to martyrdom.

What of the Future for Textiles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for some time now that the alarming increase of imports constitutes a grave threat to the domestic textile industry. This industry is too important in the economy of our country to be liquidated by allowing foreign producers to capture the domestic market. Approximately a million citizens of the United States are employed in the domestic textile industry, and wages amount to around $3 billion a year.

One of my constituents, Mr. Harry L. Dalton, vice chairman of the board of American Viscose Corp., recently discussed this alarming situation in a well-reasoned talk to the Charlotte chapter of the Society for Advancement of Management. The picture he paints is indeed an alarming one. The time is at hand when positive and constructive steps must be taken to limit the flood of textile imports which constitutes such a threat to one of the great and most important industries of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the speech of Mr. Dalton and commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House for their most careful consideration.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE FOR TEXTILES?

Food, shelter, and clothing being the three basic needs of mankind, and the misdeeds of Adam and Eve having established a conscience for clothing, the future of textiles for apparel would seem to be assured as long as there are people. And, on that score, the population outlook is commonly described as "explosive."

Thereare, of course, other majojr demand factors than apparel to affect the textile future, and these are similarly heartening. The great and growing demand for household textiles is buoyed by the ever-increasing aggregate of housing facilities. Automotive markets, requiring textiles for tire fabric, seat, and floor coverings, side and headlinings, and so on, are also a steadily growing outlet among the many industrial uses for textiles.

So, the future demand for textiles is sure enough. There are, however, sobering questions as to how fully American textile and apparel factories will share the fruits of that rosy market outlook. The serpent in this particular Garden of Eden is the threat of foreign competition. I want to discuss that problem with you tonight, but before I do, there may be some among you who would be interested in a more statistical appraisal of the textile future.

THE TEXTILE MARKET BY 1970

For their satisfaction, I can report that painstaking studies of future demand for textiles are being undertaken both by the U.S. Department of Commerce and by the International Cotton Advisory Committee, each to cover textiles broadly and regardless of fiber content. The former survey is in response to recommendations resulting from the Pastore committee's investigation of textile production and commerce. It will evaluate the long-range future of textiles, as population, income, buying habits, and competitive circumstances change. It will consider the effect of competition from other materials, such as paper and plastics. Another study will appraise the prospect for new and expanded uses for textiles. These findings are due some time after mid-1960.

Meanwhile, for those who would like an immediate peek into the textile crystal ball, the staff director of the Pastore committee has made a statistical projection to 1970 for broad woven fabrics, the largest segment of the textile industry. He has weighed the variables of population growth, per capita consumption trends, productivity, and the relative increase of imports compared with exports, based on the decade 1947-57. He arrived at these interesting conclusions:

Using 1957 as the base year, he thinks by 1970 our population should expand at least 25 percent, or an average of about 2 percent a year. But, because of declining per capita consumption of textile yardage, he anticipates that the American textile market may grow only 15 percent, or little more than 1 percent a year. Finally, he expects that domestic production will increase less than 10 percent, from 1957 to 1970, or an average of only three-fourths of 1 percent per year compared with an approximate 4 percent gain annually for all manufacturing industry.

That restricted prospect for the American textile industry results substantially from the disconcerting anticipation that textile imports will expand by 350 percent, while exports decline 22 percent. Whereas, U.S. exports of broad woven textiles in 1957, at 615 million yards, exceeded imports by a ratio of almost 5 to 1, the expectation for 1970 is that imports at 625 million yards will surpass our shipments abroad by 30 percent. The truly shocking part of this outlook is the forecast of a 24 percent drop in total textile employment, which could be of serious concern to North Carolina, where textile manufacturing is the leading industry, its value added by manufacture being twice that of the next ranking industry, tobacco manufactures. Textile mills, employing roughly one-fourth million persons, with an annual payroll approaching $700 million, accounts for nearly half of all workers in all manufacturing industries of North Carolina.

Since this forecast and some subsequent comments relate to the so-called Pastore committee, it might be well to describe the origin and purpose of that committee briefly. Senate Resolution 287, of the 85th Congress, recognizing the nagging problems of the textile industry, authorized the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee "to conduct a study of all factors affecting commerce and production, including (a) the extent, nature, and causes of the decline in interstate and foreign commerce; (b) the decline in employment; (c) the effects of policies and programs of the Federal Government on the industry; and, (d) the impact of commercial policies of other nations on the industry."

PASTORE COMMITTEE FINDINGS

The resulting Pastore committee, a subcommittee to study the textile industry, was chaired by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island. Other members, all from States with important textile interests, were Senators Thurmond, of South Carolina, Bible, of Nevada (wool), Purtell, of Connecticut, Payne, of Maine, and Cotton, of New Hampshire. The staff director was Dr. William H. Miernyk, director of the bureau of business and economic research, Northeastern University, who made the forecast for 1970, which we have just examined.

This Pastore committee held hearings between July and December 1958 in Washington and New York City, also in New England and South Atlantic textile centers, including Charlotte, N.C. and Clemson, S.C. Based on its findings, the committee recommended, among other steps, the creation of a Textile Interagency Committee in Government and the Textile Industry Advisory Committee to deal exclusively with textile problems. These committees are to keep both Congress and the executive departments informed of all new textile developments and their probable consequences.

Appropriations were voted and research awards have been made for studies of "cost factors entering into textile fabric production in the United States and representative foreign countries," "factors influencing fluctuations in the textile industry," and "new uses for textiles," in addition to the "long-term outlook for consumption of textile products," already described. Further, the Census Bureau has been given funds to undertake new statistical series on fabric inventories, sales, and unfilled orders, areas which have always been a serious void in textile marketing information.

Returning to our main theme, the future for textiles, the real question is to what extent will American mills share the future market for textiles. The Southern States have an especially important stake in that answer. They have made great strides to date, as demonstrated by the records of the past decade. They should rightfully be entitled to a full share of the future textile market, but they are facing a keen competitive struggle with imports.

The Pastore committee clearly foresaw that contest and recommended strongly that U.S. foreign aid, trade agreements, export and other programs be administered in full recognition of their potential impact upon the domestic textile industry, especially in view of the expansion of textile capacity abroad. It recommended more realistic interpretation of the peril-point provision of the Trade Agreements Act, faster action on escape clause cases brought before the Tariff Commission, and regulating the flow of foreign textiles into this country, by quotas if necessary.

TEXTILE PROMINENCE OF THE SOUTH

Approximately 1 million workers are dependent on the American textile industry for employment and annual wages of around $3 billion, with the South Atlantic States accounting for about half of the total. In value added by manufacture, these States increased their share of the national total from 38 to 47 percent in the last 10 years. North Carolina, the No. 1 textile producing State, hires 23 percent of all employees and has raised its share of the national total output from 15 to 21 percent in the past decade. The Tar Heel total of $1.1 billion is almost as great as the combined values added by textile manufacturing in the next two ranking textile States, South Carolina and Pennsylvania.

Since the Southern States and cotton have been regarded traditionally as synonymous, it may not be realized generally that the manmade fibers industry, which I represent, constitutes a major factor in the South's economic life. There are 46 plants producing these fibers in the South, shipping $1¼ billion of products annually and employing over 60,000 people with an annual payroll in excess of $250 million. Our industry purchases over $500 million worth of materials, mainly pulp and chemicals, which also are among the South's major industries.

The great bulk of American Viscose Corp. production is concentrated in the South, with our largest rayon plants being at Nitro, W. Va., and Front Royal, Va., and our largest cellophane plant at Fredericksburg, Va. The nylon plant of Chemstrand Corp., which we jointly own with Monsanto Chemical Co., is at Pensacola, Fla., and the Chemstrand acrilan plant at Decatur, Ala. Another nylon plant is planned for Greenwood, S.C.

All of the foregoing adds up to the unmistakable fact that the South generally and North Carolina particularly have a very important stake in what happens to our domestic fiber and textile industries, and in seeing that their products and workers are not to be engulfed in a flood of imports from low-wage foreign countries. And I say "flood of imports" deliberately in the face of what is actually happening in many areas. Let's take rayon stable, for example, the product made at our Nitro and Front Royal plants. Foreign suppliers shipped a whopping 83 million pounds into this country in 1958 and the final record for 1959 will exceed 115 million pounds or a gain of 40 percent. That means the equivalent output of two average-sized American plants and the jobs that are involved. It means also that imports have already taken 25 percent of the domestic market, and Government has turned a deaf ear to our plea for relief.

IMPORTS A MAJOR THREAT

One of the textile trade associations has listed the three major threats to production, employment and prices in this country as: (1) cotton manufactures from Hong Kong, (2) woolen and worsted fabrics from Japan and Italy, and (3) manmade fiber fabrics and low-cost manmade fiber from Europe and Japan. Imports of woolen and worsted fabrics, it estimates, supplied 11 percent of the domestic market for apparel fabrics in 1959 in comparison with 3½ percent in 1950. The United Kingdom had traditionally supplied the bulk of this import trade, but last year the greatly enlarged foreign share was divided about evenly three ways between England and the still lower wage sources, Italy and Japan.

U.S. imports of cotton textile yardage and garments from Hong Kong rose so sharply in

1959 as to constitute almost 80 percent of the tremendous 248 million yard total in the Japanese self-enforced quota of shipments to the United States. Man-made fiber manufactures also have been rising sharply from these low-cost areas, Japan having shipped us 3.8 million pounds of fabrics and knit apparel in 1958 and a thumping 11 million pounds, or nearly three times as much in 1959.

This alarming flood of imports is by no means confined to textiles. It is a too general phenomenon. The devastating effect on specific industries or products is too often lost in general statistics on imports relative to total consumption. Passenger auto imports, for instance, increased from 259,000 vehicles in 1957 to 433,000 in 1958 and to 668,000 or 10 percent of our domestic market in 1959. At the same time, U.S. passenger car exports were declining from 142,000 in 1957 to 122,000 in 1958 and a mere 104,000 in 1959.

Similarly, U.S. imports of foreign steel and manufactures have risen from 1.2 million tons in 1957 to 1.5 million in 1958 and, abetted by our steel strike, spurted to 4.4 million tons in 1959. During the same interval, U.S. exports dropped steadily from 5.2 million tons in 1957 to 2.7 million in 1958 and to a meager 1.5 million in 1959. Imports are supplying an estimated 55 percent of the domestic market for barbed wire, 38 percent of nails and staples, and 27 percent of concrete reinforcing bars, to illustrate the impact on individual items.

That impressive story of the inroads of imports on American markets, often with concurrent losses of exports, could be extended much farther if time permitted. We might mention just one more trade where American products and jobs are being displaced by imports from a low-wage country, that is, radio apparatus and parts, primarily from Japan. Here imports rose from $3 million in 1955 to $28 million in 1958 and to $73 million in 1959.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OUTMODED

I have spent my entire business life in the textile industry, and with my roots deep in North Carolina soil. No one has ever had cause to believe me to be a "reactionary, conservative protectionist," the epithet commonly applied by the international do-gooders to anyone who dares to speak in behalf of American industry and jobs when they are threatened by foreign competition. I am impelled, however, to talk to you frankly about the serious problems confronting our country from our foreign policies, particularly as exemplified in the Trade Agreements Act. America needs some critical soul searching on this vital issue.

Congressman DORN of South Carolina was the first southern Congressman to vote against the Trade Agreements Act (1953), but he has seen an increasing number of colleagues from the traditionally free-trade South awaken to the dangers inherent in continuing that course.

I do not intend to thump the tub of wage disparities, the well-known fact that wage rates in the United States are 10 times those prevailing in Japan and 3 or 4 times those paid in Europe. There is no need to repeat to this audience the fact that United States tariffs have been reduced about 75 percent in 25 years to the point where they are among the lowest of any major industrial nation. I am sure, also, that you who have tried to export North Carolina textiles are well aware of the fact that most foreign countries have invoked widely protectionist measures little known or used in the United States—such as quotas or even embargoes, exchange restrictions, import licenses and so on. A Ford car, for example, costing around $3,600 in the United States, is delivered for about $8,000 in England, $8,200 in France, and $5,800 in Italy, because of duties, taxes, and surcharges imposed by those countries.

The Trade Agreements Act, first advocated by Cordell Hull, has never been titled "reciprocal" except by the freetraders who want to give the impression that America is obtaining payment in kind for its tariff reductions. The United States has not obtained reciprocal benefits from the actual operation of the act, and now after 25 years the generosity of Uncle Sam has brought us to the point where imports are increasing while exports decline and where indeed we need a complete new approach, possibly even a protectionist approach.

Recently, with urging by our own State Department, a number of foreign countries have got religion with respect to their exclusion of American products, but despite much ballyhoo the signs of repentance unto good works have been doubtful. This move came only after the plight of the United States from an imbalance of international payments forced a token threat to foreign countries enjoying increasingly easy access to our market while practicing protectionism at home and thereby rebuilding their own economies.

"BUY AMERICAN" RESURGENCE

That threat consisted of the decision of the Development Loan Fund to insist on a "buy American" policy for foreign recipients of our loans. To understand the extreme significance of that decision, you must recognize that our foreign policy is shaped essentially by the Department of State, which vigorously opposes the "buy American" policy of requiring our economic aid, grants or gratuities to be spent for American goods or services. Instead, it strongly favors worldwide procurement in expenditure of such funds.

Realizing that background, you can understand just how critical is the fiscal situation of the United States which enabled Treasury Secretary Anderson to force even this limited "buy American" policy, when the directors of the affected Development Loan Fund include the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs (Dillon) and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, who answers to the Secretary of State.

The trend of increasing imports on top of declining exports had accentuated the net deficit of $3.4 billion in our international balance of payments in 1958 and a $3.8 billion deficit in 1959. The net result is a genuine threat to the fiscal stability of the United States, possibly even to the gold standard, and certainly to confidence in our position of leadership among the free nations of the world. Hence, the unusual decision that development loans must be expended in this country and the rash of promises to relax restrictions on U.S. exports.

The State Department opposition to "Buy American" is almost as strong as we might expect to emanate from selfishly interested foreign state departments, so stout in fact that immediately after public announcement of the Development Loan Fund decision, numerous State Department spokesmen, including the Secretary of State, took every opportunity to assure all and sundry how limited ($400–$500 million per year, DLF estimate) the effect would be and how unlikely that this policy would be extended to our other far more substantial ($1½ billion plus for ICA, etc.) foreign aid or grants. Now all of this is simply to point up to you how formidable is the opposition that American industry faces within our own Federal Government on any question involving foreign competition.

GATT ACCENTUATES IMPORT BURDEN

As we move into the 1960's this problem of import competition is certain to plague us more and more. GATT negotiations are already scheduled for later this year and in 1961, under the 1958 extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which can reduce American tariffs another 20 percent. As far as textiles are concerned, the Pastore committee of the Senate affirmed the loss of 717 textile mills and the displacement of nearly 200,000 employees from 1946 to 1957, and has concluded that the textile industry is substantially affected by import competition.

It is painfully demonstrable that foreign textiles are not kept from the American market by presently existing duties, but rather that imports are rising generally and in specific cases threatening to get out of hand, as with Japanese and Hong Kong textiles and apparel. Under those circumstances there is no reasonable justification for reducing duties further. A delegation of prominent textile officials has impressed that fact upon the President, requesting an indefinite moratorium on textile duty reductions. May I suggest that you who are concerned for the future of the American textile industry consider using your influence to the same effect.

The first line of defense for American industry against import competition is, of course, efficient, economical production and effective merchandising. But there are many postwar industries throughout the world which vie with our technological progress and, in addition, benefit from sharply lower labor costs. Among these are Germany and Japan, whose manufacturing operations average hourly earnings of 56 cents and 22 cents, respectively, compared with $2.23 an hour in the United States, underwritten by our Fair Labor Standards Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

On this score the Pastore committee noted that "however efficient American mills might be, they are unable to undersell manufactures in other countries where labor standards and wage rates are so far below American levels. Both textile management and textile labor agreed that if textile labor standards are to be protected"—and you and I know they will be—"control must be exercised over the flow of foreign textile products into this country."

American capital is mobile. It can and has located plants abroad. To the extent that it does, however, American jobs and income are being exported, because of the comparative immobility of labor. I suppose it would be possible to contemplate America becoming simply a nation of distributors of foreign merchandise, but perish the thought. Rather than falling in line behind the pied pipers of our free trade foreign policy, each one of us as consumers ought to consider carefully what that proferred imported bargain may mean in loss of American jobs and income. Consider, if you will, that it is the high level of wages in American industry, not the wages of the service trades, that supports the high standard of living in the United States.

The decision of the Development Loan Fund is symptomatic of the serious crisis in our international policies, of the risk to our fiscal stability and to our leadership of the free world. America has indeed been the arsenal of the free world. It cannot dissipate the strength of its production industries and remain that bulwark of human freedom and democracy. We are sorely in need of an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign trade and aid policies. That is vital to the future of the textile industry in America—which is so important to North Carolina, to the South, and to the entire American economy.

It is indispensable if we are to maintain the United States of America as "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Save Our River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of March 30, 1960, printed a letter to the editor from F. S. Wilson entitled "Save Our River." I do not know Mr. Wilson, but I think all true conservationists should be interested in what he wrote. For this reason I want to insert it in the RECORD following my remarks.

We have spent billions of dollars in this country building huge mainstem dams on our rivers. This has been done in the name of conservation. The people and organizations backing these big dams claim to be conservationists—but are they? A true conservationist will not unnecessarily sacrifice one irreplaceable natural resource in order to develop another or wastefully spend Federal funds that could be more gainfully employed in a sounder method of preserving our resources.

Water and land are our two greatest irreplaceable resources. The conservation of both is essential to our national economy. Promiscuous construction of large mainstem dams, however, is not the answer to conservation of either.

To conserve both land and water we should start by retaining the raindrop as near as possible where it falls. This is accomplished best in two primary stages. The first stage entails contouring, sodding, and reforestation of the land. This stage will not always retain all the water, so a second stage should be construction of smaller temporary retention reservoirs where necessary in the upper reaches of the watershed. These first two methods of attack will retard runoff and greatly reduce erosion of the soil. This is of extreme importance because of the many years it takes to build up even a quarter of an inch of topsoil. It is also very important because it builds up our ground water supply which in many cases is becoming critical.

After the potential of the first two stages has been exploited, it may still be necessary to construct some dams on the mainstem of our rivers for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and other water uses. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no engineer, irrespective of his ability, who can tell us with any degree of accuracy, how many mainstem dams we need, what size they should be, or where they should be located until we have utilized the potential of stages one and two.

Our so-called planners have put the buggy before the horse. They wanted to build large dams. The less spectacular approach of preserving our soil and construction of small dams in the upper reaches of the watershed has not appealed to them. Often the construction of large dams has actually depleted both our land and water supply. Construction of large reservoirs frequently inundates some of our most fertile lands permanently. This forever deprives us of the use of these lands for production. The Tennessee Valley is a good example of this. In the name of flood control it permanently flooded more land than was ever subjected to infrequent floods.

While we build big dams, flooding valuable land, we let our reservoirs gradually fill up with irreplaceable topsoil because we have not protected our watersheds. In talking about the conservation of water we also forget that ground water and water flowing in our streambeds from return ground water does not evaporate like it does from the surface of our large reservoirs. We can actually develop storage on rivers to the extent that we lose more water from evaporation than we conserve.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that those in charge of our conservation programs and those pseudoconservationists, both individuals and organizations, who are so vociferous in their demands for big dam construction are more interested in other things than they are in true conservation. Read the releases of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers and see how many times they point with pride to their developments as being the biggest this and biggest that. A committee of the Congress visits Russia and comes back with the report that the Russians are building a bigger dam or hydroelectric plant than we have over here. Immediately, certain elements in this country begin the cry that we have to start a crash program of more and larger dams over here in order to keep ahead of them. It seems to make no difference whether the dams are needed, whether they are economic or what other resources they may destroy, just so they are bigger and there are more of them.

Even some otherwise conservative businessmen may want a big dam—not in your or my area but in theirs—if it will drop a big payroll in their trading territory.

Probably the most ardent supporters of the big dam are the Government power advocates. They want the Government to build more hydroelectric developments, irrespective of the need for power in the area or regardless of economic feasibility, so long as it will supply their tax-exempt distributors with some federally subsidized power. And they use every subterfuge in the book to get the Government involved—navigation, flood control, irrigation, and all the rest.

Mr. Speaker, we have our bureaucrats wanting to build something spectacular; our businessmen wanting a big Government payroll dumped in their backyard; and the public power crowd wanting more Federal subsidy—so the big dam program goes on in the name of conservation while true conservation takes a back seat. We can go ahead spending ourselves into bankruptcy on plans guided more by selfishness than by accomplishment.

It is too bad that we do not have more unselfish, intelligent people in this country taking an active interest in our conservation program.

The letter follows:

SAVE OUR RIVER

I was glad to see your March 24 editorial, "Save Our River," and I am sorry this is not one of the items I see in your "50 Years Ago in the Star." It is too late now to save "our river." I should like to quote as pertinent some extracts from "Road to Survival," an alarming and well-authenticated book published by William Vogt, an expert on conservation and wastage of natural resources, with a preface by Bernard Baruch. This is pertinent to your appeal to the Army Engineers.

"Effective conservation has been made impossible, in many parts of the world, by man's failure to recognize the indispensability of scientific treatment. When a man is sick, he goes to a highly trained general practitioner who may send him to a specialist. A sick river valley is vastly more complicated than a sick man. In some parts of the world the sick valley may be subjected to the blundering management of a lawyer. In the United States we are likely to turn it over to an Army engineer. Is it any wonder that flood peaks are steadily rising?

"It [elementalistic thinking] is partly responsible for the antics of such people as Army engineers, who seem literally incapable of understanding the necessity of beginning flood-control work on the hilltops.

"To reduce temporary floods by building a series of dams that would permanently submerge some of the richest land in the world—the project of the U.S. Army Engineers—would seem to compound the foolishness. We can no longer afford to waste fertile fields beneath hydroelectric reservoirs. We do not have enough good land to meet current needs.

"In the southeastern part of the United States 13 costly major reservoirs have been filled to the top of the dam with the products of erosion over an average of less than 30 years. Engineers have not found an economical method for cleaning a reservoir once it is filled with sand and mud. * * * During the past 100 years the Potomac River has carried more than half a billion tons of soil past Washington. * * * Small wonder that the deep harbor into which came ocean-going ships from the seven seas has filled with silt and is now the site of the Lincoln Memorial.

"An especial danger is that the Engineers will be turned loose before adequate studies have been made. To locate dams without them—as the Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation have been doing—seems like irresponsible abuse of both the land and the taxpayer."

In view of these statements, it appears that the plan to build big dams and pools north of Washington is going to be much less effective in the long run than reforestation of denuded slopes. And most certainly, in view of past failures, any plan of the Army Engineers should be scrutinized by scientists with broader backgrounds than the engineers have.

F. S. WILSON.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Are We Shadowboxing With Competition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein, in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, before the annual banquet of the Mayflower Warehousemen's Association, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Saturday evening, March 19, 1960.

Mr. Johnston is one of our foremost and most enlightened business executives and he has consistently presented in his public addresses a balanced analysis of our national problems.

The address follows:

ARE WE SHADOWBOXING WITH COMPETITION?

It is a pleasure to be here with you this evening, to welcome the Mayflower Warehousemen's Association to our Nation's Capital, the greatest warehouse of the free world. For Washington these days is not merely the legislative center of the United States. It is also a gathering place for the free world's loftiest dreams and aspirations.

There is no catalog that could possibly cover everything you'll find in this remarkable city—the treasures of our Government in our National Archives Building, the storehouse of Western civilization in our Smithsonian Institution, the broad vistas of man's communications in our Library of Congress, the voices of all nations in the embassies lining our broad avenues.

There is so much to see here, so many points of view represented, that it's no wonder many a visitor is at times dismayed, at times overawed.

Our taxi drivers are perhaps the only ones who can really find their way around town. Not long ago, one of these masters of transport felt a tap on his shoulder. His passenger, pointing toward the Archives Building, read aloud the legend that appears there.

The legend says: "What Is Past Is Prologue."

"What's that 'goobledygook'?" the stranger asked.

"That's easy," the taxi driver replied. "What that means is, 'You ain't seen nothin' yet.'"

With this doctrine, I am heartily in accord. It is this promise that animates, inspires, and drives our American dream, that puts us in orbit as compelling among living men as any orbit possible in lifeless space.

But there's another aspect to America. Sometimes there are periods of indecision, of self-doubt, of rigid and alarmist thinking. Some think we are in one of these moments now. There is certainly a good deal of whimpering and howling going on.

But I trust we shall escape the fate of that businessman—perhaps he was a warehousemen—who found time for a vacation a few years ago. His favorite diversion was hunting. He went south to a recommended hunting lodge, hired a recommended hunting dog for $5, and went into the fields.

The dog turned out to be a champion. The businessman soon had his full bag of game and went home in high spirits.

The following year, the businessman returned to the lodge and asked to hire the same dog again. "Oh, that's the dog we call 'rugged individualism,'" said the hound's owner. "He rents for $10 now."

The hunter agreed to the price. He went into the fields and the dog once again proved himself superb.

Next hunting season, he was back again, asking for "rugged individualism." "Oh," said his owner, "we call him 'private enterprise' now. And he rents for $20."

The businessman paid up quietly because he wanted to be sure of catching his game. And once more the dog behaved splendidly.

Then another year came. Again the merchant looked up his hunting companion. But this time the hound's owner was despondent.

"Oh, you don't want that old dog any more," he said. "He's ruined and it's your fault. You overpaid him. Last spring we renamed him 'Affluent Society'—and now he just sits on his haunches and howls."

Well, as I noted, there's considerable howling these days—about real problems that confront our society—and about fancied and frenzied problems that are conjured up out of nothing.

We must distinguish between them, between the substance and the shadow of our national challenge.

Tonight I want to discuss competition—to try to distinguish between the shadow and substance of what is truly one of the underlying problems of America today.

The competition I shall discuss is not economic competition within the United States. It is the competition of nations within the Western World.

At stake in this struggle is the economic soundness and stability of the whole free world. For if there is one thing certain on this changing globe, it is that the West must be strong enough to discourage the Communist powers from embarking on any foolish or hazardous adventures.

In this capital of light industry and heavy thinking, there is today considerable stirring in the economic fraternity. Some of this thinking takes rather sharp exception to the conventional view of affairs among our people—the pleasing view that we are now embarked on the soaring sixties, the surging sixties, the all-satisfying and stupendous sixties.

This conventional and easy view of our future sees ours as an ever-expanding economy—with more production, more consumption, more abundance, more everything for everybody.

But not all economists wear such rosy-tinted glasses. As these gloomier prophets look at the economic horizon, they see some serious dangers ahead for the United States. As they foreshadow it, we may be headed not for the soaring but perhaps for the slumping sixties.

And what is it that they see?

They see three principal signs of danger, three trends which can greatly damage our American economy.

I should like to discuss these trends with you, for I most certainly share the view that they can be perilous unless we recognize them, understand them, and take purposeful steps to head off their dangers.

Let me summarize these three trends in this way:

The first is that with skyrocketing costs we shall price ourselves out of world markets.

The second is the hazardous outflowing of our gold and our dollars. This is the dollar gap, the deficit in our international trading balance with other countries.

The third is the instability of commodity prices on which the lesser developed countries depend for their economic health. Anything that undercuts the economic base of these countries inevitably affects us, the entire Western World, and invites raids and depredations from Soviet Russia and Red China.

These are all mouth-filling pronouncements. They might sound fascinating in a school of advanced economics. But what business have I in intruding them on you on such a pleasant evening?

I do it because every businessman, every citizen of America, man and woman, can have their lives and their livelihoods altered and disrupted by these economic manifestations of costs and dollar gaps and commodity prices.

So let me discuss these three trends in a little more detail.

FIRST, PRICING OURSELVES OUT OF WORLD MARKETS

What we're really talking about here is productivity, another one of those mouth-filling words the economists love to bandy about. And what does it mean? The measure of productivity is simply this: how much one man produces in 1 hour.

As we all know, the way to keep costs and prices within reasonable bounds is to increase productivity, the output per man per hour.

In productivity, we've always been the world's champion. We gave the world the assembly line. We have constantly invented and developed new tools and techniques to improve our efficiency. A revolutionary machine was barely installed in a plant before its successor was on someone's drafting board somewhere.

This quest for productive efficiency gave us an unmatched position for decades. It meant we could produce in vast volume and bring to the people of America greater benefits than man has ever known.

But now it is no longer true that we occupy the pinnacle alone. Others are coming up. Our productivity today is not increasing at the same rate as it is in some of the other industrial nations of the Western World.

And what has been the result? The result is that other nations have been able to cut into international markets where we were formerly preeminent. This is most noticeably true in manufacturing.

I'm not bemoaning competition. I'm not lamenting the fact that Britain and Germany, France and Italy and Japan are increasing their exports. I don't envy the other fellow.

But what I do say is that we need to look inward to ourselves. If we are in danger of pricing ourselves out of world markets, it's our own fault and we can't pass the buck to anybody.

What do we do about it?

I won't elaborate, but I would like to suggest some things we should avoid doing and some things I think we should do.

The worst thing to do would be to try to create an economic Fortress America by raising tariffs and by placing barriers against our foreign competitors. In the long run, that's the surest way to sap our economy, not to strengthen it.

The things that we should do must be basically the constructive actions of labor and management, of private initiative, of private enterprise in America.

Labor may think it is feathering its own nest when it engages in featherbedding. But featherbedding always makes an economy less efficient, not more efficient. And in that process, labor itself is victimized.

The great labor unions of America should welcome and assist in the introduction of new techniques, new machines, of automation in all of its potentials. Our economy has always taught this lesson: That machines don't do away with jobs, they create more jobs.

The unions, in cooperation with Government and with management, should encourage their members to acquire the skills that our scientific and technical advances require today. This is the way to get ready for new jobs that new machines create. The unions have the stature and the ability to participate in this joint effort. They must recognize that you don't go forward by looking backward.

And labor should also exercise statesmanship in gearing its demands for wage increases to the rate of increased productivity. This is the only sound basis for increased wages. It would be a powerful brake on inflation, which is the greatest robber of the weekly pay envelope. And it would assure our ability to compete on even terms in the international marketplace, to compete successfully throughout the world.

Management, too, needs to snap out of old-fashioned, outmoded, encrusted thinking. Too much management thinking today centers on ways to restrict markets, to fence in and limit competition. The emphasis should be on opening up markets and fostering competition.

If labor is guilty of featherbedding, management is guilty of destructive practices too. One is nepotism—padding the payroll with your next of kin. Others are devices enabling managers to perpetuate themselves in office beyond their creative usefulness, devices that are responsive neither to the will of the stockholders nor to the needs of the Nation.

Management should have more faith in itself and in America. There should be more farsighted planning.

Above all, management should constantly invest more and more in facilities to expand production. And it should stand on its own two feet and break the habit of running to Government for handouts and subsidies and special protection. Why, some of our businessmen who talk the loudest about free enterprise are among those most frequently seen in the corridors and lobbies of Washington.

I know it's easy to say what's wrong and what should be done about it. But I also know that without a new frame of mind, a new attitude on the part of both labor and of management, there is a serious danger that the economists may be right—that we may indeed be pricing ourselves out of the world market.

Rich as we are, powerful as we are, America can't live in the world without a substantial and increasing foreign trade. Today, management and labor still have a chance to carry this forward. Tomorrow may be too late.

Tomorrow, the people of America may call on the Government to step in, and once in, Government will never again be disentangled from a position of decisive influence and control over American industry and over American labor.

This is what is likely to come to pass if we are content merely to shadowbox with competition, instead of truly engaging in competition. Competition may be a hard taskmaster. But its rewards are unlimited.

Now for the second danger—the hazardous outflow of our gold and dollars.

A wise economist-statesman once said: "The American dollar is the sun of the solar system of our world economies. If the sun should explode, or shift in the heavens, the whole order of things would be violently changed."

There has been no explosion so far. But the dollar has been slipping away from our shores. In the last 2 years, it has been flowing out at the rate of $3½ billion to $4 billion a year.

We have a vast amount of gold stored in Fort Knox. But even that glistening pile is not inexhaustible.

Why have we been losing dollars abroad? A quick review of recent history will cast some light.

Fourteen years ago, Europe came out of the war prostrate, flat on its back. Two jobs needed to be done. One was immediate repair and rehabilitation. The other was long-range reconstruction. America stepped in to do both jobs. Since the war, we have poured tens of billions of dollars into Europe.

But Europe still needed something else. Following the war and in the early days of rehabilitation, communism swept over the continent. It almost engulfed two or three of the Western countries.

The danger was not merely internal. The Soviet Union, a reawakening giant, tightened its grip on Eastern Europe and threatened the West from the outside.

Again we stood beside Europe. We helped to build that sturdy defense shield, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and into this effort we have poured additional tens of billions of dollars.

It was not just humanitarianism that motivated us in these tasks, although this was a significant factor. Our self-interest also demanded it. A weak and defenseless Europe would surely have become a communized Europe. And a Communist power on the opposite shores of the Atlantic, like a Nazi power earlier, would have threatened our security and our whole future.

During this period, in order to build their internal economic strength, many of the countries of Europe adopted tariffs and barriers to the importation of products from the outside. This particularly affected American products.

After all these years, with our help and with heroic efforts of its own, Europe has more than recovered. It is now prosperous.

Yet many of the restrictive measures that might have been justified when Europe was weak are still retained. And our foreign trade suffers as it tries to scale these barriers.

In America, we have followed a different course. We have been lowering our tariffs, our trade restrictions. Consequently, the industrial nations have been steadily increasing their exports to the United States.

To sum up, these are the two main reasons for the dollar gap, our heavy expenditures and investments overseas, and the failure of our exports to redress the balance.

Our economic and financial assistance has not been confined to the industrial nations of the West. We have also been spending vast sums in the underdeveloped countries. This is a load we have shouldered thus far almost alone.

As I said earlier, there has been no explosion yet in our economic solar system spinning around the dollar.

But isn't it palpably obivous that the outflow of our gold and dollars can't go on forever? It must be eased and reasonably soon.

I think it is time to call upon our partners in the West to do two things:

First, we should call on them to dig deeply into their own funds to share with us the burden of providing adequate aid and assistance to the underdeveloped nations. The stability of these countries is no less important to our Western industrialized partners than it is to us. Our partners are capable of taking a full share of this responsibility. It is time they do so.

And, second, we should call on our Western partners to tear down the whole tangled web of tariffs and duties and restrictions and limitations that have been built up against exports from the United States. They are no longer justifiable. They are no longer excusable.

We should all set as our ultimate goal the transforming of the Western community into a large-scale free trading unit—an Atlantic common market.

And now for the third danger facing our economy—the instability of those countries which rely on the export of raw materials for their economic life.

In this economic arena, I'm referring not merely to the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia, but also to some long-established countries, especially in Latin America.

In many of these lands, the price of one product or one commodity determines the economic stability of the whole country.

Let me name a few.

In Brazil, there's coffee. If the price of coffee in the United States falls by 1 cent a pound, it means the loss of many millions of dollars to Brazil. In smaller Ecuador, the loss is $8 million if the price in America drops by 1 cent.

There is Chile, where the price of copper in the world market spells the difference between prosperity and economic distress, between large scale employment and massive unemployment.

The story repeats itself all over the globe, along the whole great tier of countries that lie athwart or below the equator—from Asia through Africa to South America.

With their unbalanced economies, these nations have largely become pawns with little control over their fortunes on the international chess board.

Why is it a danger to the United States when Brazil loses millions on the price of coffee, or Bolivia on the price of tin, or Malaya on the price of rubber, or Pakistan on the price of hemp?

These distant events endanger us on two scores.

They endanger us because we are rapidly exhausting our domestic source of many raw materials. We need the raw materials of these countries to keep our own industrial plant going.

And they also endanger our security. We can't afford to let these countries collapse. If they should collapse, Soviet Russia is all too ready and eager to pick up the pieces.

Is there anything we can do about it? Yes, plenty.

Over the long term, together with the other industrialized nations, we need to extend the fullest possible assistance, skills, and know-how to these nations, helping them to move from a one-crop or one-product economy to an advanced and many-faceted economy.

For the shorter term—and this needs our immediate attention—our country should take the leadership in initiating international conferences to develop programs to stabilize raw commodity prices in the world market.

This has pitfalls and manifold difficulties. But it can be done. And when it is done, it can be the best bulwark to stave off Communist encroachments while the countries have an opportunity to develop rounded, balanced, and self-sustaining economies.

I have tried to sketch for you what some economists call our three deadly perils.

I've also sketched some ways in which I think we can overcome and dissipate these perils in the months and years ahead.

But of this we may be quite sure. These dangers won't vanish merely by wishing them away. And they won't vanish by being smothered in the complacency of a so-called affluent society—because an affluent society today can become a has-been society tomorrow.

This has happened before to complacent societies. And there is no reason to think it can't happen again.

If I were to assess these three deadly perils in terms of our country as I know it, I would say that the economists are too pessimistic. They are operating on the theory that America can't rouse itself and face up to sacrifices and difficulties, however necessary they may be.

But this is not the America I know. Nor do I think it is the America that any of you here would recognize and be proud to call your native country.

In a sense, I suppose there's always a need for pessimists in the world. They serve a useful purpose. They are the ones who keep nagging at our coattails to alert us to the open manhole around the next corner. And, besides, if there were no pessimists, how would you recognize their opposite number, the optimists, the believers, who always lead us to victories?

We have a choice today, a very clear choice. We can sit down like the hound dog and howl to our heart's content. Or we can set off again up the rugged trail that has always beckoned Americans in the past, the trail that leads up through difficulties and hardships to the stars.

Being an American, I know the choice we will make.

First Run of the Pony Express Reenacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a very fine article by Gary Chilcote in the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette describes the events in St. Joseph as its citizens celebrated the 100th anniversary of the pony express.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Chilcote:

THOUSANDS CHEER AS PONY EXPRESS RELAY HEADS FOR SALT LAKE

The pony express came to life yesterday while thousands of Midland Empire residents cheered the reenactment of the start of the enterprise 100 years ago.

The departure of the first rider, Lee Shifflett, Wathena, Kans., climaxed the colorful ceremony held at the Pony Express Museum under clear skies and bright, warming sunshine.

The celebration was reenacted exactly 100 years from the day the first pony express rider galloped toward California. Signaling the start of yesterday's ride was a cannon roar at 1:45 and a slap of the horse by the mayor just as was done on April 3, 1860.

Traffic Sgt. Tom Farmer estimated the crowd at 7,500. Traffic was heavy in the vicinity of Patee Park and sheriff's deputies assisted in keeping the street open.

Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL, who addressed the crowd just prior to the start of the rerun, reminded his listeners of the stirring scene which took place there a century earlier, an important drama in the development of America.

"A young man—it matters not whether Johnny Fry or Billy Richardson or Alex Carlyle—mounted his horse and galloped off through the gathering darkness on the first leg of a perilous journey which today symbolizes the 'winning of the West,'" Congressman HULL stated.

"It is not difficult for us to recapture the excitement and significance of that day. As we retell and reenact the events of 100 years ago, we share in its color and drama."

Congressman HULL closed his talk by pointing out that St. Joseph was the birthplace of a great episode of American history, and recommended that the city dedicate itself to the job of carrying forward, with similiar courage and enterprise the American goals so nobly served by the pony express.

The Sixth District representative was introduced by Mayor Arthur J. Meers, who assumed the role of 1860 Mayor M. Jeff Thompson. He delivered a talk which was given by the controversial mayor at the start of the pony express.

Missouri's Gov. James T. Blair also took part in the centennial observance along with other dignitaries.

"This is a great day for the residents of St. Joseph," Governor Blair said. "I am very pleased to be here for the celebration, and offer my sincere congratulations to all those sponsoring the event."

Kansas Gov. George Docking, who was present with his wife and Mr. and Mrs. Gene Sullivan, formerly of St. Joseph, also spoke briefly to the crowd in front of the restored pony express stables.

Master of Ceremonies Richard Hope gave a brief history of the restoration of the pony stables.

Earlier in the day, several hundred persons filled Penn Street in front of the stables to observe the religious services. The Reverend Cecil Franks, pastor of Patee Park Baptist Church, conducted the service, with Mayor Arthur Meers handing out souvenir Bibles to the 70 riders who made the rerun westward. Both the Reverend Mr. Franks and Mayor Meers were dressed in 1860 style for the celebration.

"Today, as in the days of the Pony Express, we depend upon prayer to help us in our daily living," the minister said. "You can be sure the Pony Express riders of 100 years ago turned to prayer when they encountered troubles on their rides."

A chuck-wagon breakfast followed the religious services, with noon activities focusing on a Burlington Railroad exhibit of an 1860 type locomotive and replica of the first mail car placed into use here in 1862.

The train was located just a block from the museum at Eighth and Olive Streets, and attracted thousands of visitors during its 2-day display.

On hand to add color to the event were Indians from the Iowa Tribe headed by Chief Frank Dupee. The Indians performed dances and songs after the first rider left the stables. Other "Indians," really members of a local riding club, carried out a mock chase on South Ninth Street as Lee Shifflett rode toward the Pony Express Bridge.

A band concert featuring western melodies was played by the Central High School Band.

Better Try Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Better Try Again" from the Plainfield Messenger, Inc., of Plainfield, Ind., and written by Mrs. Ellen C. Curtis, editor, dated January 21, 1960, as follows:

With Congress in session again, World War I veterans are bringing some facts before them which they hope will be sufficient to get a pension bill on the statutes which will give these aging members of our citizenry a little compensation for the service which they rendered in the 1917–18 war. Ten thousand of them are dying every month—360 every day, 15 every hour, 1 every 4 minutes.

It is high time that the Government begin easing the last few months, days, hours, and minutes of this vanishing army, which performed so gloriously at Chateau-Thiery, Bellau Woods, Mt. Faulcon, in the Muese Argonne and on other fronts in those days 43 years ago. These men are now from 60 to 75 years of age and have never had any financial recognition for their services.

Strange as it may seem, veterans of World War II and Korean war, who have had so much from the Government, are foes of a plan to pension the World War I veterans because of the prohibitive cost. We'd like to ask just one question: Who has been paying the cost of their education, their pensions, their GI loans and other benefits? If you stop to think, you'll realize it has been for the most part, the veterans of World War I.

With the death rate among the World War I veterans as high as it is today, the cost of pensioning them will go down about 6 percent the first, 12 percent the second, and therefore by 1976 only 6 percent of these men will be living and the cost of the proposed pension will have been reduced by 95 percent.

Barracks No. 1178, Brazil, through its commander, Harold E. Stearley, is doing everything in its power to bring the matter before the attention of the present Congress. Every veteran of 1917 should write his Congressman urging support of a pension bill for the long-forgotten men of World War I.

Centennial of the Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. Joseph, Mo., celebrated the centennial of the pony express, one of the dramatic chapters in American history, on April 3.

It was a fitting celebration of a date—April 3, 1860—about which there is no dispute. On that day 100 years ago, a rider left St. Joseph on the first leg of a journey which, along with subsequent pony express odyssies, made a substantial contribution toward the winning of the West.

It is to be regarded as regrettable that there has been a controversy this year as to the date on which the pony express centennial should be celebrated. The city of St. Joseph, which was the point of origin of the pony express and its headquarters, has had its observance on the historically correct date. The centennial will be observed again in July in other locales and although this is similar to celebrating Independence Day in Octo-

ber, it is nonetheless to be hoped that these events will be as successful as was the one in St. Joseph.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of delivering the principal address on the occasion of the pony express centennial in St. Joseph and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the St. Joseph News-Press which touches upon my talk but more importantly discusses the relationship between the pony express and modern-day St. Joseph:

PRIDE AND INSPIRATION

There was inspiration in the remarks of Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL at St. Joseph's salute to the pony express yesterday.

And there was inspiration for those in the crowd before the historic shrine of a boisterous era of American history in the reenactment of those events of 100 years ago.

Today, St. Joseph's centennial program is a matter of history. It joins that first day of the pony express as another date in the years and events which are America.

But, for those who make the effort to take note of the day—and there were thousands—there is a touch of pride in self and city, and added inspiration for the future which wasn't there before.

St. Joseph, a city of wealth in things historical, could well look upon events of last weekend as a lesson in such things as pride and inspiration.

Those qualities run high among the people.

And although the pony express centennial celebration was pushed by but a handful of this city's leaders, the people came through with an outpouring of participation far surpassing the expectation of anyone.

So, St. Joseph perhaps should take note. A city must be an inspiration to its residents to grow, even to survive. The material is here in abundance. If properly evaluated, its restoration and preservation properly directed and properly financed—privately or with public money—St. Joseph could become an effective tourist city—an endless inspiration to its residents and to those attracted to it.

If, however, we continue to overlook the value of our natural shrines, they will die—a little each passing day—until there may be nothing inspirational remaining for those of other generations which someday may want again to pay respects to the historical greatness of St. Joseph.

Captive Europe and the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of Congress to a statement by Senator THOMAS J. DODD which appears as the lead article in the current issue of Free World Review.

In this article, Senator DODD makes the argument that we would be on sure ground—legally, morally, and politically—if we raise the issue of the captive nations at the forthcoming summit meetings; and he argues further that this is the only way in which the West can go over from its present defensive position to a diplomatic offensive.

Because of its significance, I include the text of Senator DODD's article, entitled "Captive Europe and the Summit," in the RECORD. I believe that Senator DODD has formulated his proposal in a manner which makes it appear both logical and politically realistic.

The article follows:

CAPTIVE EUROPE AND THE SUMMIT

(By THOMAS J. DODD, U.S. Senator)

If the Western Powers continue further along the path they followed so far at Geneva, the forthcoming summit conference may very well result in a new "Munich."

On the other hand, if the Western Powers go to the summit with a clear awareness of what is at stake, the summit may yet be used as an opportunity to seize the initiative from the Kremlin and reverse the sorry trend of recent years.

As the distinguished editors of Protracted Conflict have pointed out, the cold war has thus far been conducted according to a one-sided set of rules. It has always been fought on the territory of the free world, while the territory controlled by the Communist world has been considered sacrosanct. We have fought back against Communist offensives—sometimes successfully, sometimes unsuccessfully—but we have never ourselves launched a political offensive or counter-offensive.

I fear that if we continue to adhere to this self-imposed set of rules through very many more years of cold war, the free world will be lost.

At the forthcoming summit meeting the Communists will endeavor to confine the discussion to Berlin, as they did so successfully at Geneva. If we permit them thus to limit the agenda to the territory of the free world, the conference, almost inevitably, will result in a further retreat by the West. Somehow the West must find a way of going over to the offensive. But how do we do it, and at what points?

In my opinion, the only answer to this question is—the captive nations. On this issue we are on sure ground—legally, morally, and politically.

Legally, we can point to the series of postwar covenants assuring the captive nations of the right to choose their governments in democratic elections.

Morally, we can invoke the Atlantic Charter and we can point to the overwhelming vote by which the U.N. General Assembly condemned Soviet intervention in Hungary.

Politically, there is no issue on which the Kremlin is more sensitive or more vulnerable.

There may have been a time when the Kremlin believed that it could crush the spirit of resistance in the captive nations and ultimately produce a generation of Communist robots. If they seriously entertained this illusion, the events of the past few years have certainly destroyed it. In quick succession there have been the East German uprising, the Poznan uprising, the Polish revolt against Moscovite control, the Hungarian revolution, the Tibetan revolution.

That the will to freedom which exploded so heroically in Hungary in October 1956 remains unsubdued was once again proved by the spontaneous emotional mass demonstration which greeted Vice President NIXON in Warsaw. Marguerite Higgins quoted a senior European diplomat as saying that the Warsaw demonstration convinced him that, if it came to war, the Kremlin would have to place the whole of Poland under military occupation.

In my opinion, this is a great understatement. If it came to war in Europe, the Kremlin would have to place its entire satellite empire and much of the territory of the Soviet Union under military occupation. This task alone would strain the resources of the 100 Red army divisions west of the Urals. As for the 75 satellite divisions, there is a far greater chance that they would fight on our side than that they would fight on the side of the Soviet Union.

I believe we should call Khrushchev's bluff by saying these things frankly to him. And, having done this, I believe we should place before the summit conference a package deal that calls for—

(a) Free elections under U.N. supervision in East Germany and the captive nations;

(b) Disengagement in depth on both sides of the prewar Soviet frontiers;

(c) A nuclear test ban and a substantial degree of disarmament, with adequate inspection; and

(d) Increased East-West trade, including the extension of credits.

The liberation of the captive nations, in my opinion, is the one objective for which we should be willing to pay with substantial reciprocal concessions. If the Soviets were to agree to liberation, then we could afford to offer such concessions without endangering our future security.

From the Soviet standpoint, the package deal I have outlined would have definite advantages. It would enable them to disembarrass themselves of the troublesome, rebellious captive nations under the protection of a face-saving formula. It would offer them security, disarmament, trade credits—all objectives that have figured high on their list of demands. And, in pursuing this line of argument, it might be pointed out to them—in all accuracy—that their relations with independent, non-Communist Finland have in many respects been more satisfactory than their relations with some of their satellites.

In pursuing the objective of liberation, we should use all the devices of diplomacy. We must first of all establish our strength and persuade the enemy that we are aware of his weakness. We must place him on the defensive by shifting the arena of diplomatic controversy to territory under his control. We must offer counterconcessions that are not only intrinsically valid but provide the enemy with a face-saving formula. We must show ourselves as persistent in pursuit of our goals as the enemy is in pursuit of his.

And finally, we must hold forth to the world the possibility of genuine coexistence.

(The dictionary defines imperialism as a "doctrine leading to the territorial expansion of a state or to its domination of others.")

Year	Countries	Population (thousands)	Area (square miles)
	ANNEXED OR UNDER SOVIET ADMINISTRATION		
1940	Part of Finland	450	17,600
1940	Estonia	1,122	18,300
1940	Latvia	1,951	25,400
1940	Lithuania	2,957	21,500
1945	Part of German East Prussia.	1,187	5,400
1945	Part of Poland	11,800	69,900
1945	Part of Czechoslovakia	731	4,900
1945	Part of Rumania	3,700	19,400
	Total	23,898	182,400
	CONTROLLED BY U.S.S.R.		
1945	East Germany	18,807	42,900
1945	Poland	26,500	120,355
1948	Czechoslovakia	12,340	49,381
1947	Hungary	9,750	35,902
1948	Rumania	16,100	91,584
1946	Bulgaria	7,160	42,796
1946	Albania	1,175	10,629
	Total	91,832	393,547

In all, within 8 years Moscow succeeded in extending its control over an area of 575,947 square miles with 115,730,000 inhabitants.

Only one power used the Second World War as a cover for its own territorial expansion—the Soviet Union.

Former State Senator Andrew J. Sordoni of Wilkes-Barre Honored by Wyoming Valley Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record, Thursday, April 7, 1960:

PLAQUE CITING SORDONI GIVEN LOCAL HOSPITAL—TRUSTEES' TRIBUTE SALUTES OLDEST MEMBER FOR WORK

Singular honor was paid former Senator Andrew J. Sordoni last night with the unveiling in the lounge of Wyoming Valley Hospital of a bronze plaque paying tribute to his dynamic leadership, broad vision, and great generosity.

The ceremony followed by a year the opening and dedication of Wyoming Valley Hospital's reconstructed and expanded facilities. Its reconstruction, achieved by two valley-wide general drive for funds, was done in two separate construction phases over a 5-year period. With a valuation today exceeding $1,500,000, it is one of the country's most modern hospitals in equipment and facilities. Known originally as the Wyoming Valley Homeopathic Hospital, it was founded in 1911.

The plaque was a gift to the hospital from the 19 members of the board of trustees honoring Andrew Sordoni, its oldest trustee (since 1936) and president for 16 years. The plaque bears a relief of President Sordoni and is inscribed in part: "This plaque is erected by friends who have been privileged to share in his efforts to make the hospital a center of growing service to the people of Wyoming Valley."

The unveiling was preceded by a dinner given President Sordoni in the hospital's new cafeteria. It was attended by the board of trustees and the medical staff. Judge Frank L. Pinola served as dinner and gift chairman.

Judge Pinola noted that the Sordoni Enterprises, which comprise 14 organizations, are this year observing their 50th anniversary. He said, "Senator Sordoni has instilled that same dynamic drive and enthusiasm with which he developed his business enterprises into everything he has undertaken—the Wyoming Valley Hospital stands today as an outstanding example."

Members of the board who personally contributed the plaque include David S. Davis, vice president; Eugene Goldstein, treasurer; Alexander W. Dick, secretary; Ben Badman, Jr., administrator; Senator Harold E. Flack, Thomas H. Kiley, George J. Kintz, Andrew J. Sordoni, Jr., Abe N. Soloman, Ralph Lisman, Max Roth, Judge Frank L. Pinola, Roy E. Morgan, Reuben H. Levy, L. Verne Lacy, Dr. Eugene S. Farley, Attorney Robert J. Doran, and John S. Cresko.

The plaque was made by Spencer Industries and the relief of Sordoni was executed by Gilroy Roberts, chief sculptor of the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia.

As spokesman for the hospital board, Dr. Farley, in a brief address of presentation, declared, "We join together on this occasion to honor the man whose vision, leadership, and generosity have made possible the great gains of the last 5 years of constructive effort.

"At a time when it seemed that our plans for construction were bogged down, it was Andy Sordoni who gave life to those long delayed plans. He did this by assuring substantial gifts if we, as a board and staff, would undertake to raise the balance required for completion of our plans of construction. Happily, we accepted the challenge he placed before us."

Dr. Farley continued, "Andrew Sordoni is a builder. His greatest satisfaction comes from constructive effort." Declaring Sordoni started life with few material advantages, he said, "He has always possessed other advantages. First among these, a devotion to his mother and to her memory. Second, a burning desire to accomplish something of significance. Third, vision and a driving force to attain the ends to which he set his heart. Like other successful men, he has ultimately directed his energies and resources into efforts that relate to the welfare of his neighbors and his community."

He concluded, "In presenting this plaque we are expressing our warmth of feeling for the man who held us together. We can add to his honors but little, we can add to friendships immeasurably. We thank him for the privilege of participation in his efforts to build a hospital that can render outstanding service to this and to coming generations."

Mr. Speaker, in acknowledgment, President Sordoni said:

I am humble in this honor you show me and, yet, I am proud—proud of being associated with such men as you. You can rightfully take pride in what you have done for your fellowman. Thank you for your part in making Wyoming Valley Hospital one of the finest in spirit, facilities, and accomplishment.

Courier-Journal Rated Near Top Among Nation's 1,755 Daily Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in 1 week the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., has been designated as among the country's 10 great newspapers. This is a distinction the Courier-Journal has regularly achieved over the years. In the latest survey—a private nationwide poll of publishers—the Courier-Journal rated fifth among America's top 10 daily newspapers.

When the Courier-Journal had been in existence for a period of 40 years, Henry Watterson, inspired leader of the newspaper, who had become affectionately known throughout Kentucky and the South generally as Marse Henry, gave it a new name when he wrote:

Forty years of shine and shower have passed over the good gray head of the Old Lady at the Corner.

From the time Marse Henry penned these words, the Courier-Journal has been fondly known as the Old Lady at the Corner, and it is gratifying to note that the Old Lady at the Corner is continuing in the high journalistic tradition established by one of its early leaders.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the April 11 issue entitled "Courier-Journal Rated Near Top Among Nation's 1,755 Daily Papers."

The article is as follows:

COURIER-JOURNAL RATED NEAR TOP AMONG NATION'S 1,755 DAILY PAPERS

A pleasant form of lightning has struck the Courier-Journal twice in a week.

America's top 10 daily newspapers, selected by publishers in a private nationwide poll, were announced today by New York publicist Edward L. Bernays.

The Courier-Journal was rated fifth among the 10.

If you think you say this same story last Monday you are almost right. On that day the magazine Practical English announced results of a survey conducted by Scholastic magazine. This one was among editors, and the Courier-Journal, though one notch lower, sixth, was rated relatively higher because 15 dailies were named to the list of "most superior" papers.

The Baltimore Sun, listed in a 1952 survey of publishers by Bernays, was displaced by the Los Angeles Times among this year's top 10.

VOTE PERCENTAGE FOR COURIER-JOURNAL RISES

Among the Nation's 1,755 daily newspapers the top 10 this year, as released by Bernays, were:

The New York Times.
The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
The Christian Science Monitor.
The Washington Post and Times Herald.
The Courier-Journal.
The Milwaukee Journal.
The Kansas City Star.
The Chicago Daily News.
The Los Angeles Times.
The New York Herald Tribune.

The percentage of publishers voting for the Courier-Journal had increased from 38 percent in 1952 to 39.54 percent.

The 10 leaders have a combined daily circulation of about 4 million and a combined Sunday circulation of more than 4,500,000. Confined to no one section of the country, they covered an area from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In both surveys by Bernays, publishers were asked to name the 10 papers that, in their judgment, "best live up to the ideals set forth by Joseph Pulitzer, Adolph S. Ochs, and Thomas Gibson."

SMALLER DAILIES ARE PRAISED

Pulitzer was publisher of the old New York World; Ochs, publisher of the New York Times; and Gibson, publisher of the Rocky Mountain Herald, Denver.

In announcing results of the survey, Bernays said: "An interesting and significant fact in the current survey is the frequency with which publishers pay tribute to the high standards and idealism of smaller dailies with only regional circulation.

"Time and again, respondents emphasized in personal notes that they were sure there were many other papers in the country as deserving as those that would undoubtedly rank highest in a nationwide survey simply because the big-name papers would be known to far more publishers than the smaller circulation journals."

In both the 1952 and the 1960 surveys, the following statements by Pulitzer and Ochs

were furnished the publishers as the basis for their judgment on present-day adherence to the criteria established by those famed individuals:

Pulitzer, as the salutatory of the New York World, May 10, 1883: "An institution that should always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice and corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty."

Ochs, on assuming control of the New York Times, August 18, 1896: "It will be my earnest aim that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is permissable in good society, and give it early, if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other medium. To give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interest involved; to make the columns of the New York Times a forum for the consideration of all public questions of public importance, and to that end, to invite intelligent discussion from all shades of opinion."

The Young as Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting survey paper prepared by Thomas J. Curtin, director of civic education, Massachusetts Department of Education, for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth:

THE YOUNG AS CITIZENS

(By Thomas J. Curtin)

From all sides one hears the cry that Americans need to understand the meaning of the democratic way of life if they are going to live it and be willing, if necessary, to die for it. To instill such love of democracy in our youth, we must know what democracy really means, and practice it in such a way as to inspire them.

One sign of our failure to achieve this measure of devotion was the behavior of some of our young men as prisoners of war in Korea. Maj. William E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist, has estimated that out of 4,000 POW's, one-third yielded to the brainwashing of the Chinese. An additional 13 percent were accused to crimes committed while in POW camps and were tried in court-martial. Yet our GI's were not subjected to torture. Why did so many yield?

Major Mayer believes that the effectiveness of Chinese brainwashing indicates serious weakness in the characters of these Americans and shortcomings in their education. Our American educational system failed to give first place to teaching the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. He says, "Just being well adjusted so that you can have a wonderful time in our comfortable country isn't enough."

When questioned by Major Mayer, many of these GI's said they weren't taught enough in school about the American system—our history, politics, economics. They didn't know enough about the U.S. Constitution, its guarantees of personal freedom and human rights. These things should be learned at home and at school, the major believes, and learned early.

He recommends increased attention in education to teaching what democracy is, how it operates, what its achievements are, and also admitting where it has failed—a completely realistic, honest presentation of our own system. And a similar, honest presentation of the Communist system. "Anyone who is cognizant of both," he says, "knows that our system sells itself on its merits; there is simply no comparison. If you have the facts about both, you are going to choose ours." [1]

A similar point of view is expressed by Gross and Zeleny in their book, "Educating Citizens for Democracy":

"Much has been said for and against indoctrination in American schools * * * many American educators have been afraid of the word, which seems to suggest totalitarianism. But there is nothing wrong with the idea that the democratic doctrines, beliefs, and methods are the ways for us to follow and that the Communist and other totalitarian ways are not for us. * * * essential facts about historical and contemporary types of governments should be studied and compared with ours. America will not suffer in the comparison." [2]

Some reference to pertinent information about Russia and communism are included in the bibliography at the end of this paper.[3]

Another indication of our failure to properly educate our youth for democracy is afforded by a 1947 poll of high school students which found that: 41 percent felt there was no value in sending telegrams to Congressmen; 41 percent regarded communism and fascism as the same; 46 percent were against women holding office; 57 percent agreed that the average citizens should be aloof from dirty politics; 57 percent thought democracy depends fundamentally on free business enterprise, overlooking the rights of the individual as the prime factor.[4]

Educators and youth leaders who wish to teach the meaning of democracy will find helpful information in John J. Mahoney's book, "Education for Citizenship." In this book, and before that in his "For Us the Living," he pioneered an approach to civic education which has become the basic pattern for the program of the State of Massachusetts.

These are the objectives of the Massachusetts State Department of Education civic education program:

1. A progressive approach toward that balance and maturity of individuality which is required for constructive participation in democratic society.

2. Adequate understanding of, and wholehearted allegiance to the democratic way of life.

3. Understanding of the major features of the present international situation and the problems involved in the attainment of world peace.

4. Appreciation of the rights, privileges, and protections which political democracy insures, and a deep sense of personal responsibility for making them available to all, without discrimination.

5. A keen interest in human affairs and a desire to participate effectively as a citizen in a democracy.

6. A determination to apply intelligence to personal participation in political affairs.

7. An understanding of the need for effective selections and training for political leadership and a clear appreciation of the role of leadership.

8. The will to abide by the laws and support their enforcement.

9. A grasp of the understandings and attitudes needed by citizens to make the American scheme of free enterprise work with maximum efficiency in our democratic society.

10. The earnest desire to develop and maintain intergroup understanding, respect, and good will.

11. The will to translate into civic behavior the basic [5] teachings of character education and religion.

These, then, are the kinds of behavior which mark the good citizen. A bad citizen, is characterized by the reverse, by shortages in civic behavior like: intolerance, poltical irresponsibility, lack of ethics, emotional maladjustment, and economic illiteracy.

To be effective, education must be put to use, good citizenship must be practiced. The Columbia University citizenship education project has emphasized that the skills of American citizenship, like any skills, are applied in action. They point out that effective citizenship must necessarily be active, and that it must be learned through action.[6]

It must be learned, too, in a democratic atmosphere.

THE DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL

The spirit of democracy cannot develop in an atmosphere which is undemocratic and which is dominated by people who use authoritarian procedures. This lesson was forcefully pointed out to the schools about 20 years ago when the world was acquiring a fuller understanding of the threat of totalitarianism. Democratic education was carefully analyzed in "Learning the Ways of Democracy," on the basis of how democracy was then lived in 90 American high schools. The analysis merits repetition now in the face of newer challenges to a society which has faith in its schools:

Democratic education has as its central purpose the welfare of all the people.

Democratic education serves, each individual with justice, seeking to provide equal educational opportunity for all, regardless of intelligence, race, religion, social status, economic education, or vocational plans.

Democratic education respects the basic civil liberties in practice and clarifies their meaning through study.

Democratic education is concerned for the maintenance of those economic, political, and social conditions which are necessary for the enjoyment of liberty.

Democratic education guarantees to all the members of its community the right to share in determining the purposes and policies of education.

Democratic education uses democratic methods, in classroom, administration, and student activities.

Democratic education teaches through experience that every privilege entails a corresponding duty, every authority a responsibility, every responsibility an accounting to the group which granted the privileges or authority.

Democratic education demonstrates that far-reaching changes, of both policies and procedures, can be carried out in orderly and peaceful fashion, when the decisions to make the changes have been reached by democratic means.[7]

More recently the northeastern commissioner of education emphasized the importance of the "social climate of the school" in fostering the democratic spirit when they wrote:

"If the procedures and tone of the school are essentially democratic, then our pupils are gaining experiences in and from democratic living. On the contrary, if the procedures and tone of the school are authoritarian in nature, then there may be a real conflict between the words our pupils hear

Footnotes at end of speech.

from us and the lives we force them to live in the school. Learning the ways of democracy calls for a deliberate effort to establish a social atmosphere that is essentially democratic." [8]

The school administrators of the Nation gave further support to this viewpoint by devoting a whole chapter of their 1954 yearbook, "Education for American Citizenship," to the significant role of the individual school. While recognizing the importance of programing in citizenship for an entire school system, the commission underscored the point that success or failure is realized in each individual school. Here is where citizenship is experienced. This is the setting in which critical thinking, the understanding of social values, and the practice of socially acceptable behavior can be learned. Since the individual school is, or can be, the focal meeting place of pupils, the people of the neighborhood or community, and the school personnel, it is the logical place in which to initiate and develop education in and for citizenship.

The Detroit citizenship program was organized and developed on the premise that the best way to improve civic behavior would be to encourage each of the eight participating schools to make a concerted effort in the direction of self-improvement. As a result, the specific undertaking was conducted on a "whole school" basis involving the cooperative efforts of faculty, students, parents, and the study staff. At the conclusion of the experiment, the Detroit authorities were agreed that these cooperative procedures did bring about significant changes in the citizenship education programs of the participating schools.

The final results of the Detroit citizenship education study, upon which these programs were based, is reported in Stanley Dimond's "Schools and the Development of Good Citizens." Chapter 4 presents test data of students' reaction toward democracy. As a result of these data, three major projects were developed for teaching democracy at junior and senior high school levels. The following conclusions were reached:

"Emotional appeals were successful chiefly in large group situations; they were less effective in classroom situations.

"The intellectual approach was effective when sufficient time was devoted to discussing democracy in class.

"Opportunities for democratic participation seemed inadequate, with student government needing more attention.

"Opportunity for pupils to participate in out of class and community activities was largely neglected.

"Improving mental health is an important approach to good citizenship.

"Individual teachers and schools should be careful not to overemphasize one way of teaching democracy and minimize others." [9]

Additional evidence in support of the contention that the democratic school is a prerequisite for the making of good citizens emanates from the Kansas study of education for citizenship, from which the following statement was taken:

"So far as our evidence goes, social studies work in the senior high school does not seem to have a great effect in changing attitudes. Where changes did take place it may have been the total school environment which was operating to bring them about rather than any specific instruction." [10]

EMOTIONAL HEALTH

One of the earlier reports of the Detroit study bore the title "Emotional Adjustment: A Key to Good Citizenship." The place of emotional adjustment in citizen education became so important in the minds of the study staff that they made it the major conclusion of the citizen education study.[11]

Footnotes at end of speech.

The northeastern commissioners of education, independently, arrived at a somewhat similar conclusion. The committee which developed the policy document wrote:

"A basic concern in civic education is the development of well-adjusted mature individuals. There is increasing evidence that well-adjusted boys and girls are more constructive citizens in the school, and are less likely to fall for crackpot ideas than are those boys and girls who are not adequately adjusted because of pressing, unmet, social, and emotional needs." [12]

Kenneth F. Herold in the 1951 yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies stressed the need to be concerned with emotional adjustment in order to effect better civic behavior:

"It is 'healthy to be democratic' but it also is equally true and important to remember that people have to be healthy to be democratic.

"Democratic living makes tremendous demands upon the feelings, and without the emotional stability essential to the healthy give and take of cooperative planning and action the going will be difficult.

"Finally, democratic and responsible human behavior is dedicated living. It is living for others, and to the highest level of one's own dignity and worth." [13]

Helping students to achieve emotional maturity presents a real problem for secondary school teachers who may be so concerned with their pupils' achieving subject matter mastery, significant as this is, that they sometimes overlook the need to understand their pupils. One vital factor in guiding young people into more satisfactory human relations is the necessity for teachers to understand youth as it sees itself.

UNDERSTANDING YOUTH

How does youth see itself? How is youth affected by serious personality difficulties, by growth factors, by the concern for popularity, by hopes and fears for the future, by the desire for reasonable standards, by feelings toward school, by the dilemma of being partly children and partly adults?

Remmers and Radler have summarized the physical, sexual, and social concerns of adolescents and at least three other studies throw further light on the subject. The survey research center at the University of Michigan conducted a study of adolescent boys (1955) for the Boy Scouts of America, and a study of adolescent girls (1956) for the Girl Scouts of America. A third survey was done by audience research in 1957 for the Camp Fire Girls.

The Boy Scout interviews of 1,045 youths 14 to 16 found that 8 out of 9 felt that parents made rules for the boys' benefit; 83 percent wanted information on vocations; 41 percent admired their dads most among adult acquaintances; 57 percent worried about achievement in school and jobs, and 29 percent about acceptance by girls and friends; 58 percent wanted more responsibility; and 31 percent belonged to no organizations, including school clubs.

The Girl Scout study of 1,925 girls 11 to 18 indicated that they valued feminity (one-third wanted to be like their mothers); were affected by adolescent problems like dating and adult concerns like jobs; most wanted middle-class status and middle-class husbands; all shared the ideal of helping other people; most wanted to be nurses, teachers, and secretaries (only 10 percent chose long careers); wanted parents to make the rules; desired adultlike responsibilities; feared dating even though they did date; considered their girl friends as a crucial source of self-esteem; worried over appearance and social skills; and preferred social activities(dances, etc.) to sports, games, and contest skill activities.

The Camp Fire Girls study revealed some very interesting insights into the attitudes and opinions of the adult leaders of this program concerning the girl membership. The difference between what adults believe adolescents are like and what children say they are like give us cause to study the relationship further. The girls say they accept and prefer to have adult leadership in their groups, but they want their leaders to show an understanding attitude, and treat them as mature people.

Zeleny and Gross in "Educating Citizens for Democracy" state very clearly what they feel are "youth's expectancies of society." They credit McNassor for several of the following points:

"Youth wish their integrity and worth to be respected, and in the same manner as does any mature individual in a free society.

"In a free society youth desires freedom, adventure, and security.

"Youth has a strong desire to assume responsibilities which lead to the approval of associates, including peer groups." [14]

McNassor, in an article appearing in the California Journal of Secondary Education of February 1958 invites school authorities to give consideration to some of the following key factors in adolescent development: adolescent perceptions of self, social order, ethic guidelines, and the opportunities modern life presents to fulfill yearnings for personal significance, love, and creative work.

McNassor further suggests that youth should be challenged more to deal with the critical issues in government and with the human conditions and problems in social organization; that there be more focus on the meaning of life to them; that smaller schools, or schools within schools be structured to provide a sense of belonging. (A good example is the "House" system which is in operation at Brookline (Mass.) High School.)

The civic educator who wishes to know his children and youth better has a wealth of resources to turn to. The monumental research of Arnold Gesell and his associates at what is now the Yale Clinic of Child Development, provides "a developmental psychology of infant, child, and youth—normal youth—in the settings of home, school, and urban community." [15]

Dr. J. Roswell Gallagher, founder of a "hospital of their own for adolescents," has written many articles and books which youth workers will find helpful in discerning the causes of adolescent behavior.[16]

BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS: EDUCATING FOR ALTRUISM

The ideal of brotherly love has probably been stored in the mind more than it has been translated into overt behavior. It deserves as much attention as the concept of the freeman, because there can be no real freedom for the individual without an accompanying care and concern for the other fellow.

The need to train astronauts to explore the heavens captures the imagination, excites extraordinary technological activity, and commands heavy financial support. The need to develop altruists who may lead us to Heaven or, at least, may help to make this a better world, all too frequently is dismissed as time-consuming "do goodism." An enlightened self-interest would seem to require the development of more astronauts and more altruists if we are going to give further leadership to the family of nations.

Gross and Zeleny point out that "the dominant idea of our American democracy is the sense of worth of the individual. Furthermore, it recognizes the common or social good, aiming to balance the individual value on the one hand and the social value on the other." [17]

Rosenberger states that if a sense of social responsibility is not developed in the individual, the purposes of education are defeated. Unless education implants a per-

sonal sense of responsibility for the welfare of others it can only result in mental cleverness. He adds, "The person lacking a sense of social responsibility will not fulfill his or her obligations to society, and may be a menace. Such a person can be as destructive as a raging bull moose, with an antler spread of 6 feet, turned loose in an art museum." [18]

Action programs in school and community which are designed to educate youth for social responsibility are not new. However, such programs, in which young volunteers work under adult leadership or guidance, are growing in numbers and importance, and will continue to grow.

The fact is that with society's prolongation of childhood, young people are isolated from opportunities to work with adults for a better community. However there is a growing desire in many communities on the part of adults to include young people with adults in working on community enterprises.

Some advice for adult leaders on how to work successfully with youth is to be found in Dorothy M. Roberts' "Partners With Youth." She points out that genuine partnership is only possible if the young people feel adults have confidence in them. The author suggests that leaders should work within the range of teenage interests and abilities; work with rather than for teenagers; decide on projects mutually.[19]

The vital need to stress self-direction in educating youth for social responsibility in and through the school is clearly stated in a special issue of the Journal of Education Sociology which bore the title "Youth as Citizens: A Study of Adolescent Self-Direction and Social Responsibility." The authors expressed the need for youth leaders to study changing adolescent character. They observed that many adults today are concerned about evidence of antisocial adolescent behavior. A feeling persists that social controls are not being adequately accepted by adolescents as a basis for action; they are not being internalized. Uneasiness spreads as to whether we will have enough teachers and other adult workers to hold the increasing adolescent horde in some kind of line.

A more appropriate and hopeful approach is to seek, as intensively as we can, ways in which schools can release the energies of boys and girls for their own responsible social self-direction and socially responsible behavior in and through appropriate learning experiences organized by adequate adult and school intervention. If this is achieved, individual adolescent mental health will benefit, social controls will be more readily accepted, and the need for adult directive leadership will be lessened.[20]

THE CONCEPT OF LAW

A significant objective of the Massachusetts civic education program is the will to abide by the laws and support their enforcement. This involves everyone's attitude toward the place of law in our society. It is the writer's firm conviction that schools, in particular, have not adequately met their obligations to impress on all young people the fact that we have a lawful heritage, and that one of the most distinguishing factors (if not the distinguishing factor) between our way of life and totalitarianism is our concept of "a government of laws."

Juvenile delinquency should be considered within the total framework of the place of law in American life. It is such a vital problem, however, that it requires special attention from the school. The responsibility is not exclusively the schools' but schools can, and sometimes do, cause delinquent behavior, or they can prevent children from becoming delinquent. Teachers and school administrators should make it their business to create the kind of total school climate and services which will make better citizens of all students.

In the schools and out, we must help children learn to abide by the laws. As is pointed out in "Delinquent Behavior—Culture and the Individual," "limit setting is a vital element in permitting and assisting every child to learn rules and regulations and to abide by them. The child must learn what is expected of him, and this is true in every culture and subculture." [21] Gallagher and Harris point out too, that "such a thing as a conscience needs to be developed. It doesn't just happen. From their earliest years, when still very little, boys and girls need to learn increasingly to distinguish right from wrong. This does not mean that they should be bombarded with endless 'No's' and punished and frustrated and inhibited to the point of becoming little automatons. But controls and conscience will be needed in adolescence and they won't be there if the difference between right and wrong isn't taught—and taught consistently, simply, firmly, and kindly, from very early childhood." [22]

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

As shown above, idealistic and altruistic people but politics at the low end of their interest scale. The disapproval of "dirty politics" is understandable, but there is something wrong with our teaching when young people, who should be active in civic affairs, fall by the wayside and become ciphers in a government "of and by the people."

SOME "CITIZENSHIP IN ACTION" PROGRAMS

Many fine programs do attempt to train youth for the responsibilities of citizenship. Some are essentially school-centered, others are sponsored primarily by community youth-serving agencies. In many cases, youth benefits from the cooperation of schools and community organizations.

The School Bureau of the United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston conducts a youth program in social service. More than 5,500 volunteer workers from 187 secondary schools (public, parochial, and independent private) have given over a quarter of a million hours of service in 84 "Red Feather" health and welfare agencies during the past 3 years. Not only have these young people met many of the needs of the agencies, but also, through a series of field trips, seminars for teachers and students, and courses interpreting social services, a climate has been established for understanding what democracy implies. One of the most meaningful ways in which young people who participate in this program obtain recognition and acquire further understanding of social responsibility is the inclusion of some of their representatives in the membership of the Youth Citizenship Conference held annually at Tufts University. In 1959, this conference focused on the theme, "We Are Our Brother's Keeper." Particular attention was given to exploring in depth the "why" of volunteering for social service.

Similar programs are also carried on in Baltimore, Cincinnati, Detroit, and other communities. In some instances, they involve joint action of schools and "Red Feather" agencies; in other instances, the schools work with Junior Red Cross chapters.

In New York City, there are more than 200 school civics clubs functioning in the elementary and junior high schools. For more than 10 years, these clubs have provided leadership training for thousands of children and made it possible for them to perform hundreds of good deeds in services to school, neighborhood, city, this Nation, and other nations.

Examples of the national youth agencies which have greatly enriched their community service activities are the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Kiwanis, YMCA, YWCA, the Boys Clubs of America, the Future Farmers of America, and 4–H.

Training of youth for political responsibility has been carried on for many years by the American Legion, which sponsors Boys' State; and by the American Legion auxiliary, which conducts Girls' State. Some other stimulating programs which concentrate on equipping youth for practical politics are the Massachusetts Student Government Day and Student Government Exchange, and the Syracuse University Youth Day.

Yet "scattered," "sporadic," and "conflicting" could be applied to this multiplicity of these volunteer community service programs involving many young Americans in school and community settings. Studies are needed to find out why youngsters participate in these services; their values should be compared against those implied in the writings of Jacob, Sorokin, Allport, and Sills and the techniques of adult leaders should be refined to reduce possibilities of serious errors with reference to student volunteer services.

In summary, then, the Massachusetts program calls for the development of civic behaviour consistent with the goals found empirically and through research to be conducive to better living together. The need for "action research" continues.

Teaching our youth how to be good citizens in a democracy requires that we understand the meaning of democracy and practice it in an inspiring way. We have not entirely succeeded in doing this in the past, and must now rededicate ourselves to the task if we are to preserve our free democratic way of life.

The school is the logical place where young people can learn about our democratic system. To accomplish this purpose, the school must itself be democratic and encourage democratic activities by the students.

The emotional adjustment of our youth plays its part if citizen education is to be successful. To assist in such adjustment, teachers and youth leaders must better understand young people.

Teaching altruism is an aid to developing respect for democracy, as it teaches concern for the opinion and welfare of others. Young people can learn altruism first-hand by participating in volunteer social service programs under the guidance of youth leaders. Such leadership should seek to develop well motivated self-direction by youth itself as an education in citizenship.

Leaders in citizen education should take every opportunity to work with social psychologists, cultural anthropologists, and other social scientists whose research findings can enhance their efforts to educate for better civic behavior. What we accomplish in training our young to be good citizens is not only essential to our own survival as a free Nation, but will also have its impact on the peoples of other countries in this small world.

CONCLUSION

Therefore the development of the young as citizens involves four important interrelated elements:

1. Democratic character (psychological).
2. Democratic concepts and values (ideological).
3. Understanding democratic government (political).
4. Democratic opportunities in the community (experience).

These elements need to be developed through all the instruments of education, family, school, church, and community agencies.

---

[1] Mayer, William E., U.S. News & World Report. "Why Did Many G.I. Captives Cave In?" Feb. 24, 1956.

[2] Gross, Richard E. and Zeleny, Leslie D. and Associates. "Educating Citizens for Democracy." Oxford University Press. 1958.

[3] Djilas, Milovan. "The New Class." Praeger Press, 1958; Berliner, Joseph F.

"Soviet Economic Aid; the New Aid and Trade Policy in Underdeveloped Countries." Praeger Press. 1958; U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. "The Communist Party, U.S.A.," U.S. Government Printing Office. 1956.

[4] Remmers, H. H. and Radler, D. H. "The American Teenager." Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1957. Pp. 178–207.

[5] Commissioners of education of the northeastern States. "Education for Citizenship." 1952.

[6] Vincent, William S., Bartlett, Hall; Tibbetts, Lora Teal; Russell, James E. "Building Better Programs in Citizenship." Citizenship education project, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1958.

[7] Educational Policies Commission. "Learning the Ways of Democracy." National Education Association. 1940.

[8] Commissioners of education of the northeastern States. "Education for Citizenship." 1952. P. 66.

[9] Diamond, Stanley E. "Schools and the Development of Good Citizens." Wayne University Press. 1953. Pp. 107–108.

[10] The Kansas study of education for citizenship. "Better Teaching and Better Learning in the Social Studies." Kansas State College Press.

[11] Pflieger, Elmer F. and Weston, Grace. "Emotional Adjustment: A Key to Good Citizenship." Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1953.

[12] Commissioners of education of the northeastern States. "Education for Citizenship." 1952. Pp. 29–30.

[13] National Council for the Social Studies. "Education for Democratic Citizenship." Twenty-second yearbook. National Education Association. 1951. Pp. 48–50.

[14] Gross, Richard E. and Zeleny, Leslie D. and Associates. "Educating Citizens for Democracy." Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. 32–36.

[15] Gesell, Arnold and Ilg, Frances L. "Infant and Child in the Culture of Today." Harper's. 1943; Gesell, Arnold, and Ilg, Frances L. "The Child from 5 to 10." Harper's. 1946; Gesell, Arnold; Ilg, Frances L., and Ames, Louise Bates. "Youth: The Years from 10 to 16." Harper's. 1956.

[16] Gallagher, J. Roswell. "Rest and Restriction." Their Conflict With an Adolescent's Development. American Journal on Public Health. November 1956; Masland, Robert P., Jr., M.D.: Heald, Felix P., M.D.; Hill, William R., M.D., and Gallagher, J. Roswell, M.D. "Some Comments on Acne Vulgaris in Adolescents." Journal of Pediatrics. 49:680–684. December 1956; Gallagher, J. Roswell, M.D. "Understanding Your Son's Adolescence." Little, Brown & Co. 1951; Gallagher, J. Roswell, M.D., and Harris, Herbert I., M.D. "Emotional Problems of Adolescence." Oxford University Press. 1958.

[17] Gross, Richard E. and Zeleny, Leslie D. and Associates. "Educating Citizens for Democracy." Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. 16–17.

[18] Rosenberger, Homer Tope. "What Should We Expect of Education?" Ch. 8. "We Are Our Brother's Keeper." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, February 1956. P. 243.

[19] Roberts, Dorothy. "Partners With Youth." Association Press, 1956.

[20] Patterson, Franklin; Lukoff, Irving; Winick, Charles. The Journal of Educational Psychology. "Is Society the Patient? Research and Action Implications." October 1956. Pp. 106–111.

[21] Kvaraceus, William, Miller, Walter B., and Others. "Delinquent Behavior: Culture and the Individual." National Education Association. 1959. Pp. 125–126.

[22] Gallagher, J. Roswell, M.D., and Harris, Herbert I., M.D. "Emotional Problems of Adolescence." Oxford University Press. 1958. P. 171.

Dennis Allen and the Race Relations Society of San Diego County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of San Diego County's most distinguished citizens has recently retired as president of the Race Relations Society of San Diego County. This fine group was established by Dennis Allen in 1924 and he continued in the position of leadership for 34 years until recently when he relinguished it for reasons of health.

Many distinguished Americans, including Minority Leader CHARLIE HALLECK, have addressed this group at its annual meeting over the years.

Under unanimous consent I include as a portion of my remarks a letter recently received from Dr. Frank B. Gigliotti, who has just been named president of the group and who is carrying on in the same fine tradition that has exemplified the work of Mr. Allen:

THE INTERNATIONAL
SUPREME COUNCIL,
ORDER OF DEMOLAY,
Lemon Grove, Calif., March 23, 1960.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: You will be interested in knowing that I have taken over the presidency of the San Diego Race Relations Society of San Diego County. As you know, Dennis Allen has been president of this organization for 34 years, for it was organized in 1924. It has done a great work as it affects racial minority groups in the San Diego area. The national secretary of the Urban League said, some 3 years ago, that San Diego was 30 years ahead of any other community in the United States on the matter of the solution of interracial problems. This condition has been made possible because of the foresight, vision, courage, and consecration of Dennis Allen and the small group of people that have cooperated and worked with him in solving problems great and small.

Major General Van Deman, former Chief of Military Intelligence of the United States, said to me one day, prior to his death, that Dennis Allen had done more to keep communism from taking hold among the minority groups and especially the Negro, in San Diego and in southern California, than any other person that he knew. He went further to say that Dennis Allen is a great patriot, and a great American, and a great public servant. His kindness and humility and understanding of other people's problems is like that of any early Christian apostle.

The Honorable Frank F. Merriam, Governor of California from 1933 to 1939, appointed Dennis Allen chairman of the California Race Relations Commission. This commission laid a great ground work for a better understanding amongst the various racial groups throughout the State of California and when a small group of short-sighted individuals in the assembly failed to provide any means for financing of the work of this commission, Dennis Allen and a small group of the people of California did the work without compensation or remuneration and even paid their own travel expenses. I believe that work of this kind, as you and I know it, should not go unnoticed or unappreciated. He has always taken a great interest in the friendly relations between our country and our neighbor, Mexico. For years there has been a Race Relations Day at the Rotary Club in Tijuana. Dennis Allen has always been the honored speaker with a few exceptions when I have gone down with him while I was chairman of the Governor's committee for the employment and rehabilitation of the handicapped. He has always taken a very active part in the civic affairs of San Diego, and especially of Logan Heights.

In taking over the presidency of this organization and in following such men as Dennis Allen and Dr. Peter Lee, that fine Chinese gentleman, who has found it impossible to continue as president of the society, I hope that God will give us the wisdom, the courage, the patience, and the ability to continue this fine patriotic work.

With regards and prayers, I remain,
Your friends,
FRANK B. GIGLIOTTI, D.D.,
Active Member.

Text of Pony Express Centennial Address by Representative William R. Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to make the principal speech April 3 at the centennial celebration of the pony express in St. Joseph, Mo.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my speech on that occasion:

TEXT OF PONY EXPRESS CENTENNIAL ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM R. HULL

Governor Blair, Governor Docking, Mayor Meers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. It is an honor to be with you on this memorable occasion.

This great celebration has been made a reality through the efforts of a great many public-spirited citizens and I want to take this moment to congratulate each and every person who has contributed, in time and effort, to the success of this occasion.

To try to list the names of all these citizens would be quite impossible but I do believe it is fitting for us to pay tribute to the memory of one man who did much to make this day one to remember.

I refer of course to our friend, the late Karl Goetz, and I know that all of us wish he could be here with us to enjoy this great day.

Ladies and gentlemen, near this spot 100 years ago, a stirring scene in the drama which is the development of America was enacted.

A young man—it matters not whether Johnny Fry or Billy Richardson or Alex Carlyle—mounted his horse and galloped off through the gathering darkness on the first leg of a perilous journey which today symbolizes the winning of the West.

It is not difficult for us to recapture the excitement and significance of that day. As we retell and reenact the events of 100 years ago, we share in its color and drama.

Through the eyes of Johnny Fry or Billy Richardson we can look west, across our familiar river, at the huge untamed territory lying beyond the outpost States of the Mississippi Valley.

In all this vast expanse between our Missouri River and California is a pioneer land, where the Indian and the buffalo roam at

will, where civilized people are few and far between, and where the yoke of law hangs lightly on every shoulder.

On the western rim of the Mississippi Valley, the land begins to rise across semiarid stretches to the foothills of the Rockies.

Beyond these towering mountains lay more than a thousand miles of plateau and basin, split by mountains, slashed by valleys, and blistered by deserts.

Across the plains and mountains and deserts, trails have been worn deep by the tread of oxen and the grind of wheels, and near the trails are many graves.

This vast, rich dominion is yet to be conquered and exploited. In 1860, the territory is American, but just barely.

This is the challenge to the men of the pony express: To link East with West, to provide a fast communication link between the old territory east of Missouri with the new area west.

The difficulties to be surmounted are formidable. We must overcome savages and weather and terrain, and brave hundreds of unknown dangers which lurk along the trail from St. Joseph to Sacramento.

The reward is $25 a week and immortal glory.

In the San Francisco newspapers, an advertisement has appeared. It reads: "Wanted, young skinny, wiry fellows not over 18. Must be expert riders willing to risk death daily. Orphans preferred. Wages $25 per week."

That is a quaint way to recruit employees by present-day standards but remember, this is 1860, and today in St. Joseph there are any number of fellows who, with the vision of $25 per week, will gladly change places with Johnny Fry or Billy Richardson.

Although the businessmen who are in charge of the operation, Messrs. Russell, Majors, and Waddell, do not know, their pony express venture is destined to become a financial failure.

In less than 2 years, it will be a business of the past.

But in that short span of time, it will make contributions to the development of America which will be forever inscribed on the pages of our history books. Its significance is unquestioned. The pony express has blazed a new trail from east to west, the trail of communication.

By swiftly conveying news of great national importance from Washington and the East to the Pacific coast, the pony express cements the loyalty of the Western territory to the Federal Union in the perilous days of 1860 and 1861.

It opens the West to orderly progress and seals its loyalty to the Nation.

Thousands of people preceded the lonely pony express rider across the great reaches of the West, but he helped open the door for many millions to follow.

Today, of course, is 1960 and the world has turned over many times since the pony express rider dashed away from these stables, which are now a great historical shrine.

Times have changed a very great deal. The transmission of a message from St. Joseph to Sacramento, for example, can be accomplished almost instantaneously, instead of in 10 days.

But this city of St. Joseph, which we love, still is an important crossroad of our Nation. It remains a vital link between the old East and the still young and ever growing West.

Likewise, we in St. Joseph still face challenges, as did the intrepid men of the pony express whom we honor here today.

And I believe we can take a page from the book of these men who, whether by personal design or accident, wrote a courageous chapter in the history of our country.

Today, our Nation still is threatened by savages, of a different sort.

We still must contend with perverse weather and the occasional obstinacies of terrain.

In a word, we are plagued by the same type of conditions and circumstances which beset the heroes of the pony express, although perhaps they appear in a different guise.

Our national goal is not too much different than it was in the boisterous 1860's, the achievement of a strong and stable America and the perpetuation of our own form of democracy.

To solve our national problems and achieve our national aspirations, we can certainly borrow the quality which distinguished above all others the riders of the pony express, courage.

We must acknowledge that the greatness of our country has not been easily achieved, and cannot be easily protected. We must realize that no goals worthy of the name can be attained without sacrifice, and to sacrifice requires courage.

We must unswervingly protect and augment what we know to be our just credo, that every person born by the grace of God has the right to live in freedom and pursue happiness, regardless of origin of birth, race, color or creed.

In this troubled world, we must strive to bring about a moral rejuvenation which alone can achieve the lasting peace which nuclear bombs and diplomatic convolutions cannot possibly achieve.

Yes, even though our world today is in many respects a world apart from that of the men of the pony express whose work immortalized this spot at which we are gathered, we can borrow very liberally upon their qualities to build an even better America.

St. Joseph, Mo., the proud birthplace of a great episode in American history, is the best place in the world to dedicate ourselves to the job of carrying forward, with similar courage and enterprise, the American goals so nobly served by the pony express.

My friends, the men of the pony express pursued a dream, and captured it.

Let us have the courage to do the same.

Mortgaging Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, my voting record in this body has been consistently on the side of sound financing and I continue to believe that a sound fiscal policy is our greatest bulwark against communism. The maintenance of such defenses means that we must continue to resist these recurring raids on the Federal Treasury and we must respond with a resounding "no" to every proposal that would have to be financed with borrowed money.

My good friend, Wilmer M. Thomson, of West Chester, Pa., has called my attention to a recent statement made by Budget Director Stans which appeared as a recent news item and which is herewith set forth to lend emphasis to the threat to our ever-increasing debt:

BUDGET CHIEF WARNS NATION—SAYS IT MUST STOP PILING UP DEBT

SAN FRANCISCO, March 22.—The boss of the Federal Budget Bureau warns that America must "stop compulsive spending, stop living on Government credit cards and fight an economic war as we would a military war."

Maurice H. Stans, addressing the 41st annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America, said the national debt of $290 billion "is far from all we owe for the past."

SOME ITEMS NOT LISTED

"Here are some items it doesn't include: Our already accrued liability for military requirement is about $30 billion," he said. "Our unfunded present accrual for retirement benefits for civilian Government workers is almost $28 billion.

"Future pensions, compensations and other benefits voted to veterans will cost about $300 billion. The $290 billion current public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion of commitments for future Federal spending adds to the almost incredible total of nearly $750 billion.

MORTGAGE ON FUTURE

"That is the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future—on ourselves and our children—beyond the regular annual cost of defense, welfare, and commerce.

"Is it any wonder that your President pleads for a sense of proportion, for a limit on compulsive spending, for a passion for responsibility?"

In this connection my attention was also called to an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on March 26 and which further emphasizes the fallacy of coming to Washington for handouts which by the name of things will be added to the national debt, the interest on which costs each one of us $225 annually. This editorial is included in full as follows:

OUR RICH UNCLE

The popular conception of Uncle Sam envisions an inordinately rich old gentleman who has no need to consider the size of his expenditures, whether measured in hundreds of thousands, or millions, or billions. This conception involves the further idea, often applied in practice, that he is a soft touch. He is therefore expected not only to spend lavishly on his own household, but to support projects that are logically the obligations of States and lesser governmental units.

This picture of the great white father is erroneous and dangerous. Where does Uncle Sam get the money he spends so freely? From his nephews and nieces. He takes it away from them in taxation. But he is not satisfied—cannot be, on his present scale of living—with what they must give. They must also lend. For he spends more than his income. He borrows what's needed to make ends meet. He therefore has run up the biggest debt the country ever heard of.

Federal spending in excess of needs for defense of the country, Federal failure over the years to reduce the debt even in periods of great prosperity, Federal failure to curb the inflationary spiral, has reduced the value of the dollar, the stability of which is the basis of national welfare. If this tendency toward reckless spending goes uncurbed, the whole economy might tumble like a house of cards.

No political party likes to preach the doctrine of Federal economy in a year when spending makes votes. But commonsense makes it obligatory that voters everywhere shall be warned of the dangers that lie ahead. The laws of economics are immutable.

Election year or no election year, it is time to stop, look, and listen; time to realize that a lot of Uncle Sam's fabulous wealth is on paper; time to remember that the mere annual interest on what he owes comes to more than the total cost of running the Government only a few decades back.

The voice of Senator HARRY BYRD has for years been the voice of one crying in the wilderness, but common prudence demands that he shall have more listeners.

Wyoming Valley's Famous Concordia Singing Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extremely interesting and informative feature story, written by Mr. Sheldon C. Wintermute, as told by Mr. Paul M. Loefflad, which appeard in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent on April 10, 1960:

A STAR IN THE SONG SKY FOR 81 YEARS—TOO FEW AWARE OF BROAD FAME OF CONCORDIA

(By Paul M. Loefflad as told to Sheldon C. Wintermute)

Preserving Wyoming Valley's priceless heritage of good choral singing is the 81-year-old Concordia Singing Society which still boasts of members of all nationalities, all walks of life, and all faiths.

In its early years Concordia listed in its ranks an American Indian as one of its best baritones.

Concordia has been on the lips of local music lovers so long that most people forget how long.

In fact the present generation has little knowledge of the singing history written by this unique group—including winning the international singing competition at Newark, N.J., in 1906 and doing it the hard way—singing the winning number in German when the membership included English, Irish, Welsh, Scots, French, Italians, Poles, Lithuanians, and Swiss, as well as some Germans and an American Indian.

PLAN MAY 20 CONCERT

Concordia has had high and low points of both popularity and membership in the four decades that have passed, but the quality of its music has never suffered as will be recognized when the 81st anniversary concert is presented Friday night, May 20, at Irem Temple.

If there is such a title as "Mr. Concordia" it must go to the late Adolph Hansen, who directed the singing society from 1889 until his death in 1942. The present director is Howard C. Williams, head of music in Central Luzerne County Jointure Schools.

Concordia came into being in 1879 when a few members of the defunct Wilkes-Barre Mannerchor organized the new society.

The first president was John Reichard, one of the foremost residents of the city and founder of Reichard & Weaver Brewery. He and the other organizers of Concordia voted to meet in famed Landmesseer's Hall and announced the aims would be to encourage male choral singing, music appreciation, and to provide social entertainment for members.

HAD OWN ORCHESTRA

In the first 10 years the chorus had four conductors: Theodore Bottger, Jacob Reig, Karl Krebs, and Louis Praetorius. Membership was not restricted to Germans as is generally believed. Through the support of Harrison Wright, Ridgeway Wright, Andrew H. McClintock, and other prominent men of the community, Concordia gained favor with residents of all nationalities.

During the first 10 years a women's chorus was organized and concerts included mixed choruses. A symphony orchestra also had been formed, for which the society bought instruments at considerable expense. This orchestra gave additional concerts.

Later the women's chorus was disbanded in order to concentrate on male chorus singing.

Adolph Hansen became director in January 1889, when the chorus numbered only 22 members. His voiced opinion of that time was "some could sing, others could not, and their chief asset was the spirit of 'Gemuthlichkeit;' discipline was unknown and independence prevailed."

He further recalled "at his first rehearsal they faced in every direction except toward me—an array of backs and profiles. I sat down, but they sang on regardless. I told Mr. Schappert, father of the later well known Dr. N. L. Schappert, they apparently didn't need me; they sang just as well without my direction."

OPENED OWN HALL

During the early period of Hansen's directorship the chorus increased in numbers and included some of the best singers of the community, including Joseph Atkins, Anthony C. Campbell, John Seibel, Thomas Darling, Arthur Hillman, S. S. Chan, and Joseph Burns. The society by this time outgrew its original home and moved to Concordia Hall, presently the Manfield, South Washington and East Northampton Streets.

In 1892 the Cambro-American Society, a Welsh organization, promoted a competitive eisteddfod, to which were invited three local German singing societies, Concordia, the Sangerbund, the Liedertafel, and the Liederkrantz of Scranton. The prize was $100 and a German flag. Concordia won this contest easily.

Through the efforts of President William Schrage in 1893 Concordia Hall was remodeled and improved. This attracted many new sustaining members and the society's membership rolls soared to more than 400.

Early in 1900 the choral group entered the prize singing contests of the Northeastern Singing Association in competition with societies from Maine to Maryland. Concordia went to Brooklyn with a chorus of 65 men and sang in the second class, competing with 17 societies. Concordia won first prize and brought home a Wisner grand piano which is still being used by the chorus. This victory established Concordia as one of the foremost singing societies in the Nation.

HAD PERFECT SCORE

Encouraged by this success Concordia entered the first-class contest at Baltimore in 1903 with a chorus of 95 men. The prize song was a very difficult number in German, but Concordia won first prize with a perfect score.

In 1906 Concordia went to Newark, N.J., to sing in competition for the Kaiser prize, the most coveted of all competitions, and won.

In 1905 a grand silver jubilee concert was held in the 9th Regiment Armory in which Concordia and all the German societies and the Mason Glee Club, a Welsh organization, took part.

Following 1909, an interesting period in the history of Concordia developed with the formation of a group within the society called the Roaches. It promoted and presented minstrel shows. Mr. Hansen recalled one of the features of the show of Laning Harvey arrayed as an angel in pink tights and ballet skirt, making a most amazing descent from heaven by sliding down a diagonally strung wire rope, with wings flapping.

Commemorating the centenary of the birth of Richard Wagner in a worldwide festival promotion in 1913 the society gave a Wagner concert in the 9th Regiment Armory with a chorus of 200 voices, a full orchestra from Boston and guest soloists.

In 1926 the chorus participated in a competitive sing held in New York City sponsored by the Associated Glee Clubs of America. It won first prize and again in 1929 in New York took first honors.

AT WORLD'S FAIR

In the spring of 1939 Concordia appeared at the New York World's Fair in a group of 3,500 voices in a great outdoor concert sponsored by the Associated Male Choruses of America.

The year 1939 saw the society's greatest celebration and the community's greatest musical event—Concordia's 60th anniversary and Adolph Hansen's 50th year of continuous active directorship.

Concordia, in 1940, joined with the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Sinfonietta in a combined concert, and in 1941 the society presented the 109th Field Artillery Benefit Concert, in conjunction with Orpheus Glee Club, Shawnee Choral Society, Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Sinfonietta, Alexander's Band, and John D. Stark Post American Legion Band.

HELPED CHRISTEN CRUISER

Participating in the ceremonies at the laying of the keel of the cruiser *Wilkes-Barre*, at Cramp Shipyards, Philadelphia, September 1941, Concordia played a major role in the program.

In 1947 the chorus participated in a mass chorus sing at White Plains, N.Y., under the sponsorship of the Associated Male Choruses of America, and again in 1952 at Atlantic City at the Eastern District Festival of the Associated Male Choruses of America when it was the only group to sing alone.

During the summer of 1954 Concordia was the guest of Lions International Convention at Madison Square Garden, New York, on Pennsylvania Night.

Following the death of Adolph Hansen in September 1942, Prof. Paul Gies, head of the music department at Wilkes College, assumed the baton of the chorus. On the death of Professor Gies in January 1948, the directorship went to Charles H. Davis, supervisor of music at Elmer L. Meyers High School. Upon the resignation of Davis in 1954, Clyde Owens, West Pittston, was appointed director. Following Mr. Owens resignation the directorship was assigned to Howard C. Williams.

No Amount of Self-Serving Industry Explanation Can Whitewash the Record of Television Violence—The New Educational Television Bill Gives Promise of Something Better Than the Present Mindless Fare of Murder and Whodunits to Which Our Children Are Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, every parent who is concerned over the present mindless fare of murder and whodunits

to which our children are exposed—and this is all of us—has been immensely heartened by the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives in favorably reporting H.R. 10609. This bill amends the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

We learn this morning that 45 parents watched 185 Washington, D.C., television programs during children's viewing hours last month and tried to keep track of the violence. A total of 114½ hours of monitoring brought the violence totals up to 281 assaults, 117 killings, 19 robberies, 16 kidnapings, 10 murder conspiracies, 6 dynamitings, 5 tortures, 3 arsons, 3 extortions, 3 jailbreaks, 1 lynching, 1 bombing and 1 suicide. The parents monitored the four Washington channels when viewing by children is heaviest—4 to 9 p.m. weekdays and 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. The study was a project of the Walnut Hill Elementary School Parent-Teachers Association of Falls Church, Va. No amount of self-serving industry explanation can whitewash this record, which was reported by the alert and able radio and television editor of the Washington (D.C.) Post, Lawrence Laurent, in that newspaper on April 13, 1960.

During the 85th Congress the Senate passed educational television construction grant legislation and, after holding hearings on the subject, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported the bill—but too late for the House to take action. During the present Congress the Senate again passed an educational television construction grant bill (S. 12), and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held extensive hearings on the Senate-passed bill and on several companion measures in the House, including one which I had sponsored.

Following these hearings a clean bill was introduced which represented the committee's consensus. Now this bill has been reported with certain further amendments. As reported, the bill would authorize a maximum appropriation of $10,000 for the development of a State program for the construction of educational television facilities, and not to exceed $750,000 for matching grants to any State's governmental and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television.

The purpose of this splendid legislation is to speed up the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the several States in the development of State programs for the construction of educational television facilities and by aiding governmental and private nonprofit agencies.

The new committee bill is patterned after the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, commonly referred to as the Hill-Burton Act, which has successfully assisted in the establishment of literally scores of hospitals throughout the Nation with the aid of Federal matching funds. The educational television legislation which I sponsored, along with others, the principles of which are incorporated in this new measure, would make it possible for the Delaware Educational Television Association to qualify for assistance under the act in establishing an educational television channel in Delaware in cooperation with the Philadelphia Educational Association in the event that channel 12 is assigned to it for this purpose.

I include herewith as part of my remarks two splendid editorials from leading newspapers in Delaware, as well as an article from the Washington (D.C.) Post:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Apr. 4, 1960]

BETTER TV FARE IN "PRIME TIME"?

(By Thomas R. Dew)

If ever anything was misnamed, it is what is being presented to us in Delaware as educational television.

I admit that I'm stumped when it comes to finding a more suitable adjective. "Cultural" sounds too intellectual and perhaps snobbish, yet this really has some definite "cultural" aspects.

"Community" television is about as close as I can come, and even that doesn't fill the bill adequately.

I refer, of course, to the four-way race to gain control of channel 12, which the Federal Communications Commission is now in the process of adjudicating. Who will win is anybody's guess.

Three of the applicants are commercial enterprises, including Rollins Broadcasting Corp., which presently owns radio station WAMS in Wilmington. The fourth is WHYY, Inc., of Philadelphia, supported by the Delaware Educational Television Association. WHYY now operates channel 35, an ultra-high frequency channel, as an educational television outlet—but this can reach only sets which have been equipped with converters, which cost the set owner roughly $65.

If I could tell the FCC how to decide this case today, I would tell it without hesitation to award channel 12 to the educational television interests.

It wasn't always thus. Two months ago I would have urged that it be given to the commercial interest which showed most clearly it would operate channel 12 in the best interests of the people of Delaware. I was skeptical of educational TV because it sounded as if it were beamed at the schools exclusively; in short, there was nothing in it that would interest me, and that it would be aimed at too small a segment of the public to really be worthwhile.

Why the change of heart?

A month ago I visited the studios of WHYY in Philadelphia. I asked pointed questions about finances and programing. I saw how it operates.

And that's why I say that educational TV is a misnomer. What is proposed here is not a program that is aimed at school children.

If our schools choose to get into the picture and use channel 12 if it becomes available for this purpose, that's their business. They will be offered the opportunity to select programs which they can fit into their curricula. But there are too many school districts in the proposed area of reception; it would be folly to think that all their needs could be met through this medium.

If they want to use it, fine. It will be up to the individual school district to decide the extent of use—and to pay for it in proportion.

What does appeal to me is the opportunity presented by this proposal to receive good programs during the so-called prime evening time. If WHYY is granted the license to operate channel 12, it will broadcast from 9 a.m. to 12:15 a.m. next day—and that means that a good chunk of time is going to be devoted to programs other than those beamed at the schools.

These programs would include symphony orchestras (the Wilmington Symphony is already tentatively listed for a series by WHYY); features on current issues, and Delaware issues have a prominent spot in the proposed schedule; and strictly cultural shows—here WHYY says it would go out and solicit many of Delaware's fine cultural centers, such as Hagley and Winterthur, for assistance; and many others. There also would be much Delaware news.

These are things which I would like to have the opportunity to tune in on during the evening hours.

Another factor colors my thinking. I have a 2-year-old son who is just now discovering television. I would like him to have the opportunity to view something other than is offered on the three channels we now receive, something which will truly broaden his horizons and take him beyond what I myself or the schools he will attend in the future can impart to him.

Not only children, but adults as well could have their horizons broadened by educational TV. WHYY is a member of National Educational Television, which is growing so rapidly that some people call it the fourth network. Through NET, WHYY can get the use of a wide variety of video tapes, many of them prize-winning presentations, which utilize many of America's most valuable cultural, scientific, and natural resources.

In conclusion, two short notes:

1. Richard L. Burdick, managing director of WHYY, has assured us that the money it would take to set up operations of channel 12 with studios in Wilmington and a transmitter in Glassboro, N.J., is in hand, and there is more than $16,000 to spare. Also committed is the money to run the station for the first year.

2. I do not subscribe to the argument that Philadelphia interests are trying to take over a Delaware prerogative any more than I subscribe to the argument that Wilmington and New Castle County are trying to take over the entire State of Delaware and remake it in their own image. Channel 12 would remain Delaware-based, and Delaware would have equal representation on its board of directors.

I might not always tune in channel 12 if it were given to educational TV, but I sure would like to have the chance.

[From the Delaware State News, Dover, Del., Mar. 21, 1960]

WANT MORE TV RETURNS?

(By Joe Smyth)

VHF channel 12 in Wilmington was recently vacated by an independent commercial broadcaster who could not keep up with the pace set by the three commercial Philadelphia stations.

The reason for the failure of this broadcaster, and the two others before him, is simple—they could not make enough money to justify the operation. Why? Because independent stations cannot afford to sign up the best programs—hence, not many viewers—hence, not much advertising.

The "Big Three" of television, CBS, NBC, and ABC, have all of the popular stars tied up, either on high-priced contracts, or on high-priced guest appearances. Naturally the three Philadelphia channels, being network stations, can drive any competitive independent program planner in Wilmington out of his mind.

Four broadcasting companies have entered bids with the Federal Communications Commission for the use of the now vancant Wilmington channel.

Three of them, Rollins Broadcasting, Goodman Associates of Chicago, and Metropolitan

Broadcasting of New York, are commercial. If one of those three get the broadcasting rights, I assume we will end up with more lady wrestlers, corny local shows, and old movies.

The fourth broadcasting company to bid for FCC permission to use channel 12 is WHYY. Being education television, and nonprofit, it does not have to sell commercials; in fact, it cannot charge for time at all. WHYY operates with donated funds only.

Forty-five ETV stations operate by these means in the United States. Several of these have annual budgets approaching $1 million. They provide some of the best programs in the country.

During the school day much in-school broadcasting would be done. But after school hours and during the evenings, ETV stations do some magnificent programing for adults—educational programing.

WHYY would help the problem of education for our children, opening the entire world of nature and science to them, replacing the sadism and violence now pushed at them. But adults are not forgotten. WHYY plans programs for adults who know they are adult, and who want to watch TV aimed at mature and intelligent grownups.

The choice facing Delaware is the choice between more commercial television "left-over" quality, the crumbs left by the three networks * * * or noncommercial TV as a contrast to and change from commercial programs.

I do not ask that all of the westerns, and other noneducational programs, be thrown out. I do assert that we have enough of that type program already. Why add more of them, when we can instead have programs available, for those who choose to watch them, that will improve our minds and our country?

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1960]

PTA WENT LOOKING FOR VIOLENCE ON TV PROGRAMS AND FOUND IT

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Peoples and programs: Forty-five parents watched 185 Washington TV programs during children's viewing hours last month and tried to keep track of the violence. This was a project of the Walnut Hill Elementary School Parent-Teachers Association, Falls Church.

A total of 114½ hours of monitoring brought the violence totals up to 281 assaults, 117 killings, 19 robberies, 16 kidnapings, 10 murder conspiracies, 6 dynamitings, 5 tortures, 3 arsons, 3 extortions, 3 jailbreaks, 1 lynching, 1 bombing and 1 suicide.

The parents monitored the four Washington channels when viewing by children is heaviest (4 to 9 p.m. weekdays and 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday).

Victor O. Reinemer of 1907 St. James Place, Falls Church, was chairman of the TV survey committee.

Timely, Reasonable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Republic of Friday, March 4, 1960.

TIMELY, REASONABLE

An educational training manual of U.S. Air Force Reserve was recently strongly denounced by powerful liberal groups in Washington. It was said that the manual was unfair and insulting to the Christian churches and to the National Council of Churches in particular. The manual, so we were told, had recklessly accused the National Council of Churches of harboring pro-Communists in its midst. Public indignation against this Air Force manual was so great that the appropriate authorities in the Defense Department in Washington felt compelled to withdraw it from circulation, and offered full apologies to its critics.

We have studied the full text of the manual very thoroughly and very carefully, and we cannot understand why it was withdrawn. Nor can we understand the reasons of those Washington VIP's who saw fit to apologize for it. Maybe their utter ignorance concerning Communist problems is their excuse. We find the manual a very timely, a very reasonable and a very admirable document. We see nothing wrong in the fact that it was used as textbook material for Reserve training courses by the U.S. Air Force. Quite the contrary, we think the educational department of the U.S. Air Force should be congratulated for having done such an excellent job in exposing the underground Communist activities in the U.S. churches.

In the first place, the manual warns all Air Force personnel of the dangers of Communist spying activities, giving actual examples of the successful—for the Communists—work done by very skillful Communist agents. The manual then discusses the Communist technique of confusing gullible people with well-sounding words and phrases about peace, democracy, social justice, international trade and the like, which mean different things to the Communists. Democracy, for example, in Communist phraseology, means the dictatorship of the one-party Communist regime. Peace means an international settlement on Communist terms. Social justice means the Communist system of injustice, discrimination, and terror. What's wrong in pointing out these very obvious—but often forgotten—truths concerning the deceitful ways with which Communist propagandists work?

The manual then gives concrete and documentary evidence proving that many ministers of the church, including a lot of prominent members of the National Council of Churches, have sponsored and supported—and continue to sponsor and support—both open Communist political groups and drives, and so-called Communist-front organizations. The manual quotes prominent U.S. Christian ministers arguing that Jesus Christ was, in fact, a Communist, and that the Soviet Union today follows Christ's teaching of brotherhood, equality, and justice. Considering the Communist slave labor camps, in which tens of millions of innocent human beings have perished, considering the Communist police terror system—the most cruel terror system known to man—it is, indeed, breathtaking to see preachers of the Gospel of Christ praise the Red murderers as humanitarian social workers and saint-like missionaries. Yet such preachers exist in America today. What's wrong if an Air Force manual names them and quotes their fantastic, not to say blasphemous, hymns of praise to the most sinister killers and torturers in history?

The manual ends with a simple, but well defined and beautifully phrased definition of the American way of life, and in contrast, of the Communist political purpose—to subjugate all human activities, all economics, all morality, all religion to the iron will and discipline of the Communist state.

Our only regret is that the "controversial" Air Force manual has not been distributed outside the personnel of the Air Force Reserve. We think it should be read by all Americans, from all walks of life, of all professions, all religions, and all political affiliations. The manual can displease or anger only people who know nothing about communism, or who consciously or unconsciously serve the Communist cause.

Crusade for Economic Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Letter Carriers has presented their case for a pay raise most succinctly. It is as follows:

CRUSADE FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY

Average gross pay for a letter carrier: $4,640 a year; $370 a month; $89.23 a week; $2.23 an hour.

This wage scale is far below 1960 standards of pay for workers in comparable jobs.

It is even below the average wages for garbage collectors, street sweepers, grocery clerks, parking meter atendants and others in traditionally low-paid and comparatively unskilled jobs.

Why? Letter carriers have received too few increases, too small increases, too many vetoes.

Approximately 380,000 of the 550,000 postal employees are in level 4—this salary scale totally inadequate for today's needs.

Year by year the letter carriers have fallen further behind in their struggle for economic equality. During the past 11 years they have received only four increases. During the same period workers in similar or comparable categories have received increases almost every year.

THE POSTAL PAY STORY OVER THE PAST 11 YEARS

1949: Small pay increase.
1950: No increase.
1951: Public Law 204.
1952: No increase.
1953: No increase.
1954: No increase because of veto (discharge petition necessary).
1955: Public Law 68 passed (after another veto).
1956: No increase.
1957: No increase because of veto (another discharge petition).
1958: Public Law 426 passed.
1959: No increase.
1960: (?).

Letter carriers received too few pay raises, too small pay increases, too many vetoes.

WHY SELECT THE YEARS 1949–60?

Because these years represent a period of unparalleled dynamic economic development. Both the manner and the standard of living have changed. Prices have advanced. So have wages. This has added up to a better and fuller life for everyone except letter carriers and other Federal employees.

During the years 1949–60, the gross national product increased from $258.1 billion to $483 billion. Personal income increased from $182 billion to $387 billion.

The following pages contrast the pay increases received by letter carriers with those received by other workers in comparable categories during these years.

(NOTE.—Each difference of 10 cents per hour represents a difference of $208 per year.)

Pay schedules for letter carriers and post office clerks, level 4, postal field service

Level	Step	Annual salary	Hourly rate	Gross pay		Amounts withheld			Net take-home 2-week pay	Net take-home annual salary
				Monthly pay	2 weeks' pay	Life insurance	Retirement 6½ percent	Federal tax, man, wife, 2 children		
4	1	$4,035	$1.94	$336.25	$155.19	$1.25	$10.09	$9.30	$134.55	$3,498.30
	2	4,175	2.01	347.91	160.58	1.25	10.44	10.70	138.19	3,592.94
	3	4,315	2.07	359.58	165.96	1.25	10.79	11.40	142.52	3,705.52
	4	4,455	2.14	371.25	171.35	1.25	11.14	12.10	146.86	3,818.36
	5	4,595	2.21	382.91	176.73	1.25	11.49	13.60	150.39	3,910.14
	6	4,735	2.28	394.56	182.12	1.25	11.84	14.30	154.73	4,019.88
	7	4,875	2.34	406.25	187.50	1.25	12.19	15.00	159.06	4,135.56
After 13 years' service	7A	4,975	2.39	414.58	191.35	1.25	12.44	15.70	161.96	4,210.96
After 18 years' service	7B	5,075	2.44	422.91	195.19	1.50	12.69	16.50	164.50	4,277.00
After 25 years' service	7C	5,175	2.49	431.25	199.04	1.50	12.94	17.20	167.40	4,352.40

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Arizona, California, Colorado, and Illinois

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Cement finisher, Tucson, Ariz.	Police and firemen, San Diego, Calif.	Police and firemen, San Francisco, Calif.	Police and firemen, Oakland, Calif.	Police and firemen, Denver, Colo.	Patrolmen, Chicago, Ill.
1949	$1.815	$2.10	$1.71	$1.815	$1.817	$1.80	$1.28.
1950	No increase	No increase	No increase	No increase	No increase	No increase	No increase.
1951	$2.015	$2.40	$1.99	$1.95	$1.914	$1.98	$1.45.
1952	No increase	No increase	$2.08	$2.16	$2.116	No increase	$2.145.
1953	do	$2.75	$2.29	$2.43	$2.365	$2.19	$2.23.
1954	Veto; no increase	No increase	$2.41	$2.53	$2.452	No increase	$2.365.
1955	Veto; $2.19	$3.10	No increase	No increase	$2.509	do	$2.465.
1956	No increase	No increase	$2.66	$2.77	$2.742	$2.44	$2.525.
1957	Veto; no increase	do	$2.79	$2.97	$2.977	No increase	$2.61.
1958	$2.34	$3.20	$2.93	No increase	No increase	$2.92	$2.70.
1959	No increase	$3.45	$3.07	$3.28	$3.283	No increase	$2.81.
1960	?			$3.43	$3.436		
Number of increases	4	6	9	9	10	5	10.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		82.5 cents	83.5 cents	$1.09	$1.094	59.5 cents	$1.005.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Illinois, Iowa, and Kentucky

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Central Illinois Light Co., Peoria, Ill.	Local 1027 UAW-CIO, Springfield, Ill.	Bell Telephone cableman, Des Moines, Iowa	Newspaper printers Des Moines, Iowa	Sheet metal workers, Waterloo, Iowa	Maintenance employees, du Pont de Nemours & Co., Louisville, Ky.
1949	$1.815	$1.795		$1.725		$1.85	$1.78.
1950	No increase	$1.93	$1.54	$1.8125	$2.25	$2.00	$1.93.
1951	$2.015	$2.065	$1.63	$1.90	$2.37	$2.10	$2.03.
1952	No increase	$2.20	$1.71	$2.225	$2.475	$2.25	$2.07, $2.09, $2.14.
1953	do	$2.335	$1.75	$2.30	$2.575	$2.40	$2.22.
1954	Veto no increase	$2.46	$1.79	$2.35	$2.67	$2.55	$2.32, $2.39.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$2.595	$2.05	$2.4625	$2.725	$2.70	$2.48, $2.57.
1956	No increase	$2.73	$2.11	$2.60	$2.78	$2.85	$2.64.
1957	Veto, no increase	$2.865	$2.17	$2.7125	$2.86	$2.95	$2.90.
1958	$2.34	$3.00	$2.23	No increase	$2.96	$3.025	$2.93, $3.00.
1959	No increase	$3.135	$2.44	$2.8125	$3.05	$3.075	$3.06, $3.11.
1960	(?)						
Number of increases	4	11	10	10	10	11	17.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		81.5 cents	90 cents	56.25 cents	27.5 cents	70 cents	80.5 cents.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Missouri

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Machine tender, parchment paper mill, Kalamazoo, Mich.	Police and firemen, Detroit, Mich.	Patrolman, Minneapolis, Minn.	Lineman, Southern Bell Telephone, Jackson, Miss.	Western Electric installer, Kansas City, Mo.	Bottlers Local Union 107, St. Louis, Mo.
1949	$1.815	$1.76	$1.90	$1.68	$1.45	$1.8325	$1.625.
1950	No increase	No increase	$1.98	$1.71	No increase	$2.0525	$1.71.
1951	$2.015	$2.00	$2.12	$1.78, $1.93	$1.925	$2.1725	No increase.
1952	No increase	No increase	$2.30	$2.07	$2.025	$2.2925	Do.
1953	do	$2.35	$2.40	No increase	No increase	$2.4125	$2.27.
1954	Veto, no increase	No increase	$2.48	$2.26	do	$2.5325	$2.37.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$2.56	$2.51	$2.38	$2.25	$2.6525	$2.47.
1956	No increase	$2.66	$2.64	$2.50	$2.375	$2.7725	No increase.
1957	Veto, no increase	$2.74	$2.72	$2.63	$2.487	$2.8925	Do.
1958	$2.34	$2.80	No increase	$2.75	$2.537	$3.0125	$2.81.
1959	No increase	$2.87	$2.85	$2.88	$2.65	No increase	$2.91.
1960	?			$3.00			
Number of increases	4	8	10	12	8	10	7.
Amount of increase above letter-carrier increase		58.5 cents	42.5 cents	79.5 cents	67.5 cents	65.5 cents	76 cents.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Michigan

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Operating employees, du Pont de Nemours Co., Louisville, Ky.	Carpenter, Standard Oil Co., Baton Rouge, La.	Iron worker, Bath, Maine	Police private, Montgomery County, Md.	Truckdriver, Worcester, Mass.	Eaton Manufacturing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.
1949	$1.815	$1.67		$1.53	$1.32		$1.43.
1950	No increase	$1.82	$2.305	$1.57	$1.36	$1.35	$1.485.
1951	$2.015	$1.92	$2.39	$1.67, $1.75	$1.48	$1.47	$1.535.
1952	No increase	$1.96, $1.98, $2.03	$2.505	$1.84	$1.55	$1.52	$1.695.
1953	do	$2.11	$2.67	$1.94, $2.03	$1.62	$1.60	$1.815.
1954	Veto, no increase	$2.21, $2.26	No increase	$2.08	$1.71	$1.67	$1.875.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$2.35, $2.41	$2.77	$2.23	$2.31	No increase	$2.005.
1956	No increase	$2.48	$2.935	$2.36	$2.65	$1.82	$2.447.
1957	Veto, no increase	$2.74	$3.11	$2.46	No increase	$1.97	$2.497.
1958	$2.34	$2.77, $2.87	No increase	$2.56	$2.87	$2.12	$2.68.
1959	No increase	$2.93, $2.98	$3.27	$2.65	$2.98	$2.34	$2.74.
1960	?					$2.41	
Number of increases	4	17	8	13	10	10	11.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		78.5 cents	44 cents	59.5 cents	$1.135	53.5 cents	78.5 cents.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Montana, New Hampshire, New York, and Ohio

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Laborer, Great Falls, Mont.	Auto mechanic, Great Falls, Mont.	Gas company employee, Manchester, N.H.	Outside repairman, telephone company, Manchester, N.H.	Firemen, New York, N.Y.	Retail shoe clerks, Cleveland, Ohio
1949	$1.815	$1.50	$1.78	$1.385	$2.075	$1.737	$0.844.
1950	No increase	$1.65	$1.90	$1.485	$2.20	No increase	$1.155.
1951	$2.015	No increase	$1.96	No increase	$2.325	$1.842	$1.26.
1952	No increase	$1.80	$2.06	$1.75	$2.45	$2.001	$1.34.
1953	do	$1.90	$2.15	$1.875	$2.5125	$2.182	$1.51.
1954	Veto, no increase	$1.975	No increase	No increase	$2.5875	$2.326	$1.56.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$2	$2.30	$2.065	$2.7125	$2.381	$1.665.
1956	No increase	$2.08	$2.45	$2.185	No increase	$2.548	$1.715.
1957	Veto, no increase	No increase	$2.55	$2.295	$2.825	$2.616	$1.765.
1958	$2.34	$2.40	$2.65	No increase	$2.9125	$2.685	$1.815, $1.865.
1959	No increase	$2.55	$2.75	$2.53	$3.025	$2.776	$1.915, $2.04.
1960	(?)						$2.14.
Number of increases	4	9	10	8	10	10	14.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		52.5 cents	44.5 cents	62 cents	42.5 cents	51.4 cents	77.1 cents.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Stationary engineers, Tulsa, Okla.	Electricians, Oklahoma City, Okla.	Carpenters, Oklahoma City, Okla.	Plumbers, Oklahoma City, Okla.	Laborer, Portland, Oreg.	Inside carpenter, Philadelphia, Pa.
1949	$1.815	$1.70	$2.325	$2.125	$2.25	$1.70	$1.80.
1950	No increase	$1.80	$2.50	$2.20	$2.375	No increase	$1.90.
1951	$2.015	$1.90	$2.625	$2.325	$2.70	$1.75	$1.98.
1952	No increase	$2.02	$2.75	$2.40	$2.80	$1.85	$2.08.
1953	do	$2.09	$2.875	$2.525	$2.90	$2.00	$2.20.
1954	Veto, no increase	$2.19	$3.00	$2.625	No increase	$2.17	$2.25.
1955	$2.19	$2.29	$3.125	$2.725	$3.05	$2.23	$2.35.
1956	No increase	$2.40	$3.25	No increase	$3.15	$2.25	$2.45.
1957	Veto, no increase	$2.50	$3.375	$2.875	$3.42	$2.35	$2.55.
1958	$2.34	$2.60	$3.50	$2.975	$3.57	$2.55	$2.65.
1959	No increase	$2.65	$3.625	$3.125	$3.70	$2.67	$2.80.
1960	?	$2.75		$3.275			
Number of increases	4	12	11	11	10	10	11.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		52.5 cents	77.5 cents	62.5 cents	92.5 cents	44.5 cents	47.5 cents.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Outside carpenter, Philadelphia, Pa.	Butchers, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Plumber, Jackson, Tenn.	Firestone Tire & Rubber, Memphis, Tenn.	Construction iron worker, San Antonio, Tex.	Reinforcing rodman, San Antonio, Tex.
1949	$1.815	$2.40	$1.70	$1.75	$2.325	$2.25	$2.00.
1950	No increase	$2.525, $2.65	$1.92	$2.00	No increase	$2.50	$2.25.
1951	$2.015	No increase	$2.12	$2.125	$2.445	No increase	No increase.
1952	No increase	$2.90	$2.18	$2.25	$2.775	$2.65	$2.40.
1953	do	$3.10	$2.22, $2.27	$2.49	$2.875	$2.75	$2.50.
1954	Veto, no increase	$3.20	$2.32	$2.65	$3.005	$2.875	$2.625.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$3.30	$2.46	$2.75	$3.07	$3.00	$2.75.
1956	No increase	$3.385	$2.67	$2.875	$3.19	$3.125	$2.875.
1957	Veto, no increase	$3.535	$2.60, $2.72	$3.00	$3.25	$3.25	$3.00.
1958	$2.34	$3.635	$2.835, $2.875	$3.05	$3.40	$3.375	$3.125.
1959	No increase	$3.785	$2.95, $2.96, $3.04	$3.20	$3.48	$3.50	$3.25.
1960	?	$3.885					
Number of increases	4	12	16	11	10	10	10.
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		96 cents	82 cents	92.5 cents	63 cents	72.5 cents	72.5 cents.

Letter carriers received too few increases, too small increases, too many pay vetoes.

Comparison of hourly pay increases since 1949 between top-grade letter carriers and other workers in Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming

	Pay of step 7, letter carrier	Transit operators, Seattle, Wash.	Police and firemen, Seattle, Wash.	United steelworkers, Wheeling, W. Va.	Police and firemen, Milwaukee, Wis.	Painter, Cheyenne, Wyo.	Carpenter, Cheyenne, Wyo.
1949	$1.815	$1.60		$1.695	$1.84		$1.85.
1950	No increase	$1.67	$1.737	No increase	No increase	$2	$2.
1951	$2.015	$1.81	$1.788	do	$1.95	$2.125	$2.15.
1952	No increase	$1.88	$1.875	$1.82	$2.08	No increase	$2.35.
1953	do	$2	No increase	$1.905	$2.21	$2.275	No increase.
1954	Veto, no increase	$2.04	$1.962	$1.955	$2.28	$2.375	$2.50.
1955	Veto, $2.19	$2.18	$2.106	$2.07	No increase	No increase	No increase.
1956	No increase	$2.24	$2.250	$2.198	$2.37	$2.525	$2.75.
1957	Veto, no increase	$2.31	$2.394	$2.28	$2.51	$2.65	No increase.
1958	$2.34	$2.42	$2.567	$2.362	$2.75	$2.85	$2.94.
1959	No increase	$2.50	$2.715	No increase	No increase	$3	$3.05.
1960	?		$2.85	$2.444			$3.14.
Number of increases	4	11	10	9	8	8	9.
Amount of increase above letter-carrier increase		37.5 cents	59.8 cents	74.9 cents	38.5 cents	47.5 cents	76.5 cents.

Letter carriers received too few increases, too small increases, too many pay vetoes.

READ 'EM AND WEEP

The average number of wage increases given to workers in the 48 categories widely scattered from 28 States cited on the preceding pages is more than 10. During that time letter carriers received only four increases. Workers in the 48 categories cited received pay increases averaging 68½ cents more an hour than letter carriers received.

This adds up to an average increase of $1,424.80 a year more than that given to letter carriers.

WHERE IS THE MONEY COMING FROM?

Should the Federal budget and the so-called postal deficit be the determining factors in granting or denying a postal pay raise? Here are the facts:

Federal budget: In his budget message, the President estimated that in 1961 there would be a surplus of $4.2 billion. This shows that money is available for a decent increase. Our payments of interest on the national debt rose from $7.671 billion in 1959 to $9.385 billion in 1960. (This is an increase of $1.714 billion.) In 1958 we spent $2.231 billion on foreign aid. In 1959 this was increased to $3.780 billion. (This was a $1.549 billion increase supported by the Eisenhower administration.) This year the President proposes another increase of $1 billion.

Why should the taxpayers' money be available for everything under the sun except to give a decent living wage to letter carriers and other Federal employees?

WHERE IS THE MONEY COMING FROM?

The Post Office Department, in a recent press release, had this to say about the postal deficit: "In the 13 years from July 1946 to June 1959 the postal deficits totaled $6.8 billion—nearly half the total increase in the Federal debt in the same postwar period."

How silly can you get? Using this same yardstick, the deficit of the Defense Department was 30 times the increase in the national debt. The deficit of the Department of Agriculture was 3⅓ times the increase in the national debt. The deficit of the Department of Commerce was 1½ times the increase in the national debt.

The cost of the interest on the national debt was 5⅓ times the increase in the debt itself. The cost of foreign aid was 1½ times the increase in the national debt.

WHY PICK ON THE POSTAL EMPLOYEE?

When the Post Office Department hires a consulting firm or an engineering firm does it insist that the employees of those firms should work at a subsistence pay level? Did the Post Office Department insist that the Intelex Corp. should install the "Turnkey" operation at Providence, R.I., on a less-than-cost basis? Does it insist that the Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. should conduct its Operation Gateway at a loss? Does it insist that those who supply its equipment, or lease quarters for postal facilities or serve it in any other way should do so at a loss to themselves? Of course not. Then why should the postal employee—among all the people the Post Office Department does business with—be the only one who is expected to live on subsistence wages?

A LETTER CARRIER'S WAGES ARE AT SUB-SUBSISTENCE

In 1825 Postmaster General John McLean said that he had no intention of paying postal employees a sufficient compensation to provide them a livelihood without other means of support. After 135 years the philosophy of the Post Office Department remains the same. A compilation of more than 20,000 family budgets submitted by letter carriers within the last 6 weeks reveals the following: 95 percent of the letter carriers are family men; 31 percent have to hold down a second job; 43 percent of their wives work; and 93 percent operate at a deficit.

The average letter carrier's family operates $903 a year in the red—what kind of a life is this?

POOR PAY DRIVES POSTAL EMPLOYEES INTO DEBT

The annual report of the Detroit Postal Employees Credit Union reveals that during the year 1959, postal employees made 5,985 short term loans which amounted to $5,038,774.27. This was an increase of over 19 percent over 1958.

The following is a breakdown showing purposes for which loans were made:

Purpose	*Number*	*Percent*
Consolidation of bills	1,616	27.0
Home improvements	1,376	23.0
Medical expenses	1,017	17.0
Automobiles	1,018	17.0
Car repair	419	7.0
Vacation	150	2.5
Income tax	120	2.0
Insurance	120	2.0
Christmas	90	1.5
Education	59	1.0

It has become necessary for the credit union to establish a budget department to help postal employees who are in serious financial difficulty. These are employees who, in dire need and emergency, have borrowed from one or more finance companies, made purchases from various department stores and now are unable to make these payments from their postal paychecks and still pay their housing, food, utility bills, and other necessities.

After counseling the member concerning his income, family, and needs, an amount is determined and is left each payday for these payments. The budget department then disburses the money to the various creditors. At the present time, 205 Detroit postal employees are being assisted in this way. Each payday, approximately $10,000 is paid on these accounts. Also, the number of employees requiring this assistance is continually increasing.

Record of number of loans and amount

1955, 4,375	$2,575,743
1956, 4,482	2,952,234
1957, 5,232	3,605,106
1958, 5,659	4,230,653
1959, 5,985	5,038,774

For the periods indicated the amounts listed are the total loans granted to the members of the Lawrence, Mass., Post Office Credit Union:

The year ending Oct. 31, 1958	$33,339.85
The year ending Oct. 31, 1959	46,019.86
4 months ending Feb. 29, 1960 [1]	17,714.28

[1] (If projected to the close of the fiscal year, the total will exceed $50,000.)

Membership in this credit union is limited to active postal employees of Lawrence, Methuen, and North Andover, Mass. There are now 160 members.

The average number of borrowers is 90 at the close of each month.

These figures are typical of conditions existing all over the Nation.

The Post Office Department, in its official publication the Postal News admits that the workload of the letter carrier has gone up by leaps and bounds because of the increased volume.

Increased workloads and increased efficiency should equal increased pay.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, our office has just finished tabulating the results of a questionnaire which we sent out earlier in the session to residents of Minnesota's Ninth Congressional District. This questionnaire deals with eight of the issues facing this body, and the 7,027 replies which we have thus far received have been evaluated both totally and in five separate occupational groupings.

In the hope that the opinions expressed in this poll might be of benefit to my colleagues, I am calling them to the attention of the House at this time.

Comments and a percentage summary follow:

1. In the field of Government spending, the replies which we received indicated an overwhelming majority in favor of payment on the national debt or, at least, a balanced budget.

2. In response to the agricultural question, 63.5 percent of those replying indicated their favor with some type of controls and supports. The differences of opinion with regard to what form this program should take, however, reflect the general lack of agreement on how best to improve agricultural income and reduce taxpayer expense.

3. Regarding our mutual security (foreign aid) program, a large majority was almost equally divided between appropriations smaller than last year and appropriations the same as last year; 5.5 percent voted for increased foreign aid spending.

4. A raising of the present $1,200 limitation on outside earnings of those receiving social security benefits was favored by a majority of those who replied. This majority was largest among business and professional people, and smallest among those who are presently retired. A majority of farmers replying were against the raising of this limitation.

5. Together with the question concerning agriculture, that regarding a medical and surgical health plan for social security recipients resulted in the greatest difference of opinion. The replies against such a proposal were 1.1 percent larger than those in favor. Replies against were more common among business and professional people; replies for were more common among retired and salaried people.

6 and 7. A majority of those who replied were against Federal financial assistance for school construction, and a very large majority were opposed to such aid for teachers' salaries. This was uniformly true among all groups, with the exception of professional people, who comprised about 10 percent of the total replies. Those in this occupational grouping, while substantially opposed to Federal assistance for teachers' salaries, voted slightly in favor of aid for construction.

8. The large majority in all groups who voted in favor of Federal legislation to deal with such situations as the recent steel strike indicated the general response to such labor-management disputes.

PERCENTAGE SUMMARY

1. Which approach to Government spending do you believe will best serve the Nation's economy at this time? (1) Deficit spending, 2.9 percent; (2) a balanced budget, 37.1 percent; or (3) income exceeding outgo, permitting payment on the national debt, 56.1 percent. No opinion, 3.9 percent.

2. Which do you believe will best serve to bolster farm income, and at the same time decrease costs to the taxpayer? (1) Increased controls and supports, 12.5 percent; (2) reduced controls and support, 20.4 percent; (3) increased use of the soil bank principle, 5.2 percent; (4) a combination of controls, supports, and increased use of the soil bank, 25.4 percent; or (5) absoltuely no Government participation in agriculture, 29.9 percent. No opinion, 7.3 percent.

3. Do you believe this year's budget for our Nation's mutual security (foreign aid) program should be (1) Smaller than, 44.8 percent; (2) roughly the same as, 44.2 percent; or (3) larger than, 5.5 percent—the approximately $3.1 billion appropirated by the Congress last year? No opinion, 5.5 percent.

4. Do you believe the present $1,200 limitation on outside earnings for those receiving social security benefits should be raised? Yes, 54.6 percent; no, 43 percent; no opinion, 2.4 percent.

5. Do you believe this country should institute a medical and surgical health plan for those receiving social security benefits which would be administered and financed by the Social Security Administration? Yes, 47.9 percent; no, 49 percent; no opinion, 3.1 percent.

6. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide financial assistance for elementary and secondary school construction? Yes, 42.5 percent; no, 53.3 percent; no opinion, 4.2 percent.

7. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide financial assistance for teachers' salaries? Yes, 19.8 percent; no, 76 percent; no opinion, 4.2 percent.

8. Do you believe the latest steel strike has shown a need for Federal legislation in this field? Yes, 80.4 percent; no, 15.6 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

Report on the University Model United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a report on the University Model United Nations—U.M.U.N.—which was held in Montreal, Canada during the early part of February.

This report was prepared by Walter J. Nicgorski, a senior at Georgetown College, who led the three-man team representing the United States at that meeting. I would like to add that Mr. Nicgorski is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Nicgorski who reside in the 4th Congressional District of Wisconsin. He is an outstanding student and has recently received a Woodrow Wilson fellowship, and a Danforth Foundation fellowship, for graduate study in the field of political science. The Georgetown College delegation which he led at the University Model United Nations received the "Best Delegation Award" from the sponsors of that conference.

The University Model United Nations was sponsored by four Montreal universities and underwriten by the Canadian Government. Student delegations representing almost every member of the United Nations participated in the event. The delegations were composed of United States and Canadian university students and of foreign exchange students studying in the Western Hemisphere. They debated issues which are confronting the United Nations Organization and adopted various resolutions mentioned in Mr. Nicgorski's report.

I was pleased to receive Mr. Nicgorski's account of the conference and I believe that his comments about student opinion on a number of international issues may prove of interest to the membership of this body:

MONTREAL'S UNIVERSITY MODEL UNITED NATIONS

(By Walter J. Nicgorski)

The University Model United Nations is sponsored by four Montreal universities and underwritten by the Canadian Government. The sponsoring universities are McGill, Montreal, Sir George Williams, and Loyola of Montreal. Most of the sessions of the U.M.U.N. are held at either Montreal University or McGill University; the delegates from universities all over North America are put up at a hotel in downtown Montreal and are transported to the daily sessions by special busses.

Insofar as it is possible, the sponsors of the conference attempt to have foreign exchange students represent the country of their own origin and/or citizenship. Almost every nation in the United Nations was represented at the 1960 event. A number of nations sent diplomatic advisers from their Ottawa embassies or their missions at the United Nations in New York. These advisers helped their respective delegations to understand the policies of their own countries and aided the student delegates with floor strategy, parliamentary tactics, etc.

Besides sessions of the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the General Assembly, there were certain other events in the course of the weekend. Such events were addresses to the assemblage by various Canadian and/or United Nations dignitaries, such as the present leader of the Loyal Opposition in Canada, the Honorable Lester Pearson. There were also panel discussions on the world problems of overpopulation and disarmament. The latter panel heard from representatives of both the United States and the Soviet Governments; Prof. Otto Nathan, well known for his association with Einstein and his work in pacifist circles was also heard on this panel. As you may realize, such events yielded excellent opportunities to contact the opinions of the world's youth on many of the critical problems of today.

The U.S. delegation from Georgetown University was made up of James Cadden, of Washington, D.C.; George Giard, a Rhodes scholar-elect, from Dallas, Tex., and myself. Our official advisers were Mr. Richard Pederson, of the U.S. Mission to the U.N., and Mr. Albert Rosen, specialist on China in the U.S. State Department.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The one item on the agenda of the Security Council was a resolution concerning the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force. This resolution was introduced by Ceylon. There were a considerable number of amendments of a minor nature. The United States and the United Kingdom were concerned that the original resolution in intent went too far toward actually establishing such a peace or police force without providing for a preliminary working out of details before final commitment by nations. The resolution was overwhelmingly favored by almost all students and was eventually passed with both the United States and the Soviet Union voting in favor of it. A copy of the resolution, finally passed as I have it from the records available to me, is found under addendum I.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The assembly first took up the question of admittance of Red China to the United Nations. This resolution as for all the others that were actually discussed at the U.M.U.N. had been placed on the agenda by the sponsors of the conference. The resolution calling for the General Assembly's recognition of the government of the People's Republic of China as the authorized voice of China in all United Nations' bodies, as well as recognizing the same republic as the de jure government of China, was formally introduced by Poland. The United States immediately introduced a moratorium resolution to apply to Poland's resolution. This move met with the disfavor of the majority of the students as well as with the officials of the conference who used their influence over the Assembly in this matter. The sentiment of the ma-

jority seemed to be that though the United States succeeds in using the moratorium on the Red China question in the real United Nations, no harm could come from a good thorough student discussion on this subject of admittance of Red China to the United Nations and recognition of the government of said China by the General Assembly. There was considerable agitation for more than merely the defeat of the U.S. resolution on the moratorium, for some students as well as, of course, the official advisers of the Communist-bloc nations were anxious to see this assembly of students endorse a policy contrary to the wishes of their government. I may say, without a doubt, that the U.S. State Department seemed fully aware of the propaganda value for the Soviets to which a Communist victory on the China question might lead.

The moratorium, as was expected, was defeated, and a more extensive discussion of the China question ensued. The Polish resolution was finally defeated after almost 2 days of discussion; the margin of victory on the substantive question came very close to the actual margin in favor of the moratorium resolution in the real U.N. Assembly. Student sentiment and opinion appeared to be very much opposed to the U.S. use of the moratorium procedure to face this issue. Such a tactic seems to leave these students with the opinion that the United States cannot face the issue in open debate. The assembly never seemed to realize that in the real U.N., as Mr. Pederson noted many times, substantive debate takes place though the moratorium question is technically considered only a procedural question. One other observation of student opinion on this question is that I feel that many non-American students are very much in favor of admission of Red China to the United Nations. American (U.S. citizens) students seemed to be divided on the question. A copy of the resolution introduced by Poland and defeated by the Assembly is included as addendum II.

The Assembly then considered a resolution proposed by Canada and aimed at having the United Nations take initial steps toward prohibiting the use of outer space for military purposes and furthering a plan for the peaceful uses of outer space. A substitute resolution of the same intent was proposed by Denmark and was finally passed.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

This Council considered a resolution that would have the United Nations through the Food and Agriculture Organization work out a plan for the distribution by a U.N. agency of alimentary food surpluses of certain nations of the world and for the establishment of an International Emergency Food Bank. Many of the small nations felt that this was necessary in order that underdeveloped countries in need may get help without going directly to those countries with surpluses and hence getting themselves involved in world politics to an extent. The United States though in general agreement with the resolution urged caution about the extent of commitment involved in the resolution in light of the previous failures of the FAO to work out a plan satisfactory to all nations concerned. This resolution was finally passed.

I have just one general comment that I think is of some importance. Throughout the days of the conference in both formal and informal meetings, I had many opportunities to discuss the topics of world politics with Canadian students as well as with representative students of many other nations. It was somewhat surprising for me to discover that these students conceive of the cold war struggle in a totally different way than do American students. The world's present picture for them is, in their own words, one of "two great powers leading the world to destruction." They (and the same was evident in the statements of some of the Canadian political and intellectual leaders in the speeches and panel discussions) not infrequently referred to the "militarism" of the United States and the "eminent rationalism" or the "rationalizations" of the U.S. State Department. That the United States is taking the leadership in defending a certain set of values especially dear to the West brought smiles of doubt and cynicism to the faces of these students. There were, of course, exceptions to what I say; I have only tried to describe what I considered to be predominant sentiments.

ADDENDUM I: SECURITY COUNCIL—RESOLUTION No. 1

Noting that the recent years have seen frequent threats to international peace and security;

Considering that in many such instances, an international police force might be of some help in maintaining international peace and security especially in boundary incidents;

Conscious that a United Nations Emergency Force has proven itself useful and effective in the Israeli-United Arab Republic dispute;

Noting that under article 43 of the charter, the members have pledged themselves to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, Armed Forces, assistance and facilities necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security;

Considering that it was suggested by the Secretary General, as early as 1948, that a permanent United Nations guard be created, which was then to group some 800 men (res. 297–IV);

The Security Council—

1. Requests the Secretary General to intensify his consultations with member states on establishment of a U.N. police force to be available for observation and/or patrolling at the request of member states and under the decision of the General Assembly;

2. Invites all members to inform the Secretary General of their views of the manner in which they are willing to make manpower and equipment available for the implementation of this resolution;

3. Requests the Secretary General to organize for the next regular session of the General Assembly, a complete report of an acceptable organization of such a force, its budgetary implications and the members suggestions and offers on this question.

Proposed by Ceylon.

ADDENDUM II: GENERAL ASSEMBLY—RESOLUTION No. 1

Conscious that the United Nations Organization is an organization striving for world understanding through a world forum;

Believing that the members, cannot choose their fellow members according to their own individual preferences or dislikes;

Recognizing that the Government of the People's Republic of China has effective power over the territory and population of China;

Noting that in all previous instances, the de facto power of a government has always been the criterion to recognize its accredited representatives as the member's authorized voice;

Considering that the obligations of a member state of the United Nations could only be carried out by a government with a reasonable expectancy of permanence, which actually exercises control over the territory of that member and commands the obedience of its people;

Conscious that the United Nations cannot afford, for the sake of international institutions through which negotiations can take place and settlements can be reached;

Considering that any conventional or nuclear disarmament agreement, without the inclusion of the People's Republic of China, would fall short of what is needed for effective control and security in the eastern part of the world;

The General Assembly—

1. Recommends that the members recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the de jure Government of China;

2. Hereby recognize the representatives designated by such government as the authorized voice of China in all United Nations bodies.

Proposed by Poland.

Dr. Murry H. Fly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of Texas' greatest educators, Dr. Murry H. Fly, passed away in Odessa, Tex., on April 4, 1960, after a lifetime of dedicated service to his profession and his fellow men. The people he helped numbered in the thousands, and I think that every person whose life was touched by Murry Fly is better for it. I personally will always owe him a debt of gratitude for the guidance and kindly assistance he gave me during my formative years. It shall always be a matter of deep pride and personal satisfaction to me that I had the opportunity to graduate from a public school system which Murry Fly guided with wisdom, kindness, and a dedication almost beyond belief.

At the time of his passing, Dr. Fly was president of Odessa College, which he founded in 1946. The college started first as a dream of Murry Fly's, but he was not one to idly dream and do nothing about making it a reality. When the Odessa College was first founded, students met in borrowed or makeshift classrooms, utilizing whatever facilities were available. But Murry Fly was a builder and in the 14 years he served as president of Odessa College he fashioned an excellent, modern school with many beautiful buildings located on its own campus. Those houses of learning will stand as a monument to Murry Fly, and the good that he did will continue to be reflected in the thousands of young people who attend Odessa College in years to come.

Before founding Odessa College, Dr. Fly served for 24 years as superintendent of Ector County schools, and it was here that I first came to know him when I was a schoolboy looking for the leadership that he provided. Prior to his long and distinguished service with the Ector County schools, Dr. Fly had served as superintendent of school systems in Red River County, Collin County, and Strawn County, all in Texas. On July 1, 1959, he celebrated his 50th year in education, and received justly deserved tributes from friends, outstanding citizens,

former students and fellow educators all over the world.

Dr. Fly was himself the product of the rural public schools of his native Mississippi, and received his bachelor of arts degree at East Texas State College. He took bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from the University of Texas, and graduate work at the University of Chicago and Denver University. He received his doctorate degree at Texas Tech College.

Dr. Fly was born October 8, 1886, at Friar's Point, Miss., and in 1913 married Mildred Hamm, of Fort Worth, Tex. From their long happy union came five sons and two daughters, each of whom are outstanding people worthy of their heritage, and I am proud to call them my personal friends.

Dr. Fly was a tireless worker for any cause in which he enlisted. He served his community in many ways, and was proud of the fact that he had a record of 24 years of perfect attendance in the Lions Club. He served as governor of 2–T–2 District, Lions International, and held 1 of the 11 international keys presented in the history of international lionism. He was active in many educational and teachers organizations, serving in many elective capacities within them. He also served a term as president of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce, and was a devout member of the First Christian Church.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Dr. Fly's bereaved widow, to his children, grandchildren and other relatives. I feel a sense of personal loss in his passing, but I am consoled by the thought that the good works he did will live on.

Franklin Pierce Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened recently to read of the death of Franklin Pierce Adams, the famed columnist, "F.P.A.," who for so many years conducted the noted "Conning Tower" column in various metropolitan newspapers.

For those of us who came of age in the twenties and thirties, "F.P.A." and his column had a place in our lives which has never been duplicated.

Urbane and witty, Adams through his life fostered a respect for classical learning, a love for good literature and a sense of the importance of the ability to construct a clear and coherent English sentence.

In a time when regard for cultural matters was not as current in America as it is today, Adams through the persistence of his efforts inculcated in his readers an interest in great poetry, in notable writing and in artistic creation generally which was then encouraged by too few others in positions of such influence.

To remember how we awaited his translations of Horace, his Gilbertian verse or his weekly diary in the style of Samuel Pepys is to evoke the atmosphere of another day.

It is my conviction that we as a nation must return to adherence to many of the values which Franklin P. Adams thought important and which we have thoughtlessly discarded in the hectic war and postwar years.

Franklin P. Adams' efforts to raise our American cultural standards have been monumental and I can think of no finer tribute to his memory than to say that these efforts are still bearing fruit.

Accolade to Atlantic City Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey, a certain form of municipal government widely used is the commission form, with either five or three commissioners, according to population, and who in turn elect one of their members as a mayor. One of the unusual aspects of this form of government is that it has its own special election date, and the candidates run without any official designation of a political party. It is a political nonpartisan election.

The largest city in my Second District of New Jersey is Atlantic City, the mecca of thousands of vacationists every year, and the convention capital of the world. It was incorporated as a city in 1854 and was under a councilmanic form of government until 1912, when it adopted the commission form with a mayor and four commissioners. During all these years, there was never an election without opposing candidates or tickets, and I may say many Atlantic City elections of the past were turbulent to say the least.

This year on May 10, there will be another election for five commissioners, and for the first time in the history of Atlantic City no opposing candidates have filed to oppose the incumbents. This is so unprecedented it calls for comment.

The present commissioners are Mayor Joseph Altman and Commissioners John O'Donnell, Meredith B. Kerstetter, William F. Casey, and Richard S. Jackson, and they are all candidates for reelection. As natives of Atlantic City, they have seen and lived through many periods as the prosperity of Atlantic City follows the economic trend of the Nation. It is a health and pleasure resort with little industry, and has annual problems to face with a fluctuating population of 60,000 in winter to over 300,000 in summer, on an island 5 miles from the New Jersey mainland. The municipal maintenance and supervision of the economy are difficult under such circumstances, but added to this is the fact that Atlantic City must compete with scores of other cities and areas as a health, and recreation resort and convention city.

Down through the years the city has held its own, but in the past decade it began to show signs of wear. True, the ocean, the beach, and the sunshine were always there, but these were not enough in this modern world.

These five commissioners under Mayor Altman—these five dedicated officials saw these things and decided the world's playground needed a face lifting—that its facilities and the economy needed help. They proceeded with a planned program of municipal renovation—removing the antiquated trolley car system running the length of the island and replacing it with buses; widening and repaving the main through streets; improving and modernizing the world's largest convention hall; rebuilding, redecking, and beautifying the world famous boardwalk; changing municipal ordinances to encourage the removal of old wood constructed side avenue hotels for modern fireproof motels with side-by-side swimming pools and ice skating rinks. These things—this encouragement—this leadership has brought results. In the last several years, Atlantic City has and is undergoing an economic revolution. Scores of new modern motels in all locations have been erected, and are still going up. Convention business is increasing, bank deposits making new records, and thousands of satisfied guests are being served weekly.

Therefore, it must be that the citizens of Atlantic City have recognized these things and do honor to their incumbent commissioners by not opposing them for reelection. They have taken cognizance of the fact that their welfare depends on the good management of their city by experienced and dedicated officials. To one in the political field, I know of no way that an electorate could better show their confidence in their elected officials than by this reelection by unanimous acclaim. I join them in this accolade to Mayor Joseph Altman and Commissioners O'Donnell, Kerstetter, Casey, and Jackson.

Enough Anthracite Coal Reserves To Last an Estimated 456 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, April 7, 1960:

In sharp contrast to industry estimates of reserve life expectancies of 13 years for oil and 21 years of natural gas, Government estimates place the life of recoverable reserves of anthracite at several hundred years, according to the latest Anthracite Institute bulletin.

Original reserves of anthracite totaled 23 billion tons, according to a concensus of several authorities. By the end of 1958, however, production and losses had reduced reserve to 15 billion tons. At the assumed recovery rate of 61.5 percent of reserves, the industry life expectancy at the average extraction rates in the 3 years 1956–59, inclusive, is 456 years.

Extraction is based on fresh deep and strip mining, and excludes secondary recovery from banks and rivers.

The weighted average recovery of the original coal content by underground mining several years ago was estimated to be 40.9 percent in first mining and 24.5 percent in second mining, or a total recovery of 65.4 percent. The residual figure of 34.6 percent represented coal lost by mining operations. In addition, preparation practices were estimated to have lost 4.3 percent in cleaning and sizing. Thus the total loss of the original coal was 38.9 percent.

Subsequent improvements in mining and preparation practices have reduced this estimated coal loss and thus helped conserve coal. More important from the conservation aspect is the intensive development of stripping equipment and methods, as virtually 100 percent of the coalbed is now recovered in stripping operations.

To offset these favorable factors, many mines have been allowed to flood to the extent it is uneconomical to consider dewatering.

In others, mining has been conducted in such a manner as to make future recovery impractical.

Transfer of the U.S.S. "Charles Ausburne" to the Federal Republic of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks by our colleague Congressman RIVERS, of South Carolina's First District, were made at the transfer ceremonies of the U.S.S. *Charles Ausburne* (DD–570) to the Federal Republic of Germany, in Charleston on April 12, 1960.

This gallant ship was Adm. Arleigh Burke's flagship in the war in the Pacific.

These ceremonies, that I had the honor to attend, were impressive and moving, and Mr. RIVERS' splendid speech was one of the high points of this truly great and historic occasion. The speech follows:

Never before in recorded history has a vanquished nation risen from the depths of adversity to regain and reclaim its position among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

The success of the Federal German Republic in reasserting its economic position in European and world trade is due in large part to the faith and understanding of the American people.

The Congress of the United States has reflected this confidence of the American people by joining hands with the leaders of the Federal German Republic to provide it with the necessary tools to insure its freedom against possible future oppression. As a Member of the Congress of the United States, and also as a citizen of the great State of South Carolina, I am particularly aware of the problems that have faced the Federal German Republic since World War II.

As you know, we in the South have also known the bitterness of defeat. We also know the heartbreak and anguish that faces a great people when the fortunes of war turn against them. Most importantly, however, we know the burning desire of the vanquished for freedom and the right to live as a God-fearing people, and therefore, I think it is particularly appropriate that the people of Charleston have joined hands with the peoples of West Germany to assist them in their continued fight for freedom.

We in America recognize the splendid recovery which is the story of postwar West Germany. We share your hopes and aspirations for the future and therefore, I think it particularly significant that upon the occasion of the recent visit of Chancellor Adenauer, our President reassured him personally, that we would not abandon West Berlin under any circumstances.

We know that some of our allies appear not to share our strong views on this issue. However, in America we recognize full well that the future of West Berlin is inextricably tied to the future freedom of all Europe. And, to the extent that we may compromise our stand on West Berlin, to the same extent we compromise forever the principles of freedom for which we all stand.

I think it also significant that the President of the United States endorsed the necessity for future tariff reductions among the free nations of Western Europe so as to insure the continued economic growth of this vital bastion of freedom.

Great words have been said about the importance of this last destroyer being transferred to the German Republic. Nothing more need be said on this subject for I am certain that my good friend Admiral Ruge will do a masterful job of welding this latest link into the defense armor of the free nations of Western Europe.

We in America are not militarist, nor are the people of Western Germany. However, we have all learned to be realists. We know that we cannot continue to enjoy the fruits of freedom without paying the price of an adequate defense, therefore, in closing I think it important to reiterate that the cost of freedom and peace is high, but it is well worth the price we pay.

Thank you.

California's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a wonderfully kind and understanding mother who resides in the congressional district it is my privilege to represent has been chosen California Mother of the Year.

She is Mrs. Emerald B. Arbogast of Eagle Rock, Calif., who was selected for this honor because of her devoted work in behalf of exceptional children.

Far from throwing up her hands in despair when her own son was born with a mental deficiency, Mrs. Arbogast accepted it instead as a privilege and opportunity to provide loving care and understanding to one of God's children less able to care for himself than most others are able to do.

She was successful in helping her son to progress to a point where he can lead a reasonably normal life, and founded the Exceptional Children's Foundation to help others. I concur heartily in the selection of her as California Mother of the Year.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial honoring Mrs. Arbogast that appeared in the Pasadena Star-News, April 6, 1960:

CALIFORNIA'S MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Emerald Barman Arbogast of Eagle Rock, who has been named California's Mother of the Year, is an inspiring example of that small number of people who, though told something can't be done, go ahead and do it.

The achievement for which Mrs. Arbogast was honored was her work with a son, now 35, who was born mentally deficient. Ignoring expert advice that his case was hopeless, Mrs. Arbogast refused to commit him to an institution but instead worked patiently to develop his potentialities. Her efforts were a success, for her son has been enabled to live a reasonably normal life.

But her success with her son, as such, is the smallest part of it. Mrs. Arbogast, working as a nonprofessional, devised the proverbial mousetrap, so to speak, that caused experts to beat a path to her door. Her methods have revolutionized the treatment of cases like her son's.

Mrs. Arbogast did not limit her efforts to her son, however, but founded the Exceptional Children's Foundation, now grown to national stature, and serves as president of a school for retarded boys. She has played the role not only of mother but of human benefactor with distinction.

Tom Curtis: A Patriot of Vision and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Missouri has only one Republican in its congressional delegation. That Republican Member is my committee colleague on the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS. It is no overstatement to assert that what the Missouri Republican delegation may lack in quantity, TOM CURTIS, of the St. Louis area, makes up for in quality.

Editorial cognizance of TOM CURTIS' great ability and patriotic dedication to duty as a legislator has recently been taken by Dr. Raymond Moley, in the April 18, 1960, issue of Newsweek magazine. Dr. Moley's weekly column in Newsweek is captioned "Perspective," and the article devoted to Mr. CURTIS bears the heading "CURTIS Fights for Sanity." Both the column caption and the title of the editorial comment are particularly appropriate because the column regularly brings perspective to important national issues and TOM CURTIS relentlessly endeavors to deal with those issues on the basis of the facts so

that their solution will be sane and enduring.

TOM CURTIS was appointed to membership on the Committee on Ways and Means on January 14, 1953, after serving one previous term in the House of Representatives. He has rapidly advanced to a position of fourth-ranking Republican member on this important committee. His advancement has been accompanied by a tremendous growth in influence among his colleagues and by the development of a comprehensive understanding of the legislative subjects with which he is dealing. He has approached his duties with fearless advocacy of what he believes is right. He has attended to his responsibilities with patriotic dedication. He has proved himself to be an able lawyer, economist, and statesman.

Many of the major bills that have been prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law during the 8 years TOM CURTIS has served on the Committee on Ways and Means bear his very important contribution to their development. He has stood stanchly for a Federal tax structure that encourages economic growth in our free enterprise system. He has been in the forefront in the development of tax legislation to aid small business. TOM CURTIS has rightly believed that the greater economic opportunity for our citizens resided in the growth of private enterprise and not in the enlargement of bureaucratic Government enterprise.

With respect to our social security system this Missouri statesman has diligently worked for its improvement so that the system would more adequately and more realistically meet the needs of our citizens. He has opposed unsound amendments to the Social Security Act because they would threaten to destroy the present system. He has always been mindful of the needs of the aged and has worked to create a fuller life and greater opportunity for them.

TOM CURTIS is a man who has stood steadfastly for the principles of government in which he so earnestly believes. During his service to his country in the House of Representatives, he has earned the respect and affection of Republicans and Democrats alike. I believe it proper to summarize his dedicated purpose as being directed to assuring that the Nation he serves will be a continuously improving country for the present and succeeding generations. He believes that our generation should pay its own way rather than attempt to live off the heritage of the past or the productivity of the future.

TOM CURTIS has made his mark not only as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means but, as Dr. Moley notes, as the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

TOM CURTIS has proved that knowledge is power, and he has also proved that knowledge is a prerequisite to the right answer to the legislative issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include Dr. Moley's editorial comment on my esteemed friend and colleague, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri:

CURTIS FIGHTS FOR SANITY

(By Raymond Moley)

After that gaudy carnival in Wisconsin, thousands of Americans must be wondering whether democratic institutions are worth all that past generations have paid for them. What must be the reaction of the fine, educated people of Wisconsin who had to endure at first hand this onslaught of demagogery, corn, cafe society, Hollywood revels, and campaign methods cheap in taste but costly in money? It was a gross insult to the people of a fine State. Since so many politicians feel that their appeals must be made somewhere below the neckband, doubts must arise whether there is really sanity, sincerity, or intelligence in public life.

It is refreshing to turn to instances in which political success and influence in national affairs have attended men who have rejected the low road and have dared to fight for the public interest. There are such men, notably in the House of Representatives, who may well be the hope of free institutions in the United States. They are also a base upon which could be built a vitalized Republican Party, if that party chooses principle rather than the shadow of expediency.

I have already written in this space about two of them—GERALD FORD, of Michigan, and BRUCE ALGER, of Texas. There are others equally noteworthy, such as WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, JOHN RHODES, of Arizona, and JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin. Outstanding among such leaders of the future is THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.

GROWING INFLUENCE

He was born in St. Louis 49 years ago. He practiced law and in 1950 was elected to the House where he has had five terms. His continuous tenure has moved him well up in the Ways and Means Committee and he is ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

These two committee assignments have placed him in a powerful position in legislation which deals with the major domestic issues of these times, inflation and fiscal responsibility. His influence with colleagues in both parties has steadily grown. Minority reports of the Joint Economic Committee on economic growth were written under his direction. Fellow members of his committee say that in the hearings—in which were presented the fallacious concept of the "liberals" that government can promote growth by mere spending—CURTIS applied himself with indefatigable energy and sincerity.

As ranking minority member of the JEC Subcommittee on Defense Procurement he came to grips with another of the major 1960 issues.

TAPS FOR FORAND BILL

In this session his outstanding contribution to sanity has been his effort to sidetrack the Forand bill for medical aid to the elderly through an increase in the social-security tax. As ranking minority member of the Ways and Means subcommittee on social security, he assumed leadership in the contest. By assiduous study and penetrating questioning of witnesses he mastered the problems raised by the bill (a counterpart bill by Senator KENNEDY is before the Senate). His speech dissecting the measure, delivered in the House on March 24, is truly outstanding. As a result, he provided the President with a summary of the weaknesses of the proposed remedy and alternative measures for meeting the same problem. It was this summary which the President had at a Cabinet meeting when Secretary Flemming was, shall we say, redirected from some of his own ideas. Flemming was later sent to Congress to announce the President's views. It is fair to say that CURTIS almost alone has been responsible for shelving a dangerous measure which might well have passed both Houses.

In this as in other instances, CURTIS, despite membership in a minority, proved that knowledge is power. And when knowledge is joined with sincerity and drive it is irresistible.

CURTIS, with a few of his colleagues in the House, has been instrumental in saving American taxpayers billions of ill-considered spending. As gossip mounts concerning candidates for Vice President on the Republican ticket, why cannot attention be directed to one of these House Members? He would be not only an effective and informed campaigner, but an indispensable assistant to the next President, whoever he may be.

Office Automation and Employee Job Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, hearings held recently by the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service pointed up the need for adequate consideration of employee welfare in the introduction of labor-saving equipment. In this modern era of application of automation to office procedures, Federal employees are now facing threats experienced earlier by factory workers.

A very effective summary of the problems and of the steps taken to meet them by certain Federal agencies was presented to the subcommittee on March 2, 1960, by Mr. James Campbell, president of the American Federation of Government Employees. Mr. Campbell's familiarity with this problem area has enabled him to set forth some thoughtful suggestions for study by the executive agencies and the Congress. I am pleased to insert his statement in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JAMES CAMPBELL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The impact upon Government employment of technological changes in Federal Government operations calls for frequent and careful review. Whether those changes are brought about by means of true automation or by improved mechanization of processes already developed, there is a constant need to anticipate and resolve the personnel problems which are almost certain to arise.

This inquiry which has been undertaken by the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee should have tremendous benefit for the Government and even to a greater extent for the employees whose positions and livelihood are threatened by technological advances. In my opinion, it is a very important and a very necessary project which will bear repetition in future months, for the problem at which it is directed will constantly be manifesting changing circumstances and unusual aspects which must from time to time be evaluated anew if their adverse effects upon human values are to be kept to a minimum.

This effort to appraise the underlying problem contained in office automation, if it is to achieve the long-range objective of safeguarding job security, must determine the extent of major technological changes and then formulate and assess the personnel management problems which have resulted from those changes. Such an investigation should provide a firm basis for whatever remedial action may be suggested.

No one may validly object to the installation of laboring devices, provided the same degree of planning is devoted to determining and controlling the potentially adverse effects upon personnel as is directed to the improvement of technological processes and to the achievement of monetary savings. The long-range effects are almost certain to be beneficial to all concerned, and to oppose such advances inordinately is to impede human progress.

It is important first to ascertain the number of employees who may be displaced in the organizational unit involved and to take the necessary protective measures to safeguard their livelihood. The effect that automated or mechanized procedures will have on their future employability or earning power is of major consideration. Can their present skills be utilized elsewhere in the same bureau or division, or must they be separated from the agency altogether to seek employment elsewhere? Is retraining necessary or is it feasible? Would there be jobs available in the newly developed skill? Underlying all of these possible situations are budgetary aspects of the problem which must be resolved or possible solutions may be impractical.

The most desirable approach to putting into effect the decision to automate certain processes, which may for the present displace persons as well as revise procedures, is to view it as a personnel problem from its inception. The individual who has the principal responsibility for personnel administration should have an equal place in the initial planning group with the administrative officer, the cost accountant, the engineer, or the specialist in automation. Such procedure is more likely to develop more effective counteractive measures from a personnel standpoint than would come about if the impact on persons would be left to the final stage of planning.

In a sense what is needed is simply to apply the procedure which is fundamental to all intelligent personnel administration. As soon as it is practically possible there should be an announcement to the personnel who may be affected that new machines will be installed and the extent indicated to which present employees may be affected. A large measure of uncertainty, fear, resentment, and lack of cooperation by employees may be avoided if an adequate effort is made to maintain free and effective communication between management and employees.

This sort of communication should assure the employees that a concerted effort will be made to operate the new machines with personnel now employed and that as much training as may be necessary will be on the job and will begin well in advance of installation of equipment. If certain jobs cannot be filled within the organization, that should be stated and the reasons therefore made clear. Likewise, it should be indicated as soon as possible what individuals cannot be utilized in the new organizational structure and how that phase of the problem will be met by retraining for other work, transfer to other units, or by assistance in placement in other agencies or in positions outside Government service.

The concern of Federal employees and of their leaders that governmental management will not anticipate and fully plan for the change to automated processes is based on experience. Too often innovations whether in organizational structure or in machines have wreaked their toll in personnel simply because those in authority were not concerned with the human effects and made little or no effort to ascertain them sufficiently in advance. The specter of dismissal and unemployment looms large in the minds of Government employees when change is intimated. Automation represents the new and untried to those who are learning of it for the first time. It suggests many unknown and unanswered questions, and it is of paramount importance that a broadly premised cooperative effort be made to find the answers to those questions.

There has been a steady increase during the last several years in the use of automated equipment by the Federal Government. Large agencies having the function of collecting, analyzing, correlating or otherwise processing great masses of statistical or accounting data have adopted the use of electronic data processing machines while the same or other agencies have planned or installed equipment that will expedite their activities.

The threat which the trend toward automation in the office holds for Government employees is real and one which calls for even broader and more careful planning. The list of agencies which have embarked on automated programs grows longer each year. The Patent Office is able to make an electronic search of its huge archives in minutes instead of days or weeks to determine whether a supposedly new device is patentable. The Internal Revenue Service is using a computer to process a large proportion of its 60-odd million income tax returns. An electronic map-drawing device has aided the Weather Bureau to improve its weather forecasting. Displacements, it is claimed, have been negligible or nonexistent in these agencies.

Personnel has, however, been markedly reduced in some operations. The Treasury Department's Bureau of Public Debt, which maintains records of interest payments on the national debt, is reported as having reduced its work force from about 12,000 in 1946 to about one-fourth of that number. This reduction has come about through the use of machines to streamline the huge volume of paperwork. The same has been true of the Treasury's Disbursing Office in which advanced equipment handles the million or more checks which are written for the Government each day. This task is accomplished with fewer than half the number of employees required 3 or 4 years ago.

More and more Government agencies have installed similar equipment. It does not always involve highly complex machines of the "electric brain" type. It may come about through the adoption of more advanced techniques or of machines that have been available but not put into use in a particular Government office. Within the last 4 years the Post Office Department completed the task of mechanizing its huge payroll. The operation was changed from manual payroll methods to an electronically controlled punchcard system. Whereas 1 payroll worker was needed for each 300 employees under the manual system, the new method required 1 for each 800 employees.

During this same period the Department embarked on a sweeping mechanization program which has been termed by its planners to be without equal in industrial history. Post offices are gradually becoming large mechanized operations containing the latest mail-handling devices, such as high-speed automatic letter-facing and stamp-canceling machines, letter-sorting machines, conveyor equipment to carry mail throughout a post office building, and modern vending equipment for stamps and money orders, to mention only some of the devices being put into use.

Several agencies are engaging in automatic data processing on an accelerated scale. The Bureau of the Census has been adjusting to more and more mechanization for half a century. It was the origin of the present-day data-processing equipment and was the first agency to use high-speed computing machines. The Bureau applied electronic computers to its census activities in 1954 and succeeded in making the results of its survey available several months earlier. Wider application of automatic equipment will be made to the decennial census to be taken this year.

The Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, the world's largest insurance organization, is a pioneer in the use of electronic equipment to handle routine paperwork. The increasing use of machines at its Baltimore headquarters has made it possible to handle the increasingly larger workload resulting from the evergrowing number of persons covered by the Social Security Act.

The Veterans' Administration has played a leading role in solving the problem of what to do with persons displaced by these remarkable machines. This has been evidenced in the planned action by the VA to relieve the difficulties of employee displacement when it installs an electronic data-processing computer and a communications system linking its insurance offices in Denver, St. Paul, and Philadelphia. Installation of the complete system is scheduled for completion next year, but already it is known that it will result in the reduction of nearly 700 employees in the 3 cities.

There are already plans shaping up for relocating these who will be displaced. First there is an employment freeze by all VA installations in these areas, and the employees who will be surplused by the insurance division will be offered any job openings for which they are qualified in other VA units.

It is estimated that more than 900 positions will have to be surplused this and next fiscal year because of electronic data processing in the Department of Veterans Benefits. The number that will be surplused in insurance and in DVB by next fiscal year exceeds 1,500 positions.

The Army and the Air Force have automated programs of considerable importance. The Adjutant General's Office, the Army Finance Center, and the Army Signal Corps have adopted data-processing procedures utilizing the latest electronic equipment. The Signal Corps has used such equipment for its logistic operations in which it keeps tabs on thousands upon thousands of items of communications equipment and supplies at home and overseas. A huge data-processing machine has been put into use by the Army Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command for stock control of replacement of parts for combat and transport vehicles.

Four years ago the national president of the American Federation of Government Employees asked the Defense Department to work with employee organizations in controlling the adverse effects of automation on the Federal service. The Department policy that was later shaped up included the specific provision that employees would be trained whenever possible in the new skills that would be required for the use of automated equipment. Since that time greater attention has been given to the impact of the newer methods on personnel. The Adjutant General's Office and other Army units have sent groups of its key civilian employees to attend courses of instruction provided by private industry before procuring this modern equipment.

It is essential therefore for Congress to inquire into the extent and the future trend of this ever-broadening program of technological change in Government offices. Such an inquiry should answer important questions concerning its present and future scope and its possible adverse effects on many hundreds of civil service personnel. It should answer such questions as which Fed-

eral agencies are involved in this program. What has been the effect of the introduction of automated processes and what is the extent of the future program now in the planning stage?

Especially helpful will be the direction of this inquiry at the problems of employees recruitment and displacement. These can be studied not for the purpose of assessing blame if there be any, but of determining what improvement may be made in the manner in which agencies have been discharging their responsibilities. There should also be consideration and evaluation of training programs to prepare present personnel for new positions which will be created in the course of mechanizing many operations. Always, of course, there should be uppermost the objective of making certain that planning is far enough ahead of installation of the new machinery to permit redistribution and retraining of employees already on the job.

If the fullest measure of thought and consideration is given to the human values involved, automation can be for the Government, as it has been for industry, a source of tremendous benefits and an avenue to better and higher standards of living.

Iowa Power Line Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit to the Members of this great body an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register on April 10 of this year which concerns itself with the continuance of the construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of two electric power transmission lines in Iowa to serve the load centers of the Missouri River power marketing area in our State.

It has been my privilege to work for the construction of these transmission lines even before the proposal was first submitted to Congress last year. I have come to realize that these lines mean more to the preference customers and the people of Iowa than merely a means to move power from one point to another or to have available the facilities to obtain allotted Missouri River power which heretofore was forfeited in whole or in part. These lines when completed will serve as vital links in a vast grid of transmission networks which would provide a great many people in the Iowa marketing area with a most effective and efficient service of continuous low-cost power.

Congress should follow through on the action taken last year and pass the necessary appropriations as requested in the budget to continue construction of these transmission lines.

The editorial follows:

IOWA POWER LINE ISSUE

The privately owned power companies in Iowa are again opposing construction of a federally financed power transmission project for western Iowa.

The project calls for eventual appropriation of $8,800,000 to build two transmission lines from Sioux City to Spencer and from Sioux City to Creston. Power from Missouri River dams would be transmitted over these lines to Rural Electrification Administration (REA) co-ops and municipally owned power systems.

The power companies appear to be fighting over a dead horse on this issue. The project was authorized last year in the public works appropriation bill passed over President Eisenhower's veto. The bill contained $800,000 for survey work and design of the transmission lines. This survey work is now underway and proceeding on schedule.

The project was backed in Congress last year by all of Iowa's Representatives and by Senator TOM MARTIN. Senator HICKENLOOPER didn't take a stand on the project but voted for the public works bill. All Iowa Members of Congress have been urging appropriations this year except Senator HICKENLOOPER. He says west Iowa should get additional power from Missouri River projects but that this specific proposal is too technical for him to make a recommendation. The Eisenhower administration opposed an appropriation last year but recommends one this year.

The private power companies have opposed the project as unnecessary. They made an offer last year to transmit the public power to preference customers at reasonable rates. They claim their proposal would result in a saving to the Government. It would not, however, result in a saving to the co-ops and municipal power companies. They will benefit by the transmission lines. The Government investment will be repaid and 3 percent interest paid on it.

The private utilities are making a fight against Government favoritism of public power over private power. But the issue of public versus private power is present to only a minor degree in this project—and the private utilities lost this fight, anyway. It is our opinion that Congress should follow through on the action taken last year and make the additional appropriations essential to complete the transmission lines by the scheduled date in 1962.

Congressman Donald J. Irwin on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Congressman DONALD J. IRWIN, is most knowledgeable about matters dealing with Latin America.

He recently made a statement concerning Cuba which prompted editorial comment in the Bridgeport Sunday Post on April 10, 1960.

Congressman IRWIN said:

WHAT MUST WE DO CONCERNING CUBA?

It is important, I think, that we respond with vigor to unfavorable and unwarranted attacks upon us by the Castro government. We must do so, I feel, with the idea in mind of protecting our interests in the rest of Latin America. At the same time, we must take every step to prevent any untoward incident that will give Castro an opportunity to attack us further. Specifically, we must halt unauthorized flights by American planes over Cuba, for such flights only weaken our position at home and abroad.

I am very much opposed, incidentally, to proposals for broadcasting directly from the United States to Cuba. Such plans, it seems to me, would be repeating the fatal mistake made during the days of Peron in Argentina when our Ambassador tried to interfere. If we broadcast anti-Cuban programs, then we will be identified as the only anti-Castro force in Cuba and all Cubans will rally behind Castro. This suggestion only underlines the need for a full-blown Voice of America program for all of Latin America which would bring to the Latin Americans a clear idea of what the long-range U.S. objectives are. The VOA would spell out specifically what our programs and hopes are for the free people of Latin America.

President Eisenhower's recent trip aroused all kinds of hopes for the roles we are to play in the future development of Latin America and we must be ready to help meet these expectations. I disagree with Mr. Eisenhower's claim upon his return from his recent goodwill tour, however. The President maintained that our prestige was never higher in Latin America. In my opinion, our position in Latin America has never been more perilous.

It is of vital important, I believe, that we explain our democratic system of government and outline the role that private enterprise can play in the development of Latin American countries. Private American capital invested abroad can do much to help Latin America meet its needs.

These remarks not only initiated the following article but caused a change of opinion within the editorial staff of the Bridgeport Sunday Post:

IRWIN REPORTS ON CUBA

Congressman DONALD IRWIN, of Norwalk, recently back from a meeting of the Caribbean Assembly and a personally financed side trip to Cuba to get firsthand impressions of the situation there, says the island republic is headed for "serious economic troubles in the near future."

All signs point to it, but despite the fact, Cubans do not want Fulgencio Batista, or anyone like him, back in power, Representative IRWIN had only 48 hours to make observations in Cuba but his fluency in the Spanish language made the gathering of information comparatively easy for him.

Anti-American attacks by Castro, he believes, should be answered "with vigor" but with the idea in mind of protection for our interests in other Latin American countries. He failed to notice, he reports, any spontaneous anti-Americanism, as he walked about the streets. Cubans knew at once he was an American, yet there was no demonstration of the hatred that has been generated by the head of the rebel regime.

The Fairfield County Congressman came away convinced that Castro's management of economic affairs will surely lead to crisis. He favors a ban on unauthorized flights to Cuba from Florida, but he is opposed to broadcasting directly from this country to the island.

We had regarded the broadcasting idea as a good one, to talk directly to the Cuban people, but Representative IRWIN says if we do it, we will be identified as the only anti-Castro force in Cuba, and all Cubans, of all shades of opinion, will rally to Fidel against the United States. That seems to be sound reasoning.

Representaive IRWIN suggests the need for broadcasting the Voice of America to all Latin American nations, to give them a clear idea of our long-range friendly objectives, spelling out our hopes and our programs for the free peoples.

Our Congressman's is the latest voice to be raised in explaining what now seems to be inevitable. Castro was big enough to lead a revolt against brutality, thievery and general economic distress. But he has proved beyond any doubt that he is not big enough to lead his nation toward prosperity and

good relations with us. His campaign against us has been deliberate, not accidental, and is without basis in fact.

This is known by the business and professional people in Cuba, and the middle-class citizens. Soon the peasants and the poorest workers will know it, too. And then things will have to change—for the better we hope.

South Dakota American Legion Winning Oration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, each year, the American Legion sponsors an oratory contest on subjects related to Americanism. This activity provides an excellent opportunity for young people to express their views on public issues.

This year's winner of the State competition in South Dakota is Mr. Larry Pressler, of Humboldt, S. Dak.

I include at this point in the RECORD Larry's winning oration:

A CONCEALED THREAT TO OUR CONSTITUTION

(By Larry Pressler)

"America, we will bury you."

With these words Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev concluded his keynote address preceding the annual Communist May Day parade in 1957. With these words he struck fear and unrest into the heart of every American. For with these words he repeated the longtime goal of the Communist Party; namely, to rule the entire world.

Americans shuddered when they heard this, and they had reason to shudder. For they were dealing with a godless man, a man who has placed little value on human life. According to a Gallup poll taken early in 1959, the rank-and-file American citizen listed the Communist threat as the greatest problem currently facing this Nation.

I will certainly concur that the Communist threat is a great one, and should be carefully dealt with, but I sincerely believe that modern America faces a problem of far greater magnitude than the Communist threat ever has been or ever will be. I believe that while the American public has been reading and worrying about the Communist threat, it has overlooked a far greater and much closer to home problem—a problem that seriously threatens our Constitution and all that it stands for.

This problem that I speak of is a trend in America for citizens and States to turn more and more of their responsibilities over to the National Government. I define this situation as the march of power to Washington. This march of power away from the States has been in existence for the past quarter century. Each year our States are left with less and less power and, in turn, our National Government gains more and more.

For example, let us take the field of taxation. In 1940, the State governments collected 64 percent of all the taxes collected in the United States. In 1959—just 1 year ago—the State governments collected only 32 percent of the total taxes collected in the United States. If this trend continues at the same rate for another quarter century, the States will collect only 11 percent of the total taxes to be collected in 1980.

When this occurs, the States will be left as hollow shells, operating primarily as the field districts of Federal departments and dependent on the National Treasury for their support.

If we look about us, we can easily see the steadily increasing influence of our National Government. The social security plan, the national highway building program, and Federal aid to various businesses, are only a few examples of types of projects formerly handled by the States that since have been turned over to Washington, D.C.

It was the great idealist, Henry David Thoreau, who once remarked, "The government that governs least governs best." It seems that our Government is beginning to govern more and more and is beginning to reach further into the private lives of its citizens. I am quite sure that you have all heard of the North Dakota farmer who in 1957 was actually fined for raising too many acres of wheat. The wheat had been raised on his own land and had been fed to his cattle. Why then, had he been fined? Beown cattle. Why then, had he been fined? Because the National Government had set acreage controls on wheat to help reduce the surplus. This is only one example of the many ways in which private enterprise is being dangerously hampered by this trend.

The march of power to Washington has become very obvious. President Eisenhower, in a recent address to the annual Governor's convention in Williamsburg, Pa., remarked: "Groups of city mayors used to travel to their State capitals for aid. Now they go directly to Washington, D.C."

So regardless of how one looks at it, he must admit that our Government is fast becoming more and more centralized. If the present trend continues for another quarter century our Government might well be classified as a unitary type, with all the power concentrated in one place.

There are those who might say, "Well, what would be wrong with that. After all, a highly centralized government would be much more efficient. And, not only that, but our National Government seems to be handling quite well the extra responsibilities that we have already given it."

In answering these statements, I will say that I am opposed to our Government's becoming more centralized for three main reasons. First, as we encourage and promote the growth of our National Government, we are defeating and degrading the high purpose our forefathers had in adopting our Constitution.

At the Constitutional Convention, the main fear was a highly centralized power. The great men who adopted our Constitution—Washington, Adams, Franklin, and many, many others—had all lived under a highly centralized government. They realized the dangers of a unitary power and made certain that the Constitution provided for a definite division of power between the State and National Governments. They wanted Americans to have as much local home rule as possible without having to appeal to a distant and impersonal bureaucracy.

So today, by encouraging and promoting the growth of our National Government, we are undermining the painstaking work of our forefathers.

My second indictment of our present trend toward a more centralized government is this: A retrospect of historical events cannot fail to come upon the fact that a concentration of political or economical power has unerringly resulted in corruption. Many great nations, such as the Babylonian Empire, and the Roman Empire, have decayed from within and crumbled because of an excessive concentration of governmental powers.

History also tells us that this danger creeps into a nation slowly and quietly—much the same as a cancerous growth starts in the human body. And this is exactly what it is doing in our land. When I observe the growing, but unnoticed, growth of our National Government, I am reminded of one of Edgar Allen Poe's best stories entitled "The Mask of the Red Death," which is a weird tale of a wealthy prince and his guests who had sealed themselves in an elaborate country estate content that the plague which was destroying their countrymen could not enter and harm them there. While the plague was killing the populace of the nation, the prince and his friends were having dances, parties, and much other gay revelry which was climaxed by a masked ball. Everyone present wore a masked costume. It was then that the terrible plague, which killed nearly instantly, struck inside the estate. But because everyone had on a masked costume, no one noticed the presence of the plague until at last all were destroyed in its ravage.

The ill-fated prince and his friends had felt safe and secure behind those thick walls. They felt that all the danger to them was outside those thick walls, never once thinking that they could be destroyed from within.

And so it is with the American people. We feel that the main dangers to our country are external threats, such as Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist Party. But we seldom think that we could be destroyed from within. We concentrate all our attention on those external threats, while we practically ignore some dangerous trends in our own home Government. And the trend that I consider the most serious is the rapid growth of that distant and impersonal bureaucracy which Jefferson held in such dread and warned us about in such great and intense detail. For if its growth is permitted to continue for another quarter century, I am quite sure that our Constitution, our way of life, and our traditional American freedoms will be well on the way to ruin.

But how can we stop this march of power to Washington? In my opinion, the main cause of this situation is the failure of citizens and States to fulfill their responsibilities. It is much easier for us to let the National Government built our roads and dams, collect our taxes, and operate our industries than it is for us to do it ourselves.

To stop the march of power to Washington, citizens must take the initiative in carrying out local projects and stop asking for Federal aid at every turn. The individuality that was so characteristic of our Founding Fathers must be restored to the American public.

So I will say that the main responsibility of stopping the march of power to Washington lies with the common citizen—you and me. We must make a diligent effort to preserve our Constitution and all that it stands for. And we can best do so by keeping in mind that age-old maxim: "Those who would stay free must stand eternal watch against excessive concentration of power in government."

Tribute to Farrell Senior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the Farrell Senior High School, where I was superintendent of schools before coming to Congress, on its fine record in the field of athletics.

Farrell High School is a comparatively young school so far as organized and competitive sports are concerned, having competed only since 1916. The Farrell

High School basketball team has won five State championships—1952, 1954, 1956, 1959, and 1960. This is more State championships than any other school in Pennsylvania has won—and under one coach, Mr. Edward J. McCluskey. These championships won since 1952 are in class A, the highest classification in basketball among schools in the State.

I not only pay honor to the coach, Mr. Edward McCluskey, but also to Mr. John Hetra, who succeeded me as superintendent of schools in Farrell, and who was a great basketball player and referee himself.

My tribute to the superintendent and the coach reflects back also on each and every member of the team and the student body.

To Extend the Library Services Act, H.R. 11175

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1960, I introduced H.R. 11175 to extend the Library Services Act for 5 years. On April 5, the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Education and Labor Committee held hearings on this and similar measures.

My statement before the subcommittee follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11175, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee in support of my bill, H.R. 11175, proposing a 5-year extension of the Library Services Act.

During the week of April 3 through April 9, many communities throughout America will be celebrating National Library Week. We shall be hearing and seeing such slogans as: "Read Books That Have Shaped the World," and "Open Wonderful New Worlds: Wake Up and Read."

Posters, programs, and displays will spotlight the many satisfactions of reading. One of the aims of National Library Week is to remind the American people that reading can help them to explore and to satisfy their need for a greater sense of purpose and meaning in their lives.

During National Library Week, when we are considering the multiple rewards of knowledge and pleasure gained from reading, and when we are again directing our hopes and energies to the goal of a better read, better informed America, we must be forcibly reminded that millions of our citizens are still totally without library facilities, while millions of other Americans are in the position of having to make do with very little.

Estimates suggest that something like 46 million Americans are limited to inadequate library facilities; 25 million have none at all. If these Americans who have not yet experienced the benefits of the Library Services Act are overlooked the clarion calls of National Library Week will to them, indeed, have a hollow ring.

It seems, therefore, particularly appropriate at this time to call attention to, and ask support for, pending legislation to extend the Library Services Act.

Since the 84th Congress enacted the Library Services Act in 1956, over 800 rural communities, representing a population of over 11 million, have obtained new or somewhat more adequate library services. The work accomplished clearly indicates that the Federal allotments have stirred State and county governments to make efforts that they had not been able to manage alone. Congress has shown its growing understanding of the value of programs resulting from the Library Services Act by steadily increasing appropriations.

My bill, H.R. 11175, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 15, 1960, would amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for Federal appropriations. It also proposes that the Federal share for any State shall be 100 percent minus the State share. The State share shall bear the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the national per capita income. In no case shall the Federal share be more than 66 percent or less than 33 percent. For Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, the Federal share shall be 66 percent.

Current proposals for legislation to extend the act may be supported on several grounds. Two reasons particularly convince me of the merits of extending the Library Services Act:

First, the goals originally envisioned when this legislation was passed remain unaccomplished to a substantial extent, due to the fact that earlier appropriations of Federal funds lagged considerably below the amount authorized by the act. Second, since the proof of the pudding is in the eating, accomplishments reported by the States have certainly given many of us a clearer appreciation of how worthwhile the supporting expenditures are in this fruitful partnership between Federal, State, and local resources.

In New York State, for example, Federal allotments, coupled with new State aid, are stimulating the greatest period of change and growth in rural public library development that my State has ever seen. The program has led to a notable expansion of field consultant services which has been very helpful in accelerating the development of cooperative library systems.

Between July 1958 and June 1959, 5 new cooperative library systems serving 13 counties were established. A bookmobile, purchased with Library Services Act funds, has been a great success. Demonstrated on the road and exhibited at county fairs, it has made many rural New Yorkers aware of its exciting possibilities.

Presently arrangements are being made to purchase two additional bookmobiles to be used in similar demonstration projects during the 1960 fiscal year.

Another interesting project has resulted in faster communication between four library systems and the New York State Library. Teletypewriter service is now being used to speed up the transmittal of requests for interlibrary loans, thereby cutting down on the time a borrower must wait for a specially requested book.

Other developments include a program that awards scholarships to college graduates interested in rural librarianship and also provides modest grants that help pay the expenses of librarians who visit and study another New York State rural system as an aid in planning improved library service in their own areas.

In addition, over 50 regional workshops have been held, with over half of them concentrated on reference and children's library work.

Problems of rural library size and distribution and problems of securing adequately trained librarians are the tough nuts that every State is trying to crack. In 1956 the American Library Association stated in its pamphlet called Public Library Service; A Guide to Evaluation, With Minimum Standards:

"Achieving standard library facilities presents special difficulties in small cities, scattered suburbs, towns, villages, and rural areas. Even with a substantial financial effort, the small locality is often not able to buy the books needed and to employ the requisite personnel. For these reasons the many smaller libraries in the country have usually not approached the range and standard specified in national standards."

Recent studies have indicated that for real efficiency and economy a library should serve a population grouping which consists of at least 100,000 persons. To manage this, will require the kind of imagination and ingenuity that lends itself to creative and skillfully worked-out innovations.

I am told that cooperative library systems which cut across county and township lines have great possibilities in many areas. In order to reap the gains of pooling rural library resources and personnel, the smaller units are looking for ways of organizing themselves together in constructive patterns that best serve their communities.

Bookmobiles; improved communications such as that furnished by teletypewriter; more rural librarians who are trained to meet the special challenges of their work—these are some of the steps that will carry us toward the goal of making it possible for any American, no matter where he lives in our country, to be, if he so desires, part of a better read, better informed America.

Enthusiasm for the results of the Library Services Act is dramatically tangible, in the reports of State library extension agencies, in the overwhelming response of librarians, and in the many letters which have requested an extension of the act.

The satisfaction of rural librarians and communities in better serving their public is unquestioned. A great start has been made. However, every person interested in better library facilities has a distinct consciousness of what must still be accomplished if we are to be credited with making more than a small dent in the problem. We must now decide upon a less than adequate program, or one that fulfills its finer possibilities. I very much hope that the answer will be in the affirmative.

Thank you.

No Vote at All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New Republic magazine of April 11, 1960:

NO VOTE AT ALL

The world's attention has been fixed on the exhausting congressional battle that is about to end for this year, over how to give substance to the Negroes' formal right of suffrage. But there are few lines of copy in any newspaper outside Washington, D.C., on the fight to restore suffrage to those who live in the Nation's Capital. District resi-

dents are not merely denied in practice what they are due in principle; they are forbidden by law to register a choice in any election.

Bills to restore home rule to the District have been introduced in each session and been bottled up by the House District Committee, which for a variety of reasons, not the least of them the growing Negro population in Washington, has not wanted to relinquish its control over the city's affairs. But this year self-government has got one foot well in the door; another shove might take it all the way. Home rule has been approved by the Senate, and a discharge petition in the House is now within 34 signatures of the needed number. If the bill reaches the House floor, it can probably be passed. The key is in the hands of the Republicans.

More than 80 percent of the nonsouthern Democrats and only 26 percent of the House Republicans have signed the petition. The Democrats believe they can ring in an additional 20 signers, including some Representatives who earlier signed the civil rights petition; for example, KING and SAUND of California; BREWSTER, of Maryland; GRIFFITHS and RABAUT, of Michigan; COAD, of Iowa; BREEDING, of Kansas; and DENTON, of Indiana. All the Republicans have to do is find 14 more of their party who will sign up—14 out of 112 who have not.

Another opportunity is given Mr. NIXON to add authenticity to his self-portrait as the man who gets things done. He, the President, and their party are all recorded in favor of home rule. But only 3 of California's 14 Republican Congressmen have signed the discharge petition. If the Vice President were to pick up the phone and call Minority Leader HALLECK, and follow this with a call on his fellow Californian and stanchest House supporter, BOB WILSON, more than the necessary 219 names would seen appear on the petition.

Golden Agers Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, has officially designated May 15, 1960, as "Golden Agers Day." Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the observance of Golden Agers Day, and to include Governor Ribicoff's statement in the RECORD:

Golden age clubs, which are increasing in number and are expanding the scope of their activities, perform an important function in Connecticut. Local, State, and Federal Government agencies are working to make it possible for older people to live out the latter years of their lives in comfort, dignity and contentment, but Government alone cannot assume the entire responsibility for this, nor should it be expected to.

Golden age clubs are providing older people with opportunities for entertainment and companionship; are an example of citizen participation in Government's efforts to create and maintain a good social structure. These clubs make it possible for older citizens to do something for themselves, which is what older people want most of all.

In recognition of the worthwhile efforts of the golden age clubs, Sunday, May 15, 1960, has been designated as "Golden Agers Day."

I appreciate the opportunity to salute Connecticut golden age citizens on this observance, and to congratulate the golden age clubs for the good work they are doing.

Senator Monroe Sweetland, Oregon Education Man of the Year for 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Oregon Education Association has honored Oregon's Education Citizen of the Year. The education citizen is a noneducator. He is honored for his outstanding and continuous support of education.

Oregon's Education Citizen of 1960 has a long and splendid history. He is one of the persistent and effective fighters for better education. He is a man sensitive to human needs. I am privileged to bring to the attention of this House the outstanding work of my friend, State Senator Monroe Sweetland of Milwaukie, Oreg.

I have known Monroe Sweetland for many years. He is a humble man, yet a man with many talents. He works to preserve and improve our heritage. He has proven himself many times a valuable friend of public education.

SWEETLAND CHAIRMAN OF SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Monroe Sweetland was chairman of the State senate's education committee for the 1957 regular and special sessions of the legislature. He held the same post during the 1959 regular session. He sponsored and championed many needed programs in the State. Among them were the State scholarship commission, community college authorization, and the strengthening of the public employees retirement system for educators.

In private life Monroe publishes the Milwaukie Review, a weekly newspaper which had led the fight for better schools in his area.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a more detailed account of his accomplishments, along with editorial comment concerning his work on behalf of education.

I cite first the news release dated March 18, 1960, released by the Oregon Education Association, 1530 Southwest Taylor, Portland 5, Oreg. The release follows:

Monroe Sweetland, Milwaukie publisher, was cited Thursday night as Oregon's Education Citizen of the Year by the Oregon Education Association at their State convention banquet in Portland. Presentation was made by Dr. Rex Putnam, superintendent of public instruction.

Five hundred educators attended this banquet at the Benson Hotel honoring the seventh noneducator to receive this award for outstanding continuous support of public education. Those Oregon citizens previously honored were: Robert Holmes, Gearhart (1953); Mrs. Wilma Morrison, Portland (1954); George Huggins, Coos Bay (1955); Mrs. Paul Patterson, Hillsboro (1956); Mr. Gardner Knapp, Salem (1957); J. W. Forrester, Pendleton (1958); and Mrs. Lee Bishop, Eugene (1959).

Dr. Putnam cited Sweetland's education activities which have included chairmanship of the senate education committee for the 1957 regular and special sessions, and 1959 regular session; his sponsoring and championing such education programs as State scholarship commission, community college authorization, strengthening of the public employees' retirement system for educators.

Other activities of Monroe Sweetland, Putnam pointed out, included representing Oregon in 1957 and 1959 at the Western Inter-State Committee of Higher Education in San Francisco.

Of Sweetland's contribution to education in his own community, Putnam cited his constant availability as a speaker on school issues before PTA groups, college and public school classes, and other community groups. Special tribute was paid Sweetland for his efforts in behalf of education through his Milwaukie Review newspaper. "It is a common thing to find as many as a dozen items in a single issue featuring schools," according to Dr. Putnam.

L. G. Rood, Clackamas County school superintendent, said of Sweetland: "I can think of no one in the State who has devoted more time to the betterment of Oregon education or who has constantly given unbiased support to the students and the teachers of our educational institutions."

Arthur Kiesz, superintendent, Milwaukie public schools, praised Sweetland by stating: "I have been in education for 30 years and have had an opportunity to watch lay people who contribute to education. I have come to the conclusion that Senator Sweetland's contribution to education in Oregon is tremendous and something that cannot be measured and should not be overlooked."

Monroe Sweetland is State senator from Clackamas County. Publisher of the Milwaukie Review, he and Mrs. Sweetland have two children, Barbara, a student at Columbia University, and Rebecca, a first-grader.

Featured banquet speaker was Goodwin Knight, 31st Governor of California. Toastmistress was Mrs. Mildred Wirtz.

Monroe Sweetland's leading and effective role on behalf of better education in our State has been noted in a citation issued by the Oregon Education Association. It points out his educational accomplishments.

The citation follows:

CITATION OF MONROE SWEETLAND BY OREGON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Whereas good quality education is of key importance to the Nation and to its individual citizens; and

Whereas general public interest and the efforts of individual leaders are essential to substantial educational progress; and

Whereas the Oregon Education Association encourages such interest and support and wishes to express its deep appreciation to all persons outside professional education who so generously aid in the development of education; and

Whereas Monroe Sweetland, Milwaukie editor and member of the Oregon State Senate, is an outstanding lay leader who has, over the past several years, devoted much of his energies toward assuring a superior educational program for Oregon and his community; and

Whereas the said Monroe Sweetland's education efforts have been numerous and noteworthy and have included the chairmanship of senate education committees, representation of Oregon at the Western Inter-State Conference on Higher Education in 1959, membership on the American field service

committee to work with high school foreign exchanges; and

Whereas the said Monroe Sweetland's efforts have encompassed all levels of education—elementary, secondary, and collegiate, constructive school finance activities, attention to school curricular matters including new developments such as educational TV, and willingness to meet with and speak to citizen groups of all kinds concerning education: Now therefore

The Oregon Education Association is privileged and proud to designate and proclaim the said Monroe Sweetland as Oregon's "Education Citizen of the Year."

The journal of the Oregon Education Association, Oregon Education, edited by Richard Barss, described the State OEA convention and annual banquet in its April 1, 1960, edition. An excerpt follows:

Oregon educators with varied subject interests met in Portland March 17 to 19 for the 57th annual OEA convention to consider a common objective—how the teaching profession can best exercise its responsibility to provide better education.

Starting with a preconvention workshop on certification held Wednesday and concluding with a Saturday morning workshop on public relations, approximately 4,500 educators heard visiting speakers, viewed films and exhibits, and participated in a record number of group and departmental meetings.

A highlight was the OEA convention banquet at the Benson Hotel Thursday evening. Honored was Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukie, who was named Education Citizen of the Year. He was cited for his work for educational progress in the State Senate and for editorial support through the columns of his newspaper, the Milwaukie Review.

MONROE SWEETLAND HONORED

The general convention banquet Thursday night attracted 469 persons. Rex Putnam, State superintendent of public instruction, presented the Education Citizen of the Year Award to Monroe Sweetland, who is the eigth recipient of the annual citation.

Newspapers in Oregon of varying political opinion have commended OEA's selection of Monroe Sweetland as Education Citizen of the Year and told of his championing of better schools for our children.

The Pendleton East Oregonian in its March 22, 1960, editorial stated:

Anybody who has followed Senator Sweetland's career in public life knows that he is one of the best informed men in Oregon on education.

The respect that Senator Sweetland has earned in all areas of education was shown last week when the Oregon Education Association named him Oregon Education Citizen of 1960. OEA could not have made a better choice.

The Oregon Statesman in Salem published by our distinguished former Governor, the Honorable Charles Sprague, commented March 19, 1960:

The Oregon Education Association picked Senator Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukie, as Oregon Education Citizen of 1960. This was an honor worthily bestowed. Sweetland has been an aggressive leader in the drive to improve the schools. He has supported higher State school support and urged increases in salaries of teachers so their compensation is adequate to attract able youth into the profession and fairly adjusted to contemporary wage scales and to living costs.

The Oregon Voter, a citizenship journal of opinion, has recognized Monroe Sweetland's important contribution to education in Oregon by the following article which appeared in its columns of April 2, 1960:

State Senator Monroe Sweetland, Democrat, of Milwaukie, has again received an education honor. For Oregon Education Association he received at the hands of State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Rex Putnam, the award that goes annually to a noneducator in recognition of that person's contribution to education. Senator Sweetland of course is editor and publisher of the Milwaukie Review and in the 1957–59 sessions the senate leader on the educational programs.

Senator Monroe Sweetland has been hailed by the Capitol Press of Salem, one of our State's largest weekly newspapers, as a person who gets results and takes a backseat to no one for all-round value to Oregon education. The Capitol Press' editorial follows:

EDUCATION CITIZEN

The Oregon Education Association's designation of Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukie, as Oregon's Education Citizen of 1960 could not have been more appropriately placed.

Mr. Sweetland's contributions of time and energy in behalf of Oregon education over the years would almost in themselves justify the award to him.

But it is in getting results that Monroe Sweetland has stood out. Without setting aside his ideals on education's ultimate goals, he has painstakingly and skillfully guided legislatures and education boards through the step-by-step practical process of laying one block upon another toward better education for Oregon's people.

For all-round value to Oregon education, Monroe Sweetland takes a back seat to no one in the State's history.

State Senator Monroe Sweetland's work typifies the great efforts by many of our citizens throughout the country to advance the needs and welfare of our children who will be the citizens of tomorrow. It is for this reason that I felt his accomplishments should be called to the attention of the House of Representatives.

The People Can Bring About Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, among the complex problems confronting us today the fight to preserve our free competitive system is the most important. All the threats to our way of life do not come from abroad—we are contributing to the means of our own destruction in our careless attitude toward economics. We are stifling economic growth with unreasonable and killing taxes and we are not making the effort necessary to reduce spending so that taxes may be cut and the people allowed to keep more of their own money.

We now have an opportunity to do something concrete to bolster our economy, to add strength to our system, to build the greatest defense against communism by taking action on the measure introduced by our able calleagues, A.S. HERLONG and HOWARD BAKER, which has become known as the Herlong-Baker bill and which many of us have supported by introducing companion bills. In connection with this legislation I commend, for your study, the following article which appeared in last Sunday's edition of the American Weekly:

CAN YOU CHANGE THE TAX LAWS?—YES, SAYS THIS BUSINESSMAN—IF YOU GET YOUR CONGRESSMAN ON THE JOB

(By Thomas J. Fleming)

What is wrong with our present income-tax law?

"It makes saving difficult and is stifling individual incentive and national economic growth."

So says Rudolph Bannow, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who is always quick to point out that he is not a big businessman. He is the president of Bridgeport Machines, a machine tool manufacturing company which he founded in 1929 with some savings and $3,000 of borrowed capital.

"As a mechanic," he says, "I was able to create products with my own hands and gradually build a business. If I have strong convictions about taxes, they're based on personal experience."

As president of the NAM, Mr. Bannow has been touring the Nation 2 weeks out of every 4, talking with businessmen, politicians, and economists. He has found nothing to alter his conviction that the present tax law is ill-advised and dangerous.

"I refuse to believe that tax cheating is as widespread as some people claim, but there is no doubt that when a man sees as much as 87 percent of his taxable income taken away from him by the Government, he is tempted to cut corners.

"Even more important, our exorbitant tax rate makes it almost impossible for people to save money. Since capital is the most essential ingredient for economic expansion and in our free enterprise system can only come from the savings of individuals and businesses, it is not surprising to find that our national growth has been seriously stunted.

"For the 60 years prior to the depression, our economy grew at an average rate of 4 percent a year. Since we have imposed the current tax law, growth has slowed down to less than 3 percent. When you are dealing with a gross national product of $480 billion, this means a loss of almost $5 billion a year."

Can we do anything about it?

"Yes. That is the tragedy. Too many people seem to accept taxes as something inevitable, like the weather. Witness the old saying, 'Nothing is certain but death and taxes.' But we made the present tax law, and we can change it. In fact, there is a bill before Congress at this very moment which would do the job beautifully."

What is it?

"Representatives A. S. HERLONG, JR., of Florida Democrat, and HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee, Republican, both members of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, have introduced a bipartisan measure which is the soundest and most realistic program for comprehensive tax-rate reform which has ever been presented to Congress.

"Rates would be reduced in annual stages over a period of 5 years, and every individual taxpayer would benefit from a tax cut of at least 25 percent. Rates on individuals in the lowest brackets would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent. Our top earners, faced with a destructive 87 percent, would be reduced to 47 percent of taxable

income, and there would be corresponding reductions in all the interim rates. Corporate taxes would be reduced from the present top of 52 percent to 47 percent."

Could we do this without putting the national budget into the red?

"Yes. Because the bill has a unique, built-in safeguard against deficit spending. There is a provision that permits postponement of the reductions in any year in which we are threatened with an unbalanced budget.

"But the biggest reason why I am convinced that we would have no budget trouble is this: the money saved by the taxpayers would flow out into our economy and help the Nation grow at a rate which would more than make up for the loss of funds to the Government.

"Every percentage point gain in growth brings in a billion dollars or more in added Federal revenue. Thus a gain of 3½ percent—only a half percent over the present growth rate—would meet the $3.5 billion cost of the legislation. There is, in fact, every assurance that, with tax brakes removed, the economy would grow at a 4 or 5 percent rate, possibly even higher.

"Moreover, the Herlong-Baker bill would be sure to act as a restraint on wild Government spending because neither the executive branch nor Congress would be inclined to press for expenditures that would cause postponement, at the 11th hour, of reductions anticipated by taxpayers.

"For the first time taxpayers would be able to see, in dollars and cents, what Government spending was costing them. But this should be only a bonus—an added inducement to pass legislation which will enable our Nation to reach the full realization of its vast potentialities for growth."

Unification of Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years I have been actively interested in reducing waste in common supply and service activities in the Defense agencies. I was on the so-called Bonner committee for 2 years and we made extensive investigations and reports and I can say unhesitatingly that every member of that subcommittee was of the opinion that billions of dollars could be saved if we had proper unification of the supply and service activities in the Department of Defense.

As a result of the work of the Bonner committee a bill was introduced which would have established a supply corps for the DOD. The supply corps would have been similar to the one which it was found necessary to create to integrate common activities in the several bureaus of the Navy by the establishment of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

While the bill sponsored by the Bonner committee was never enacted it did stimulate sufficient action in the Senate so that the so-called O'Mahoney amendment was enacted as a rider to the Defense appropriations bill for 1953. In essence, the O'Mahoney amendment required the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations designed to bring about an integrated supply system for the DOD. In the fall of 1952 Secretary Lovett issued regulation 4000.8 which was intended to carry out the O'Mahoney amendment. Considerable progress was made at that time toward achieving economy and efficiency in the military supply activities and of particular importance was the establishment of an integrated medical supply distribution system under the Army at Alameda, Calif. This successfully demonstrated that one service could buy, store, and distribute medical supplies for all services.

I am unhappy to relate that with the advent of the new administration the idea of an integrated supply system was abandoned and the concept of three departments separately administered was advocated and pressed by Secretaries Wilson, Keyes, Thomas, Pike Lanphier, and so forth.

The single managership for medical supply was abandoned in November 1954 and it was not until a storm of protest developed as a result of the Hamburger hearings, the Hoover Commission reports, protests from the Bonner committee members and others that Secretary Wilson belatedly in 1955 began a single managership program first for subsistence and a few months later in 1956 for clothing and textiles, petroleum products, and medical supplies and equipment. The medical single managership was reinstated this time by parceling it out to the Navy which had scuttled the 1954 effort.

After 1956 no additional single managerships were established until the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] with my assistance and the assistance of other Members, secured the passage of what is known as the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958. This important piece of legislation gives the Secretary of Defense undisputed authority to manage supply and service activities in such a way as to best achieve economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The McCormack-Curtis amendment is much broader than the O'Mahoney amendment in that service activities are included in addition to supply activities. Little progress was achieved by the DOD under the McCormack-Curtis amendment until the Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee established a special subcommittee on Defense Procurement to consider the impact of military supply and service activities upon the national economy. The announcement of these hearings had a remarkable effect in producing results in the Pentagon, and single managerships have now been established for hand tools and housekeeping supplies assigned to the Army; and hardware, paint, and related items assigned to the Navy. Announcements are expected momentarily of assignment of automotive equipment and construction equipment.

Studies are also being made as to the assignment of 990,000 electronic electrical items. It is my understanding from articles I have seen in the papers and from other information that the usual struggle is developing as to which service will receive this single managership since great stakes are involved. I have taken the liberty to address a letter to the Secretary of Defense whom I consider to be an excellent Secretary and have admonished him to use the greatest care in the assignment of these 990,000 items which comprise a fairly large percentage of the Defense procurement budget. My letter to Secretary Gates follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 28, 29, and 30, 1960, the Special Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on the impact of defense procurement on the economy.

One of the most interesting aspects of the hearings was the report made by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (S. & L.), Hon. Perkins McGuire, on "Management of General Supplies." We discussed this excellent report in considerable detail, and I was particularly impressed by the fact that a very important decision must soon be made as to the manner in which the 990,000 electronic electrical items, which I understand take a large percentage of the procurement dollar, will be managed.

I have been interested in improvement of military supply management since I have been in Congress. As you know, the McCormack-Curtis amendment (sec. 3(a)(6), P.L. 85–599) gives you great authority in deciding the manner in which common supplies and services will be handled in the Department of Defense. I am sure that you are also aware that the Congress did not desire that the Department of the Air Force duplicate supply and service functions of the Army where the Air Force had received its support. The Eisenhower-Spaatz agreements were intended to implement this congressional intent.

Still later in 1952 the O'Mahoney amendment was designed to provide beyond any doubt an integrated supply system for the Department of Defense.

The history of the road to the development of the single manager systems since the Draper-Strauss reports were first made in 1944, has been disgraceful to say the least. I have often expressed the idea that there has been a systematic parceling of common supply and service activities in order to keep each service relatively happy and in business. This parceling out system which necessitates the continuation of three or more sets of existing facilities rather than their integration, results in the "giantism" which we all deplore. I, for one, am confident that the proper integration of these common supply and service functions will result in a much smaller overall organizational arrangement than we now have in the multiple systems which place such a heavy drain upon our resources and our taxes. It will also be much more effective, efficient, and economical.

My reason for writing to you at this time, therefore, is to urge that most careful topside consideration be given to the assignment of the single manager for the 990,000 electronic electrical items. These items utilize a considerable part of the expenditure budget each year and are, of course, vitally important to weapons development and practically every other activity in each of the armed services.

I am most hopeful that the decision you reach in this matter will be consistent with the intent of the National Security Act, the Eisenhower-Spaatz agreements, the O'Mahoney amendment, and the McCormack-Curtis amendment.

This matter is of such importance to me that I am sending copies of this letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, Chairman DOUGLAS and members of the Special Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, Congressman MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives, and others who have joined with me in highlighting this matter in the last few years. It is also my plan to place the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with appropriate remarks.

May I hear from you personally on this matter?

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Agricultural Chemicals—Helps and Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April 1960 issue of Successful Farming, urging that farmers point out to the Congress that chemicals have become one of our most important production tools.

Just week before last I introduced a bill entitled the "Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act," to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls. I realize fully the vital role which agricultural chemicals play in America's crop production, and agree that we must protect the strides which we have made in this direction while at the same time we intensify our efforts to insure that chemicals, pesticides, and rodenticides which, after thorough research and investigation, it is determined are necessary to use are used in such a way that human health and wildlife resources are not adversely affected.

The editorial follows:

ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By Dick Hanson)

Every farmer and farm organization should be watching with a great deal of concern, the development of farm legislation in Washington. This is a critical time in agriculture's basic needs and although we may not get much legislative change this year, the groundwork for the future is being laid. Once the groundwork is laid, change becomes more difficult.

One area in which we probably will get some changes is in the laws governing the use of agricultural chemicals. Ever since the "cranberry incident," a great many cooks have been stirring the chemical broth. The much-discussed Delaney amendment governing the use of agricultural chemicals obviously needs to be changed and improved upon.

There is a great deal at stake in this business of controlling the use of agricultural chemicals. First, no one will argue with the necessity of safeguarding the public's health. This is a basic need which can be satisfied by the enforcement of intelligent laws. Second, users of agricultural chemicals must be protected against using chemicals which may result in direct loss of crops and livestock or loss when products are marketed.

The third area which must be considered is one which has not received a great deal of discussion. Yet, it is vitally important to every farmer in this country. Agricultural chemicals are production tools. They are as vital to your chances of making a profit as good seed, modern machinery, or good land.

We have been going through a period in which the obvious means of increasing profit from farming have slowly disappeared, because of legislation and/or because of basic changes in agriculture. Many farmers have seen their allowable acres of certain crops grow smaller each year. Almost every farmer is aware of the fact that his share of the consumer's dollar grows smaller each year. And, there are many other factors today which govern how you profit from farming.

For most individual farmers, the answer to maintaining a profit from farming has been to become more efficient. And there is no doubt that the majority of you are efficient. One of your most important efficiency tools has been the increased use of agricultural chemicals. It would be difficult to imagine farming today without the use of chemicals for the control of weeds, insects, increased weight gains in livestock, and improved soil fertility. We have come to the point where we take the use of chemicals for granted. This could be disastrous.

We need to point out to our legislators that chemicals have become one of our most important production tools. We cannot afford to lose them. If a chemical is injurious to the public's health, of course, its use should be controlled. But, let's not let one rotten apple spoil the whole barrel. It could happen unless we get intelligent, workable laws pertaining to the manufacture and use of all types of farm chemicals.

It is our duty to make sure our legislators know the importance to us of farm chemicals. It is the legislator's duty to enact laws which are workable and practical for all concerned. Now is the time to let your legislative representatives in Washington know your feelings on this important subject. We rarely get what we want and need without asking for it—and we want and need the use of good agricultural chemicals. We can't afford to lose another production tool.

Need for Expanded Research in Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my fellow Congressmen the following letter I received urging my support of the request made for the research work carried on by the agricultural experiment stations:

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY,
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Ames, Iowa, April 4, 1960.

Hon. LEONARD G. WOLF,
Congressman for Iowa, Second District,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: I am writing this letter to urge your support of the request made by the legislative subcommittee of the experiment station committee on organization and policy (ESCOP) for an increase of $14 million to support the research work carried on by the State agricultural experiment stations. While I am interested especially in additional funds for forestry research I am in full agreement with the request for funds for other areas.

With this letter are three inclosures which I hope you will find informative and helpful in studying this request. These are: (1) The proposed use of these Federal-grant funds, (2) the need for expanded research in forestry and reasons why the agricultural experiment stations are exceptionally well qualified to conduct forestry research, and (3) a rather lengthy statement regarding forestry research at the agricultural experiment stations.

The State of Iowa has a considerable area which is producing little of economic value at the present time. This includes something over 3 million acres of poor-quality forest land as well as close to a million acres (estimated) of submarginal land which is practically waste. We can scarcely afford to permit such a large area to continue in a nonproductive state. Research is needed to show what products can be made of the low-quality timber presently on the land, to demonstrate which tree species are best suited and how we can cash returns on such lands at an early date.

Iowa's forest and submarginal land can provide jobs for Iowa people. It is a segment of our land economy which we can no longer afford to neglect. The additional funds requested by ESCOP will help Iowa's research in forestry and other areas. We solicit your support.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. HARTMAN,
Head, Department of Forestry.

Proposed use of requested increase in Federal-grant funds in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961

	$14,000,000	
	Dollars	Percentage
Marketing and utilization	$1,542,000	15.3
Forestry	3,346,000	33.2
Soil and water use and conservation	3,256,000	32.3
Livestock and poultry	474,000	4.7
Plant diseases and insects	202,000	2.0
Horticultural crops	252,000	2.5
Farm economics and adjustment	202,000	2.0
Grass and forage crops	181,000	1.8
Animal diseases	222,000	2.2
Farm mechanization and structures	141,000	1.4
Foods, human nutrition, and home economics	151,000	1.5
Field crops	111,000	1.1
Subtotal	10,080,000	100.0
Regional research fund	3,500,000	
Administration	420,000	
Total	14,000,000	100.0

STATEMENT ON NEED FOR EXPANDED RESEARCH IN FORESTRY, REASONS WHY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS ARE ESPECIALLY WELL QUALIFIED TO CONDUCT FORESTRY RESEARCH, AND PROPOSED USE OF REQUESTED FEDERAL-GRANT FUNDS IN FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1961

1. A greatly expanded program of research in forestry and related fields is needed at once to meet the increased demand on our forests in the future for wood, forage, water, wildlife, and recreation. The demand for wood in the year 2000 is expected to be 83 percent greater than it was in 1952.

2. The two major public agencies now conducting such research—the U.S Forest Service and the agricultural experiment stations—should be adequately supported to share in this expanded effort.

3. The agricultural experiment stations within the framework of the land-grant institutions already have excellent libraries, unique and often expensive laboratory equipment, and outstanding scientists who can cooperate with forest scientists which provide the basis for developing strong programs in basic research.

4. The close association of the Agricultural Extension Service with the experiment stations assures that the results of research are placed quickly in the hands of the users—the landowners and the wood-using industry owners.

5. The graduate programs of the forestry schools associated with the agricultural experiment stations are the lifeblood of research personnel needed by all agencies engaged in forest research. Stronger research programs at these institutions mean better qualified research personnel in the future.

6. The proposed use to be made of the $14 million increase in Federal grants which is being requested is shown in the table which is also enclosed.

FORESTRY RESEARCH IN THE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

"Timber Resources for America's Future," published by the U.S. Forest Service in 1959 predicts a demand for wood in the year 2000 which will be 83 percent greater than in 1952. Forest lands will have to meet similar increased demands for water, forage crops, wildlife, and recreation. These increased demands will have to be met in the face of a constant attrition of forest lands by (1) urban and surburban expansion; (2) construction of dams, highways, and transmission lines; and (3) withdrawal of forest lands from production in response to recreation pressures. Consequently, forest land must produce at a much higher rate and wood must be utilized more completely in the future, if the Nation's future need for wood is to be achieved. A much greater research effort is needed promptly by all agencies to provide the information needed to achieve these goals. The agricultural experiment stations should play an increasingly important role in this expanded effort.

The progress of forestry on privately owned land is retarded by incomplete knowledge of the methods for rehabilitating forest lands and of the economic feasibility of the methods that have been prescribed. We need to be able to produce better quality timber faster. The hope for accomplishing this lies in the field of genetics, a field of research which received little attention in forestry until about 10 years ago. It is believed that many of the forest insect and disease problems and improvement in wood quality can be solved through tree breeding.

The forests of the future will be manmade, either through management practices that will result in natural regeneraion or through planting of seed or nursery-grown trees. How these can be accomplished most effectively is not fully known. What the costs of and returns from these operations will be must still be determined. We have little experience upon which to draw because the virgin forests with which we have dealt in the past presented no such problems.

Although man has used wood for many purposes for centuries, information about wood properties is very incomplete. This is not surprising because wood is a very complex organic compound. Furthermore, wood is not a material of uniform physical and chemical characteristics. The wood of each of the more than 100 commercially valuable species has its own unique properties. To produce the maximum number of useful high-quality products from wood, much more must be known about the properties of each species.

With the rapidly increasing use of forest land for recreation, new problems are arising constantly. With virtually no research in progress in forest recreation, little is known about the effects of different intensities of recreational use on the forest resource, nor about the types of recreation uses best suited to different types of forest land.

Industrial development is already being handicapped in some areas because of inadequate water resource. Forested watersheds must be properly managed to conserve water and to minimize damage to land and streams through erosion, stream siltation, flooding of lowlands, and pollution of streams. Through research we must learn the interrelations and the integrated management of watershed resources to get the maximum economic product of vegetation, water, and recreation.

The few foregoing examples are used to illustrate the diversity and complexity of the problems which confront the forester in meeting the needs of the Nation for more wood, forage, wildlife, water, and recreation from forest lands. These examples would have to be multiplied many times to give a complete picture of the situation.

In spite of its unique facilities for conducting research in the diverse and complex fields of forestry and related areas of wildland management and wood technology and products, the agricultural experiment stations' forestry personnel and facilities have not been adequately supported financially to utilize their full potential. In the fiscal year 1959, $1.8 million or 1.3 percent of the agricultural experiment stations' budget of $140 million, 77 percent of which was non-Federal funds, was devoted to forestry research. Yet forestry research at the agricultural experiment stations should be contributing to the solution of the problems of the small timberland owner in the same ways that they have contributed to the solutions of the farmers' problems. Smallness is typical of forest landownership—55 percent of the Nation's commercial forest is in the hands of small owners, and one-third of all commercial forests is in 3.4 million farm ownerships, averaging 49 acres. By every measurement, productivity is poorest on these small ownerships—yet here lies our greatest dependence for future wood supplies. Neither these small forest landowners nor the small wood-using industries have resources or facilities to conduct the research which is required to develop the full potential of these lands.

Research foresters at the agricultural experiment stations have unique advantages not aavailable to many research foresters. These include opportunities for consultation with and even cooperation with workers in agronomy, soil science, genetics, agricultural engineering, entomology, botany, chemistry, physics, statistics, agricultural economics, and others. Expensive laboratory equipment such as nuclear reactors, radiocarbon laboratories, electron microscopes, controlled environment growth chambers, computing centers, and other facilities are available to give maximum efficiency to their work. Library facilities at the land-grant universities are also excellent.

The aforementioned facilities give research foresters at the agricultural experiment stations many advantages in conducting basic research—an area that has been badly neglected in forestry and related fields. If forestry research is to be most productive, an increasingly greater proportion of the research will have to be basic research.

The close association of the Agricultural Extension Service with the agricultural experiment stations assures that the results of research will reach the landowners and managers with a minimum of delay. Improved practices on the land and in the plants of the wood-using industries must come through the channeling of research information by the extension specialists to the county extension agents, and eventually to the landowner or wood-using industry plant manager.

The forestry schools at the land-grant universities must carry, to a large degree, the responsibility for training the forest research workers needed by all research agencies—Federal, State, and private. If forest research is to advance with need, more researchers trained more deeply in basic fields will be essential. Strong research programs are essential to the training of research personnel. The training of additional research workers is especially significant in the light of the long-range program for national forests which was presented to Congress in 1959. The program calls for an increase in Forest Service research of more than four times the current level during the next decade. If this is to materialize, stepped-up production of research workers is imperative.

World Legal Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review by Dr. Quincy Wright of the University of Virginia which discusses Dr. Wallace McClure's new book "World Legal Order, Possible Contributions by the People of the United States." Reviewer Wright is a former president of the American Political Science Association. His review will appear in the American Political Science Review in the near future.

The review follows:

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW—WORLD LEGAL ORDER, POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Wallace McClure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1960)

In this well printed and well documented book, Dr. McClure, speaking from long service in the Department of State and present service with the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, considers how the world legal order can be strengthened. He assumes it to be "inherent in the concept of law" that the rules of international law are "superior to and, in case of conflict, overrule legal norms of national origin or merely national applicability." The whole, he thinks, must be superior to the parts but this conclusion "is denied de facto and even de jure." Seldom have national courts enforced international law when in conflict with a clear rule of national law. "Thus power superseded in National Government, overrides the logic of human law" (p. vii).

Perhaps in his universal condemnation "of the inferiority of the law of a larger group to that of a smaller group within it," Dr. McClure goes too far. Self-determining colonies, including the United States and the Dominions, have not been willing to accept the dominance of imperial law over the law of the included nations, and federations recognize that the law of the whole cannot override the laws of the component parts within the reserved domains of the latter. There can be too much as well as too little centralization of law. Local self-government and national autonomy are valuable if not pushed too far. These observations, however, hardly apply to international law because its rules are binding only inso-

far as states have directly or indirectly consented to them. There is, therefore, no danger that international law will unduly encroach upon the sovereignty of states, and Dr. McClure properly emphasizes the opposite danger that states will not abide by the rules of the larger community, to which they have consented, expressly by treaty, tacitly by custom, or presumptively by deduction from the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

Dr. McClure is, therefore, on solid ground when he suggests that in the interdependent world of today the disposition of national courts to put national statutes ahead of international obligations is "ominous." He might, however, have emphasized that universal acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court would, in some measure remedy this situation. That Court necessarily applies international law, consequently, if foreign litigants can regularly induce their governments to initiate action in the World Court against any state whose courts have neglected international law, such a state would be likely to require its courts to give priority to international law in the future.

The book is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the relation of treaties to statute law in the United States. While, under the supremacy clause, treaties override State constitutions and statutes, the Supreme Court has held that treaties and acts of Congress are on a parity and that the most recent expression of the national will must be applied. He examines the cases of historical sequence, demonstrating that the logical superiority of treaties was given some support in the early period, but, with the prevailing isolationism of American opinion in the later 19th century, the doctrine of equality was so firmly established that it has been difficult to shake it in the more recent period of enlarged international responsibility. The Court has, however, generally applied a treaty when it has been convinced that the Congress did not intend a later conflicting statute to nullify it. However, the "wordy and noisy movement" initiated by Senator Bricker threatened to eliminate the legal character of treaties in the domestic forum altogether. In McClure's opinion the considerable support for this movement "signified a need for the people of the United States to about face and get in step with their progressive fellow peoples" (p. 203) some of whom were amending their constitutions to assure respect for treaties in domestic law. Assurance of the "higher level of treaties over statutes," he considers, "the first contribution" the American people could make "toward strengthening the world legal order" (p. 134).

In the second part of the book the author discusses the utilization of customary international law by American courts and finds that such utilization is common but it is subordinated to other sources of national law, particularly, to statutes. He observes that "when the supremacy of treaties over statutes is accepted, acceptance of the supremacy of the whole of the law of nations over the whole of the national law would seem to follow as of course" (p. 208).

In the third section of the book attention is given to the legal structure of the world community with special emphasis on the prevention of aggression, "the great crime against international law," and the extension of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. With reference to the first, the activity of the Nuremberg and other war crimes tribunals is reviewed, and also the action of the Security Council in the Korean and other "collective security" operations, with the conclusion that they contributed to "the world legal order" (pp. 230, 247). With reference to the World Court's jurisdiction, the author criticizes the self-judging (Connally) reservation made by the United States in accepting compulsory jurisdiction and hopes for its repeal (pp. 272–274). He also discusses the Interhandel case in which he considers the Department of State's "rationalization" as "the very tissue of reactionism" (p. 281), and hopes that further statements by the President, favoring "a genuine rule of law among nations," may force a salutary "reaction to reactionism" (pp. 281–282).

The author discusses other situations in which the United States has put what it deems immediate interest ahead of allegiance to international law, and suggests specific steps to avoid such action in the future. In the nuclear age a sound appraisal of national interest, he thinks, requires a strengthening of the international legal order, though he appreciates the importance of negotiation, conciliation, and cultural exchanges to provide an atmosphere in which law can flourish. He has "hope and faith that civilized men will see that civilization is safeguarded" and, paraphrasing Woodrow Wilson, declares that "the world must be made safe for law-sovereignty" (p. 326).

The volume is valuable both as a guide to practical thinking about American jurisprudence and foreign policy in the increasingly interdependent world, and as an up-to-date analysis of American precedents on the relations of national to international law. While not always easy reading, it ought to be widely read, particularly by lawyers interested in the efforts of the American Bar Association to promote the world rule of law.

QUINCY WRIGHT.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

Ground-Breaking Ceremony for New Federal Courthouse and Office Building in Brooklyn Civic Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the remarks of my esteemed friend and Brooklyn's borough president, John Cashmore, at the ground-breaking ceremonies for the new Federal courthouse and office building in Brooklyn Civic Center, Monday, March 28, 1960. John and I entered politics together and assumed a public station 38 years ago—he as an alderman, I as Congressman. John has risen to great heights over the years by dint of honest endeavor, hard work and practical wisdom. His remarks follow:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, each time that we have taken a step to advance the development of the civic center it has given me new encouragement, new purpose, and new incentive, to push this tremendous project to completion.

Today, we break ground for the new Federal courthouse and office building, I think we have genuine cause for satisfaction because, from where we stand, we can see that our dream of 20 years ago is now close to reality.

In these last 20 years, the obstacles to progress sometimes seemed insurmountable. We had to raise $200 million in public and private funds. We had to relocate families by the hundreds. We had to stop the project to fight a war. Then we had to hunt for materials that were in desperately short supply.

Despite all the obstacles and all the heartaches, we pushed on. Today, the Brooklyn Civic Center is now described as the greatest example of urban renewal in America.

To me, it seems highly appropriate that the U.S. Government should be represented, and well represented, in our great civic center. I have seen the model of the Federal courthouse that will stand here, and I am delighted to say that it will be an added source of beauty to our civic center, with a dignity worthy of American justice, which it represents.

Let me say right here, that we can thank the alert and vigorous congressional delegation of Brooklyn for making this day possible. Early in 1958, when the Federal Government announced that it would advance a number of construction projects, I communicated with each of our Congressmen, and both our U.S. Senators, asking that the U.S. courthouse and office building be placed under construction. I can tell you that every one of our Congressmen was on the job, and nearly $16 million was appropriated for this project.

Only a month ago, our Congressmen again came to our rescue. When the General Services Administration was about to award a contract for the construction of this building, we found that it could be constructed with marble facing for an added expenditure of $130,000. From an examination of the public buildings in this area we noticed that marble resists industrial smoke and grime better than any other building material.

We also noticed that buildings with marble facing require less cleaning and maintenance. Again, I wired to our Congressmen for help, and within 48 hours, they sent back the good news that this courthouse will be a beautiful marble edifice.

In the name of the people of Brooklyn I salute our congressional delegation and I want them to know that their efforts are appreciated.

We have now reached the point where we can honestly say that government, and especially the government of the city of New York, has done its share in the redevelopment of the Brooklyn Civic Center.

If the private enterprise will continue to invest in the commercial and residential redevelopment of the area, our Brooklyn Civic Center will undoubtedly be a model for imitation by all the great cities of America.

A Shameful Blot on Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the United Synagogue Review, spring 1960 issue. The Review is published by the United Synagogue of America, the national organization of Conservative Judaism:

A SHAMEFUL BLOT ON SOCIETY

During the recent debate in the California State Legislature on the abolition of capital punishment, perhaps the most significant testimony came from a gentleman who spent 22 years as an official of San Quentin Prison, 11½ years as warden.

Clinton P. Duffy, who officiated at or was party to at least 150 executions in his State, said he was convinced that capital punishment was no deterrent to crime. "I've asked every man on death row during my years at San Quentin whether he thought of the death penalty before committing his crime and I have yet to hear the first man say he had," Mr. Duffy declared.

It is saddening to think that in this 20th century, the penal system of California and of so many of our other States and provinces in the United States and Canada is still burdened with the vestige of a primitive age in which justice was governed by the passion for revenge.

We firmly believe that the overwhelming majority of our citizenry regards capital punishment as barbaric and repugnant to their noblest instincts. It is our prayer that before long our lawmakers too will recognize the need to remove this shameful blot from our society.

African Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to African Freedom Day. The observance this year is full of meaning as Africans are moving, and moving fast, toward freedom.

It is remarkable that but 2 years ago, Ghana was the single sub-Sahara African country to have achieved its independence. Africa had moved more slowly toward freedom and independence than any other major area in the world. The past 2 years have brought a virtual explosion in the drive toward freedom and independence. The greater part of the African countries are now just independent or on the very verge of independence. Two years from now, one can confidently predict Africa will be a continent of free nations with few, if any remaining colonies.

Major and sweeping changes are taking place across the face of Africa. The United States is fortunate in that our ideals are widely known and respected in Africa. Many Africans look to us for leadership on the path to freedom with confidence that it will be forthcoming. This confidence must not be disappointed.

I direct the attention of the House to an excellent editorial on African problems appearing in the New York Times of April 13, 1960:

AFRICAN FREEDOM

The observance of Africa Freedom Day comes at an electric moment in the spectacular evolution of a once-dark continent toward the sunlight of human dignity and independence.

From the Sahara to the Zambezi, from Dakar to Mombasa, the world is witnessing as astonishingly rapid and on the whole as bloodless a transference of power from the governors to the governed over a continental area as it has ever seen. It is true that to the north of tropical Africa—in Algeria—there is savage war, and to the south—in the Union—there looms the threat of eventual racial conflict even more savage than war; but in the great body of this huge land mass the mills of the gods are grinding faster and more peaceably than seemed possible only a few short months ago.

At the rally at town hall tonight marking Africa Freedom Day two of the most prominent leaders from one of the most troubled of the central African States, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, will speak: Dr. Hastings K. Banda of Nyasaland, released from jail just 2 weeks ago, and Kenneth Kaunda of Northern Rhodesia, also recently released from prison. It is a hallmark of native African leaders to have served their term in jail for their nationalist views; but it is also a sign of the times that most of them have been released under the irrestible pressures that are churning the political life of Africa into new and perhaps ultimately unrecognizable forms.

When the first informal organization of independent African States was formed at Accra in April 1958, there were altogether only eight such countries (excluding the Union), and all but two of them—Liberia and Ghana—were strung along the northern and northeastern fringes of the continent from Morocco to Ethiopia. Since then, one—Guinea—has been added; but the amazing fact is that during the 12 months of 1960 at least 7 former colonial States will have achieved their independence: the former Italian colony of Somalia; the former Belgian colony of Congo; the former French colonies or trusteeships of Mali (Senegal and Sudan), Madagascar, Togoland, and Cameroons; and the largest (in population) of them all, the former British colony of Nigeria.

The incredible march of these states to independence does not, of course, mean that they will simultaneously achieve real freedom, for real freedom can come only with far greater political, economic, and cultural development than they have yet achieved. And this is precisely where our own country can and must help them: not only with money but with moral and spiritual support, given freely without ulterior motive and without political ties. We are at this moment standing at the crossroads of our relationship with the peoples of Africa. We can turn toward them, for their good and ours, giving them of the benefits of our own civilization, knowledge, and techniques; or we can turn our back on them, thus losing forever our only chance for friendship of 200 million people who would like to be our friends without political strings or political domination.

Disclaimer Affidavit in the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act continues. This incorrectly named "loyalty oath" has stirred up a vast amount of opposition among students, faculty members, and college presidents. The first oath—the true loyalty oath in the same act—the positive oath of allegiance, has generally speaking not been attacked and there is no serious demand in the academic world for its removal. This is a point which cannot be overemphasized, and it is a point on which there has been much confusion. The scholars and students of the country do, with ever-increasing articulateness, want the second oath, the negative disclaimer affidavit repealed, and I hope that we can get action on that bill in this Congress.

In this connection, I thought it would be appropriate if a few of the very fine statements by college presidents, AAUP chapters, and other college-connected groups, and individuals, appeared in the RECORD. One of the most persuasive statements on this subject was the resolution recently adopted by the faculty of the University of Oregon. This resolution arrived with a letter of transmittal by O. Meredith Wilson, the distinguished president of that university:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, April 9, 1960.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: With this letter I am transmitting a resolution passed by the University of Oregon faculty. I should note that there were those of the faculty who wished a much stronger statement.

In my experience in this and several other institutions, I have never seen an academic faculty discuss any issue with greater care or with greater concern. I believe I would not exaggerate if I were to say that the entire faculty regrets deeply the inclusion of a requirement of an affidavit of disbelief in this or any other Federal legislation relating to educational aid. Only great respect for the intentions of the Congress and a clear recognition of our country's needs have counterbalanced their distaste for the offending requirement.

If the members of the faculty thought that the inclusion of the affidavit of disbelief as a requirement for participating in the National Defense Education Act were to become a precedent for a similar inclusion in future enactments intended to support education, they would have voted not to participate in the present act. They have such respect for the U.S. Congress that they are persuaded that this requirement will not be included in future acts, and remain confident that the Congress will yet remove the offending section from the existing acts. I urge you as a U.S. Representative to use all your influence to see that the requirement of this affidavit is removed from existing acts and is excluded from any future legislation relating to education.

I am pleased to record this faith and confidence that our faculty has in the ultimate wisdom of our legislators and public officers. I shall be deeply grateful for all you may do to justify their confidence.

Sincerely yours,
O. MEREDITH WILSON,
President.

A MEMORIAL ADOPTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FACULTY, MARCH 16, 1960

The faculty of the University of Oregon expresses to the president of the university its grave concern that certain recipients of funds under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies are required to file an affidavit of disbelief repugnant alike to the principles of American citizenship and to the traditions of the University of Oregon. The affidavit of disbelief serves no useful purpose. It violates the settled doctrine of American jurisprudence that an American citizen is presumed innocent unless proved guilty. It is contrary to the sound principles of academic freedom to which the University of Oregon is

committed. It singles out as objects of suspicion among all recipients of Federal funds one group—members of the academic community—as special objects of distrusts.

In his budget message of January 18, 1960, President Eisenhower stated:

"I am recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that prohibits payments or loans from being made to any individual unless he executes an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our eductional community which feels that it is being singled out for requirement."

The requirement of the affidavit of disbelief in the National Defense Education Act is opposed by the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States. It has been condemned by faculties and governing boards of the leading universities of the United States and by the leading educational organizations of the United States, including the American Council on Education and the American Association of University Professors. Although individual members of the faculty of the University of Oregon may differ somewhat in the degree of their abhorrence for the affidavit of disbelief, not a single member is known to have risen to its defense.

The people of the State of Oregon have been hostile to discriminatory legislation that reflects upon the loyalty of a small minority of public employees or recipients of public funds. The faculty recalls with pride that a decade ago, when several great universities of this country were torn by dissension over negative loyalty oaths imposed by well-meaning but misguided legislatures, the Oregon State Grange, the Oregon Department of the American Legion, and the Chancellor of the Oregon State system of higher education, with the support of the State board of higher education, went on record as opposed to such oaths and the Legislature itself declined to pass the discriminatory legislation.

If the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief remains in effect, it will tend to fix itself on higher education and to flourish as additional Federal funds are appropriated. It will, as President Robert Goheen of Princeton University has pointed out, in discussing the National Defense Education Act, restrict the university's "right to choose its own students and to accord them aid upon principles which it determines," and it thus involves a principle of great importance, that of "assuring the self-directing integrity of long-established and responsible educational institutions:" Therefore be it

Resolved, That the faculty of the University of Oregon recommend:

(1) That the president of the university express for the university its official disapproval of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief in the National Defense Education Act, and concert appropriate action with other university administrators, faculties, and governing boards—notably those of Pacific University, Reed College, the University of Wisconsin, Harvard University, Yale University, and Princeton University—to the end that a sustained presentation of the views of many universities and colleges shall be presented to the Congress.

(2) That the president of the university, with the advice of the advisory council, appoint an ad hoc committee of the faculty to work vigorously toward the elimination of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief from the National Defense Education Act and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies; and be it further

Resolved, (3) That the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief be requested to make periodic reports to the faculty on progress being made toward the elimination of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief.

(4) That the faculty, recognizing the obligation to honor the fellowships and loans now in force, records its deep reluctance to continue participation in those programs of the National Defense Education Act and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies which require the filing of the affidavit of disbelief; and that it therefore recommends:

(a) That, in order to concert action, it communicate these sentiments to the faculties of the several State universities, the communicating agent to be the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief.

(b) That it recommend to the faculties of the universities joint action to effect the removal of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief.

(c) That the basis of joint action shall be determined through negotiation and, for the University of Oregon, on recommendation of the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief and by vote of the faculty.

Here are other letters on this matter, from AAUP chapters, from professors, from doctors, from other individuals, from student body organizations, which have been pouring into my office:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 7, 1960.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MADAM: I respectfully request your support of the Clark-Kennedy bill repealing the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit now required of students aided under the National Defense Education Act. Such a requirement attacks the right of the student to believe as he sees fit and has no place in our laws.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. HOWIESON, M.D.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION,
CEDAR CREST COLLEGE,
Allentown, Pa., March 25, 1960.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: The voting body of Cedar Crest College has passed the following resolution:

"The student body of Cedar Crest College is opposed to the disclaimer affidavit and the loyalty oath of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is our belief that the oath restricts academic freedom and implies a mistrust of the academic community. We are in full agreement with the principles underlying the legislative efforts of Senators CLARK and KENNEDY."

We hope that our opinion will be considered when the validity of this section of the National Defense Education Act is considered before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THE STUDENT BODY OF CEDAR CREST COLLEGE.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS,
Boulder, Colo., March 16, 1960.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: At its annual meeting on March 1, 1960, in Berkeley, Calif., the Western Association of Graduate Schools—which is composed of 49 graduate schools in colleges and universities located in every Western State, including Alaska and Hawaii—unanimously adopted the following resolution, which I am instructed to transmit to you:

"Whereas the requirement of affidavits of disbelief or disclaimer oaths as a condition for receiving fellowships or loans is an unwarranted interference with freedom of expression and is ineffective: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Western Association of Graduate Schools urge the Congress of the United States to eliminate the affidavits of disbelief or disclaimer oaths which appear in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Respectfully yours,

DAYTON D. MCKEAN,
Secretary, Dean of the Graduate School,
University of Colorado.

MARCH 1, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: We, the undersigned, strongly favor the pending Clark-Kennedy bill which seeks to repeal the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act. We do so because:

1. Such a loyalty oath is at best wholly ineffective in protecting our democratic institutions since a confirmed traitor loses nothing by adding perjury to his crime of treason.

2. Such a loyalty oath can at worst become, in the hands of self-styled patriots, a weapon for the suppression of unpopular, though lawful, political activity.

3. Such a loyalty oath seems, to us, to be an obvious violation of the fundamental American legalism that one is innocent until proven guilty.

4. Such a loyalty oath imposes unfair discrimination against one segment of our population inasmuch as other occupational groups which receive governmental subsidization are not required to affirm their loyalty.

5. Such a loyalty oath is an unpleasant survivor of a period of mistrust and demagoguery which did more harm to our national unity and security than could be wrought by a legion of genuine subversives.

We therefore urge you to use your office to help eliminate this insult to the intelligence and integrity of America's students and educators.

Sincerely,

Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio: John Finnerty, James Breckinridge, J. J. Wainman, F. McCuskey, W. E. Brunk, Ronald E. Witalis, Nicholas Sanduleak, Arthur R. Upgren, Jr., C. B. Stephenson, V. M. Blanio, A. G. Davis Philip.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.,
March 14, 1960.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Congresswoman for Oregon,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: As a member of the Subcommittee on Special Education, I hope you will be interested in the enclosed letter to an editor in which I outline the case against the disclaimer affidavit attached to the National Defense Education Act.

As I say there, this affidavit seems to me a distinctly un-American document. I strongly urge you to help report out a bill to repeal it.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP APPLEMAN,
Professor.

CONFUSE OATH, AFFIDAVIT

To the EDITOR:

The essential point in the N.D.E.A. disclaimer affidavit controversy seems always to be overlooked or confused by supporters of the affidavit: namely, that it is not a loyalty oath. There is, in addition to the affidavit, a genuine loyalty oath attached to the N.D.E.A., but neither the Student Senate nor the Indiana University Civil Liberties Union is pressing for repeal of that. Thus your

recent correspondent who described himself as damn happy to subscribe to an oath that I am an American would still enjoy this privilege if the affidavit were removed.

The disclaimer affidavit, on the other hand, is opposed not only by the Student Senate and by the I.U.C.L.U. but by almost every important educational group in the Nation, and for good reason. The language of the affidavit tells why; it reads: "I do not believe in * * * any organization that believes in * * * (etc.)." Contrast this with the words of the United States Constitution: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech * * * (etc.)." It goes without saying that to protect a man's speech is to protect his thought as well.

Only those who believe that Congress has a right to inquire into one's beliefs can support the disclaimer affidavit; but clearly the Constitution is opposed to such inquiry, and therefore advocates of the disclaimer affidavit are quite literally un-American. Contrary to what another of your correspondents seems to think, such a disclaimer is not required of farmers who receive loans from the Government; it is not required of businessmen who receive loans from the Government; it is not required even of members of our Armed Forces. Ironically, it is only students, to whom freedom of inquiry is absolutely essential, who are required to submit to this attempt at thought control.

It is simply avoiding the issue to pretend that, as still another of your correspondents says, "the individual has the right to choose" in this matter. In cases of financial need the only alternative to signing this repugnant affidavit may be to withdraw from school; this is no choice at all. Cooperative student action, like the vote of the Student Senate, or the petition on the I.U.C.L.U. is asking students to sign, is therefore clearly called for; Congressmen listen more attentively to large groups than to isolated individuals.

These are no doubt some of the reasons that President Eisenhower, Seceretary Flemming, Senator HARTKE, President Wells, the American Association of University Professors, and many educational groups are so firmly opposed to the affidavit.

PHILIP APPLEMAN,
Assistant Professor of English.

MARCH 8, 1960.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

For your information, at the meeting on February 22, 1960, the Oregon College of Education Chapter of the American Association of University Professors voted, in a unanimous decision, to go on record as being opposed to the disclaimer affidavit of section 1001F of the National Defense Education Act and recommended that this disclaimer affidavit be deleted.

MILDRED KANE,
Secretary, Oregon College of Education Chapter American Association of University Professors.

GRINNELL COLLEGE,
Grinnell, Iowa, March 8, 1960.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I am writing to urge your support of the measure repealing the disclaimer affidavit and the loyalty oath in the National Defense Education Act. As a teacher I have observed what seems to me to be the ineffectiveness of such measures to promote loyalty. At the same time they appear to encourage timidity and cynicism. I most earnestly urge you to vote for repeal.

Your truly,

RICHARD S. WESTFALL.

Finally, in order to dispel once and for all the erroneous notion that this concern is felt only in a few colleges, or in one or two sections of our country, this listing of the schools and associations which have taken a stand against the disclaimer affidavit has been compiled by the Office of Education. The list, Mr. Speaker, is growing:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
FINANCIAL AID BRANCH,
March 17, 1960.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PROTESTING THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT PROVISION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The following list of institutions is the latest information we have gathered from press reports and other communications concerning colleges and universities which have objected to the disclaimer affidavit provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Institutions participating in the national defense student loan program have not been asked to state their position on the disclaimer affidavit. Consequently, except for the list of institutions which have withdrawn from the program, the information included here is not at all complete.

In all but a few cases the protests have been against the disclaimer affidavit only, and do not include the oath of allegiance. The protests have been made either by the president of the institution or its governing board.

1. Institutions which have withdrawn from the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit:

Amherst College, Massachusetts.
Antioch, Ohio.
Bennington College, Vermont.
Goucher College, Maryland.
Grinnell College, Iowa.
Harvard University, Massachusetts.
Interdenominational Theological Center, Georgia.
Oberlin College, Ohio.
Radcliffe College, Massachusetts.
Reed College, Oregon.
St. John's College, Maryland.
Sarah Lawrence College, New York.
Wilmington College, Ohio.
Wesleyan University, Connecticut.
Yale University, Connecticut.

2. Instructions which declined to participate in the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit:

Beloit College, Wisconsin.
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.
Haverford, Pennsylvania.
Mills, California.
Princeton University, New Jersey.
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
University of Richmond, Virginia.
Wellesley College, Massachusetts.

3. Institutions whose presidents or boards have publicly stated their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit but which continue to participate in the student loan program:

Bates, Maine.
Boston College, Massachusetts.
Bowdoin College, Maine.
Brown University, Rhode Island.
Case Institute of Technology, Ohio.
Central State Connecticut College.
Chattanooga University, Tennessee.
Colby College, Maine.
College of St. Benedict, Minnesota.
City College of New York.
Colgate University, New York.
Colorado College.
Columbia University, New York.
Cornell University, New York.
Dartmouth College, New Hampshire.
Denver University, Colorado.
Drexel Institute of Technology.
Duke University, North Carolina.
Earlham College, Indiana.
Elmira College, New York.
Fairleigh-Dickson College, New Jersey.
Fisk University, Tennessee.
George Peabody College for Teachers, Tennessee.
Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota.
Hamilton College, New York.
Hamline College, Minnesota.
Hunter College, New York.
Iowa State Teachers College.
Indiana University.
Johns Hopkins University, Maryland.
Kansas State College.
Kansas State University.
Lafayette College, Pennsylvania.
Lake Erie College, Ohio.
Lake Forest College, Illinois.
La Verne College, California.
Lawrence College, Wisconsin.
Manhattan College, New York.
Marshall College, West Virginia.
Millsaps College, Mississippi.
Northwestern University, Illinois.
Pennsylvania State College.
Providence College, Rhode Island.
Queens College, New York.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, New York.
Rhode Island College of Education.
Roanoke College, Virginia.
Roosevelt University, Illinois.
Rutgers University, New Jersey.
St. Cloud State College, Minnesota.
St. John's University, Minnesota.
St. Olaf's College, Minnesota.
Smith College, Massachusetts.
Temple University, Pennsylvania.
Tufts University, Connecticut.
University of Arizona.
University of Chicago.
University of Colorado.
University of Connecticut.
University of Delaware.
University of Hawaii.
University of Illinois.
University of Iowa.
University of Kansas.
University of Michigan.
University of Minnesota.
University of New Hampshire.
University of North Carolina.
University of Notre Dame.
University of Pennsylvania.
University of Pittsburgh.
University of Rhode Island.
University of Rochester.
University of the South, Tennessee.
University of Washington.
University of Wisconsin.
Vassar College, New York.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
Washburn University of Topeka, Kansas.
Wheaton College, Massachusetts.
Wisconsin State College.
Yankton College, South Dakota.

4. Associations reported as protesting the disclaimer affidavit:

American Association for the Advancement of Science.
American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.
American Association of University Professors.
American Council of Learned Societies.
American Council on Education.
American Jewish Congress.
Associated Students of Sacramento State College, Calif.
Association for Higher Education (NEA).
Association of American Colleges.
Association of Graduate Schools.
Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Institutions.
National Conference on Higher Education.
National Council of Churches of Christ.
National Student Association.
New England Society of Newspaper Editors.
State Universities Association.

NOTE.—Carleton College, Minnesota, and Williams College, Massachusetts, are not participating in the program, but both have declared their opposition to the disclaimer affidavit.

The Death of Bomarc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last year it was very unpopular to be opposed to Bomarc.

Yet, I felt we must reconsider the Bomarc program at that time. I talked of this on June 5 on the floor.

I was happy to learn that the Pentagon has almost completely eliminated the development and production of Bomarc.

In today's Marquis Childs column he discusses various aspects of the Bomarc controversy.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1960]

DEATH OF BOMARC MAY STIR DEBATE

(By Marquis Childs)

The so-called defense issue has largely vanished from sight if only because the military hero in the White House has said repeatedly that he knows more than anyone else in this nuclear-electronic age about America's security and how to achieve it.

But there is just a chance that it may be revived in connection with a decision out of the Pentagon that was largely lost in the sweep of the news. This was to cut back almost to zero the development and production of the Bomarc air defense missile. Some estimates put the amount spent on Bomarc at $3 billion.

Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, says that when the military construction bill comes before the Armed Services Subcommittee he will demand to know why the Bomarc and its allied warning system, Sage, are being abandoned after such a huge investment. He points out that Bomarc sites on the West Coast, each costing on the average $13 million, are to be abandoned.

They will stand, he says, indignantly, as monuments to a colossal error in judgment, to put the kindliest interpretation on what has happened. Among them are the Payne Air Force Base, near Everett, Wash., 44 percent completed; Camp Adair, Oreg., 67 percent completed; Travis Air Force Base, near San Francisco, 25 percent completed; Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., 44 percent.

The reply of the "truth squad" in the Office of the Secretary of Defense is, in effect, that development of the Bomarc was justified on earlier intelligence estimates of the number of manned bombers to be produced by Soviet Russia. The new intelligence estimate radically downgrades this number and it credits the Soviets with much greater accuracy in long-range missiles than had previously been assumed.

The total amount that will have been spent on Bomarc-Sage, according to the Defense Department memorandum, is $3.7 billion. For this there will ultimately be eight operational Bomarc bases in the East and on the United States-Canadian border, plus a warning system "ready to serve in time of war in the incredibly difficult task of sorting out enemy bombers coming in to attack."

The unofficial intimation out of the Pentagon is that Senator JACKSON has been one of the principals pressuring for the continuance of Bomarc. The Boeing plant producing and developing this missile means a large payroll in Seattle in JACKSON's home State.

Insisting that he has never at any time applied pressure, JACKSON points to the statement of the Military Construction Subcommittee nearly 2 years ago when efforts were made to get a decision out of the Defense Department as between Bomarc and its Army competitor, the Nike-Hercules.

"It is the committee's firm and unanimous opinion," said a report issued in July of 1958, "that decisions must be made to eliminate duplication or otherwise the annual cost of the defense budget will require increases beyond all reasonable proportions."

With the fierce rivalry between the two missile systems, Boeing began a campaign of newspaper advertising to resist any cuts. Primpt newspaper retaliation came from Western Electric and the Bell Telephone Laboratories involved in the production of Nike-Hercules.

Cuts in the far more modest program were resisted by Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina. An important payroll in his State was involved and he served notice on the Military Construction Subcommittee that he would publicly challenge any attempt to eliminate Nike-Hercules.

For as long as a year and a half to a year it was widely said that the Bomarc, an air-breathing missile, would be obsolete by the time it came into full production. In overall justification of the vast expenditure on Bomarc the Defense Department argues that with the rapid shift in weaponry it is often necessary to develop systems that will be obsolete before they can be proved out. Research and development still continue on Bomarc A, big brother to Bomarc B.

That argument may be valid. But this looks like such a beautiful example of duplication, commercial rivalry, and regional competition that a really thorough, objective investigation might help the poor confused citizen to find out the facts.

Foreign Goods No Idle Threat; Rubber Imports Up 278 Percent in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article to show that imports of rubber products nearly tripled during the past year. The article appeared in the B. F. Goodrich Citizen for March 1960, which is published by the B. F. Goodrich Co. in Akron, Ohio:

FOREIGN GOODS NO IDLE THREAT; RUBBER IMPORTS UP 278 PERCENT IN 1959

You've heard of foreign competition in cars, cameras, and barbed wire. But did you know that imports of rubber products—the kind we make—nearly tripled during the past year?

During the first 8 months of 1959 rubber goods brought into this country were valued at $61.8 million. In the same period in 1958, imports of the same kind of products amounted to only $22.2 million.

The dollar volume of imports isn't so alarming yet. It's the rapidly accelerating trend that causes Americans to think twice.

CAN AFFECT EMPLOYMENT

In 1955 American auto makers weren't concerned when foreign car imports amounted to 57,115 vehicles, less than 1 percent of U.S. production. But foreign car imports have risen rapidly since then, and last year—with 668,070 cars—equaled 12 percent of America's output.

A study by the Brookings Institute shows that imports definitely affect rubber industry employment. For each $1 million increase in tire imports, there will be 45 fewer workers in the tire industry and 48 in related industries, a total of 92.

In miscellaneous rubber products, each $1 million increase in imports means 77 fewer workers in rubber manufacturing and 41 in related industries, 117 workers in all.

WHY THE RAPID RISE?

Why are rubber product imports rising at such a rapid rate?

Many factors are involved, but it boils down to the fact that our foreign competitors are making and selling their products much more cheaply.

Even after paying U.S. tariffs, foreign manufacturers can sell their products here at a price averaging 25 to 30 percent below ours, depending on the product.

MODERN PLANTS

They have modern new plants—built with war recovery dollars—and machinery that incorporates the latest technological advances. As a nation, we have shared our know-how with these countries in the interests of good will and peace.

Backed by these mechanical improvements, employees abroad have exhibited extreme pride of workmanship. For the most part, you can no longer question the quality of imported products.

As the production volume of these plants increase, their unit costs become even lower.

CONTRAST IN WAGES

But the chief factor in their lower production costs is the difference in wages paid here and abroad.

Here is how average hourly earnings, including fringe benefits, compare:

B. F. Goodrich	$3.55
France	1.01
Germany	.90
Italy	.45
Japan	.20

This disparity in wages per employee offers American manufacturers a real challenge.

How is foreign competition affecting BFG divisions? Here is the story in several:

Industrial products: For the past 5 years, BFG distributors have noticed a steadily growing invasion of foreign hose, belts, sheeting, and gloves. Prices range from 25 to 40 percent lower than BFG prices.

Continental of Germany, for example, makes and distributes a wide range of industrial products. The U.S. sales manager, who is personable and talks like an American, tours the country calling on industrial products distributors, offering price advantages hard to refuse.

Continental's steel reinforced ¾-inch steam hose sells for 76 cents per foot compared with BFG's $1.41 per foot. Continental supplies 24-inch conveyor belting at $4.85 per linear foot compared with BFG's $6.25 per linear foot.

Their products dock at Boston, New York, Baltimore, Houston, and even San Francisco. They have U.S. warehouses and can furnish nationwide delivery.

Dunlop of Great Britain and Pirelli of Italy also are aggressive in the U.S. market.

DISTRIBUTORS FACE PROBLEMS

J. K. Slingluff of Baltimore Belting Co., a BFG distributor, says foreign industrial products have been quite a factor in the Baltimore area for 4 or 5 years.

"One of my competitors handles Continental belting, and his prices run 30 to 35 percent below ours," he said. "Another competitor handles Dunlop sheeting, which is 30 percent below ours in price. Pirelli of Italy makes every size of V-belt. They stock them in New York and sell them at prices 25 percent under ours. Quality of foreign products is usually good, although a few American

companies now refuse to consider foreign bids after unfavorable experiences."

Japanese industrial products are becoming plentiful in this country, particularly on the west coast. Japanese mail campaigns have reached BFG distributors as far east as Chicago.

Tires: Imports in 1959 more than doubled those in 1958.

In the passenger tire field, small cars offer the principal competition. Because of the variety of foreign cars being imported, American tire manufacturers aren't equipped to make all of the replacement sizes needed. BFG supplements its own output by bringing in some sizes from its European associates.

In the truck tire field, Michelin of France is finding increasing favor with its long-mileage X-type tire. It not only is a top quality item, but sells for less than comparable American truck tires. Michelin has set up a national sales organization in the United States.

Footwear: Thirty-four percent of all waterproof and canvas footwear sold in the United States is now imported, primarily from Japan.

Imports have skyrocketed from 1 million pairs in 1955 to nearly 48 million pairs in the first 11 months of 1959. Quality is generally good.

Wage rates put American manufacturers at a tremendous disadvantage. Average hourly wages for the footwear industry in the United States are $2.51 per hour. In Japan the average is 20 cents an hour.

Alarmed at the rapid rise of footwear imports, members of the American footwear industry briefed Senators and Representatives in Washington recently on the problem. The industry hopes foreign manufacturers will agree to a voluntary quota before the footwear market is flooded.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

What can be done about foreign competition?

The most obvious answer is to build as much value as possible into our products at the lowest possible cost. BFG products are known for their quality; through pride and vigilance, we must maintain this quality superiority. And by working smarter, we must become more efficient and keep our costs low. BFG people can't afford to give foreign competitors any further advantage.

Resolution of Democratic Midwest Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow Congressmen the following farm resolutions passed by the Democratic Midwest Conference:

FARM POLICY RESOLUTION OF 1960, ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOTING DELEGATES, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 27, 1960

Whereas the net income from farming has been trending downward during the last 7 years, has declined by more than $20 billion relative to the rest of the economy, is now at the lowest point in purchasing power since 1934; and

Whereas unused commodity supplies have now accumulated in Government hands to the extent of more than $9 billion, costing more than $1.5 million a day to store and handle; and

Whereas, administration policies can only lead to a further excess of farm output in relation to existing utilized outlets, thus resulting in aggregate inefficiency in the use of farm resources; and

Whereas economic studies by farm economists of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and leading land-grant universities have shown that the Eisenhower-Benson-Nixon policies will certainly worsen the agricultural situation, intensifying hardship and inequity among farm families, spreading the business depression in the rural regions and ultimately threatening the entire U.S. economy; and

Whereas Republican assurances uttered time after time to farmers and the American public have all proved false; and

Whereas farm program costs under the Republican administration since 1953 now total more than all the previous combined budgets of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the Republican administration has either opposed outrightly or by reluctant execution hampered the full utilization of the Nation's farm abundance to alleviate undernourishment both at home and abroad; and

Whereas it is obvious that the farm income problem must be attacked at the earliest possible moment, partly by appropriate supply programing and partly by expanded and more effective use of available supplies, to prevent the total destruction of our traditional system of family farming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the Midwest Democratic Conference express their approval of the principles, including its fair price and income objectives, of the comprehensive all-commodity bill, entitled the "Family Farm Income Act of 1960," now pending before the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, and we urge that it be promptly prepared for debate and passage by both Chambers of the Congress in the current session, so that its provisions may be effective for the crop year of 1961.

Just What Is the National Debt Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the National Home Builders Association's Economic News Notes contains an excellent analysis of the national debt management problems. It further illustrates the clear need for removal of the archaic interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD excerpts of that analysis:

JUST WHAT IS THE NATIONAL DEBT PROBLEM?

If debt is a headache to you, just consider the U.S. Treasury which handles the biggest headache of all, a $287 billion one, more and more of which has to be refinanced sooner and sooner—some $80 billion of it coming due in 1960 alone.

World War II—and the financing of much of it by borrowing, rather than with pay-as-you-go taxes—created today's large national debt. Between 1939 and 1945, the debt rose sixfold; and unbalanced budgets in some of the years since have increased it moderately to today's $287 billion level. Obviously the financing of a debt of this magnitude creates problems that go far beyond the U.S. Treasury. It is simply too elephantine a factor in our economy ever to permit the Treasury and the U.S. Government to be an impassive neutral on the economic scene. Even doing nothing is a decision that could have major business and financing repercussions. The very size of the debt itself makes Treasury operations a potent factor in the financing problems of every business in the country today.

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST?

The direct cost of financing this debt—the interest paid on it—runs about $9.4 billion a year. In 1946 the interest cost was only $4.7 billion—just half of today's cost, even though the debt was nearly nine-tenths of the current level. Higher interest rates today and the constant refinancing at these rates required because of rapid shortening of maturities have resulted in substantial increases in the cost of carrying that debt.

DEBT MATURITIES—OR WHEN DOES IT HAVE TO BE PAID OFF OR REFINANCED?

The ideal situation would obviously be to have the debt spread out more evenly over a long-time span, with Treasury short-term financing restricted to a debt of relatively temporary character. In this sense, the Federal Government's present predicament might be compared to the plight of a modest income home buyer who had to buy a home over a 20-year period—using 90-day notes.

Unfortunately the major share of the debt was incurred in a short period of time. Increasing demands for investment funds in the past decade, and the use of monetary policy to counter inflation (tight money, et cetera) have complicated management of this unwieldy debt. At the beginning of the 1950's, the average maturity of the debt was about 6 years; by last year it had fallen to 4 years four months, and today, its average life is only 4 years 3 months.

A 1918 law set an interest rate ceiling of 4¼ percent on issues of more than 5 years. The low level of debt in the 1920's, and the low level of interest rates from the early thirties until recently, meant that the ceiling had no operative effect during most of its existence. But recently that ceiling has become an important fact of economic life. As older issues expire, they require refinancing, since funds to retire them are not available at current levels of Government income and expenditures. In a period of high interest rates, it has not been possible to refinance in the long-term part of the investment market when interest rates for long-term issues rose above that ceiling, and hence the Treasury has had to refinance, at higher interest rates, in the short-term sector of the market, with consequent dislocation of the market.

October 1959 provided a dramatic—and unpleasant—example to the homebuilding industry of just what this could mean. The Treasury invaded the short-term market with a $2 billion 5-percent, 4-year, 10-month issue—the so-called magic 5s. About 108,000 individual subscriptions were received to this issue, in amounts of $25,000 or less. Total individual subscriptions to the issue reached $778 million; and many individuals investing in them withdrew funds from institutions which are major sources of mortgage funds for builders. It is estimated that at least $200 million were withdrawn from savings banks, and an additional $200 million from savings accounts in commercial banks, to purchase these securities. The remainder came from varied sources, including withdrawals from savings and loans and cashing-in of savings bonds. Obviously, the not-so-private domain of seasoned investors was heavily invaded by "thrift savers," attracted because the magic 5s paid much higher yields than obtainable from savings in thrift

institutions. In some areas of the country, such as the New York vicinity where the drain on savings deposits was heaviest, homebuilding operations and forward planning were disrupted.

Last year a Government deficit compounded the problem. This year there is some hope of a small budget surplus, which could mean some decrease in the debt, but nevertheless the refinancing problem for the rest of the year is very heavy. During 1960, $80 billion of securities comes due.

Since the budget surplus in 1960 is not expected to exceed $2 billion, most of these maturing issues will have to be refunded. The first quarter's refinancing is already out of the way, without major upsets, and the second quarter, bolstered by tax receipts is not expected to present insurmountable problems. Treasury's real test this year will come in the second half of the year (calendar 1960)—when tax receipts are lowest and revenues are expected to fall some $4 billion below expenditures. This coincides with acute concentration of major refinancing—including a peak at August 15, when a $9.6 billion note issue becomes due, and again at November 15 when $10.8 billion in bonds and certificates come due. These peaks will hit at times when business funds needs are also at high levels—for such items as contract payments on heavy summer construction, fall and preholiday inventories, model changeover investments, etc.

THE NET OF IT ALL

A vast debt of constantly shortening terms, forcing the Treasury to go to the money markets more and more often, and occasionally with considerable embarrassment, "borrowing from Peter to pay Paul" in a very real sense, as time intervals narrow.

While interest rates, on their current roller coaster, have softened recently, there is no assurance that this will continue throughout the year or that a long-term bond issue under the ceiling could succeed. Moreover under anticipated future conditions there is no assurance that the Treasury will not again attempt another issue similar to the magic 5s. Unless the Treasury can do some refinancing in the long-term sector, the situation is bound to worsen. For example, if all of 1960 financing were done with issues maturing within 1 year or less, the under 1-year debt will grow from some $80 billion at the beginning of 1960 to about $95 billion at the year's end, including one issue due in November 1961 of over $11 billion.

The old saw that death and taxes are always with us could well be modified to read "debt, death, and taxes." Whether or not the Treasury has done a good job of managing the debt in recent history, and just how it got in this bind is a matter of controversy, but at the moment it is more a matter for the historians. What should concern us is what could happen from now on out, and how this might affect the homebuilding industry as well as the economy.

Fred Seaton Boosted for Vice-Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt highly honored that among my constituents in the First Congressional District of Nebraska I can number as one of them the Honorable Fred Seaton of Hastings Nebr.

Mr. Seaton has served his country long and well in a number of capacities. He is well acquainted with the problems of the Department of Defense, having served ably in that Department. He is well aware of the many problems, big and little, which must be handled directly by the White House through his service on the White House staff as a key assistant to President Eisenhower. And he has shown a most remarkable capacity for administration as Secretary of the Interior in the President's Cabinet.

Not in many, many years has there been such a capable administrator of the Department of Interior as Fred Seaton has proved to be. It was among the wisest Cabinet appointments made by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I was further honored on March 28 of this year by taking part of the Founders Day program at Lincoln, Nebr., and sat with the Secretary and spoke from the same platform with him.

At the Republican State convention which followed our Founders Day luncheon, the Secretary received a pledge of support from the Republican Party of the State of Nebraska for the vice-presidential nomination.

On March 30 the North Dakota Republican convention, too, took action to endorse Fred Seaton for the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

I would like to include in the RECORD the two resolutions adopted by our great Midwestern States supporting my good friend and outstanding constituent, Fred Seaton. The resolutions follow:

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON RECEIVES DELEGATE SUPPORT FOR VICE-PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE

RESOLUTION PASSED BY NEBRASKA REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION ON MARCH 28, 1960

Whereas the Honorable Fred A. Seaton has distinguished himself as an outstanding Nebraskan while serving with an outstanding Republican administration; and

Whereas the Honorable Fred A. Seaton has proven himself invaluable to the Eisenhower-Nixon administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the convention here assembled endorse and recommend the Honorable Fred A. Seaton as vice-presidential candidate of the Republican Party for 1960.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY NORTH DAKOTA REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION ON MARCH 30, 1960

Whereas the yardstick of measurement applied to potential vice-presidential candidates indicates that on a comparative basis, the qualifications of Fred A. Seaton are outstanding and worthy of consideration by the presidential nominee; and

Whereas Fred A. Seaton's knowledge and interest in reclamation and agricultural progress assures his future continued attention; and

Whereas his training in private life as a businessman and in public service as a State Senator in Nebraska, a U.S. Senator, an Assistant Secretary of Defense, Deputy Assistant to President Eisenhower and as the Secretary of Interior qualifies him to continue the important duties and functions of the office of Vice President; and

Whereas his close association in public life with Vice President NIXON, with whom he shares a common political philosophy, would provide a united and forceful team approach in winning the election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention endorses Fred A. Seaton as the vice-presidential candidate and requests RICHARD M. NIXON to give careful consideration to the advantages of selecting Fred A. Seaton as his choice for Vice President.

Our Thriving Way of Life—Is It Riding for a Fall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News. It was written by the very thoughtful journalist, Howard Whitman.

There is, in the United States, almost a sickness of the soul. We are following the values—in recent years—of Babylon without stopping to think, to reconsider, and to built a new America. What is needed now is a vision of a new society where people can be economically well off, but not trapped by the gadgets they buy; where all people regardless of race, creed, or color may walk together in freedom and equality and where all people may realize their individual creative potential.

If we do not try to build this kind of society and if we fail in its construction, I strongly fear that our civilization will decay quickly at best; and at the worst, the human species will be destroyed completely.

The article follows:

OUR THRIVING WAY OF LIFE—IS IT RIDING FOR A FALL?—MANY OBSERVERS FEAR WE'VE BECOME TOO SOFT

(By Howard Whitman)

We were flying across the country, looking down upon the seemingly endless panorama of thriving farms, suburban homes, and busy cities, when the man sitting next to me said softly, "What a pity."

Startled, I asked what he meant.

"What a pity," he said, "that we've lived it up so fast. From up here everything looks so right and shipshape. But down there life's gotten pretty soft and flabby. We've let ourselves get spoiled. That's what I meant by pity. It's a pity to let a great way of life like ours take a back seat."

Was this a crackpot, a crepe hanger—or worse, a Communist sympathizer—taking this dim view of the great, abundant civilization of the free Western World?

Not at all. The man sitting next to me was a businessman, a father, a homeowner, a good citizen of his Midwest city.

"I'm just trying to be honest," he continued. "We've made a great mark in the world. Our progress, our genius, our productivity will go down in history. But where do we go from here? Do we go down in history, too?

"We've soaked ourselves in luxury, we've taken to the worship of money and pleasure. We've twisted moral values to suit ourselves, we've scoffed at integrity.

"In short, we've behaved like great civilizations of the past when they've become overfat and pleasure ridden—just before they've crumbled."

THERE'S FEAR THAT WE'LL FALL

Many an average citizen has had a similar feeling, perhaps not so pronounced, perhaps just an inkling, a fear, a momentary doubt,

a niggling suspicion that perhaps our great culture has had it.

Perhaps we have hit the top and started down. Could it be true? Will future historians write of our decline and fall?

Important leaders of our time have in recent months publicly voiced the misgivings which must be shared by millions. George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, now a history professor at Princeton, gave this piercing warning:

"If you ask me whether a country • • • with no highly developed sense of national purpose, with the overwhelming accent of life on personal comfort, with a dearth of public services and a surfeit of privately sold gadgetry, with insufficient social discipline even to keep its major industries functioning without grievous interruption—if you ask me whether such a country has in the long run good chances of competing with a purposeful, serious, and disciplined society such as that of the Soviet Union, I must say that the answer is 'No.'"

Last November, Emmet John Hughes, who served as speech writer for President Eisenhower during the 1952 and 1956 campaigns, brought out a book which he said was written "with much anxiety." One can understand why. He entitled it "America the Vincible."

"Vincible" is an unusual word. We're much more used to "invincible" especially when applied to America.

But Webster tells us plainly that "vincible" means "capable of being overcome or subdued," and Hughes tells us equally plainly that America, as he puts it, is more vincible than at at any point in its history since the Civil War.

America has led a charmed life up to now. But the charm has worn off. That's Hughes' thesis.

KENNEDY GIVES HIS IMPRESSION

Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, looked over the country which some voters would like him to lead for the next 4 years and gave this capsule impression:

"The slow corrosion of luxury—the slow erosion of our courage—already are beginning to show. Our profits may be up, our standard of living may be up, but so is our crime rate. So are the sales of tranquilizers and the number of children dropping out of school."

Coincident with his retirement as commanding general of the Army Ordnance Missile Command, Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, perhaps irked at incessant criticism of American standards in missilery and rocketry, leveled a finger at other U.S. standards.

"Have we engineered standards to take care of our agricultural surpluses, our inadequate educational structure, our 'beatniks'?" he asked. "Our standards also seem inadequate in the fields of politics, religion, and basic research."

And, taking the long view, a sociology professor at Harvard, Pitirim A. Sorokin, has stated, "At the present time, the magnificent sensate house built by Western man is crumbling, and the new integrated system of values is not yet built. Hence the crises, tensions, and conflicts of this age."

How do we react to these warnings?

We know how we reacted 2 years ago when the Russian braggart taunted, "We will bury you." We bristled. And we bristled again last fall when he explained what he had meant: that the march of civilization would tramp over us, leaving us interred like feudalism."

We bristle. But many of us also wonder in the quiet thoughtfulness of our own concern for our country, whether this could possibly be true.

There is discomfort in our reactions. We see a determined, vigorous, Machiavellian adversary, fanatical in its belief in itself, having only domination as its religion, challenging us to a duel for the future.

The gauntlet has been hurled at our feet. Will we pick it up? How will we answer the challenge?

WHAT SHOULD OUR NEW GOALS BE?

The challenge is to go forward. If we stand still the boots of new civilizations will surely tramp over us; history assures us of it. But where do wo go? Which way is forward? What are our new goals, now that we already have accomplished so much? Are we like the poor little rich boy—all dressed up and no place to go?

To some our goal is a simple one: we're rich, let's get richer.

We hear of three cars to a family, instead of two; of installment credit plans for teenagers; of 4-day workweeks and 3 days a week for amusement and indolence.

Is this the true frontier? It is questionable whether three cars will save a family from divorce, or from spiritual emptiness, or from boredom.

It is doubtful that teenage charge accounts will solve our youngsters' problems of civilized behavior, sex orientation, respect for elders, or serious preparation for adult living.

And more time for pleasure seeking than we already have would scarcely give us a greater sense of worthwhileness, as individuals, or a greater feeling of the purposefulness of our lives.

Getting richer was yesterday's frontier.

We have stayed ahead in the past because we knew when to change direction, to break out into new territory. Once we had established democracy, we didn't simply loll in it while a rival nation threatened to catch up or overtake us.

We expanded, opened new territories, built roads and cities. And when that was done, we didn't sit back either. We went on to produce goods, to create technological riches that have set the world agape.

CAN'T AFFORD TO STAND STILL

Are we going to stand still now, and let a boasting rival catch up and overtake us? Or will we move on to the new direction, the new step in our progress that will again be a trailblazer to the world?

So that when the rival does (if he does) catch up to our mechanical production of goods, we shall be far out ahead in fresh new territory—still on top and still climbing.

The new frontier is what logically follows the job of making a living (which we have done so well).

It is making a life.

This is the new territory which this series will attempt to explore: trying to find out how to live with all our products, our conveniences our mechanical servants; seeking the success of the inner man, now that we have furbished the outer man so repletely.

We shall search for new paths to family harmony, married harmony, relatedness to God and fellow humans, inner ease instead of tensions. Somewhere in that frontier territory is a sense of the meaning of life.

And out there, too, is morality, so long lost, and a purpose which includes us all.

Our work is cut out for us. No one need look down and say, "What a pity."

The Value of a Catholic Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 3, 1960, I had the privilege of attending a communion breakfast held by the Knights of Columbus, St. Luke's Chapter, at the St. Rita's Catholic Church. The organization sponsored an oratorical contest participated in by daughters of members of the Knights of Columbus. The two young women who were selected as having written and delivered the best speech on the value of a Catholic education delivered their speeches before an audience of 250 people. In addition, Thomas Nolan, district deputy, also delivered a message to the membership as did the very effective and convincing Grand Knight Anthony Caramele.

I was thrilled to hear the stirring words of the two outstanding young women who have captured the spirit of a Catholic education. Their words were forthright, simple, and carry a message which I feel should be spread throughout the Nation. The winners were Jean C. Cullinan of 1370 Virginia Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., a senior at St. Catherine's Academy, and Deborah Flathery of 2 Stuyvesant Avenue, New York City, a senior at Cathedral High School. The contest was held on March 17, 1960, at the Lady of Mount Carmel Church and the program was sponsored by Emmet Burke, State deputy of the New York State Council of the Knights of Columbus.

The speeches of Misses Cullinan and Flathery are as follows:

THE VALUE OF A CATHOLIC EDUCATION

(By Jean C. Cullinan)

Look carefully—there it stands majestic yet delicate. It casts an eerie shadow against the dusky sky. Slender and fragile are its branches, yet strong and firm are its roots. This is a tree.

How can we judge its value? For a moment we are at a loss for words. The significance of this organism, so tangible before our eyes, eludes our yardstick. Only by surveying its purpose, and estimating its effect upon others can we hope to assess the value of that tree. Its importance will be determined then, by the amount of beauty, security, and usefulness that it brings to a world firmly implanted in the barren soil of materialism.

Education also has that intangible quality which defies man to measure its value. Here likewise must we define the ideal.

Mr. Francis J. Sheed once described it thus: "Education fits a man for living. Man exists in a universe; man is; other things are. An educated man is one whose mind is responsive to all being—to all being—to everything that is.

It will be noted that in this paragraph the words all and everything have kept recurring. This is the very essence of education. You cannot fully know anything until you investigate everything. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, but an additional and grave danger is knowledge divorced from responsibility. To become acquainted with the whole and its concomitant responsibilities requires a Catholic education. In education where religion is not an incidental, noncredit course, but is the motivating center. This does not mean, and must not mean any destruction of the integrity of the natural sciences. It does not mean a substitution of piety for intelligence. It means a higher respect for scholarship, and a broader horizon than in institutions working within materialistic and naturalistic confines. It will recognize the significance of the natural but will see its completion in the supernatural. In the words of Dr. Edward Fitzpatrick, "The range of Cath-

olic education is the whole range of human life."

I see the men and women prepared by a Catholic education as a leaven for the great spiritual needs of our democracy—manifesting freedom of conscience and independent charity. I see them regarding public service as an inescapable and personal responsibility. I see them a working force for economic and social justice to replace social and economic injustice, wherever the poor or the rich are being exploited. I see a culture in which religion is the mother of the arts vivifying it, inspiring it, but also transcending it. I see a science with the wonder of God's universe still in its eyes, but deep and probing in seeking His truth. I see on the political, the social and the economic scene a force inspired by religion making a reality of the brotherhood of man.

It has been said that the absence of tree roots can cause a flood, while firmly planted ones can prevent it. So also can an insufficient education destroy a civilization as a thorough education can save it. Mr. Sheed has expressed the value of true education thus: "It is my opinion that a non-Catholic institution cannot give an education; it can give a magnificent mass of scholarship and rich mental training; but in the intellectual order there is one thing necessary—a comprehensive view of the totality of being; and this it cannot give."

Catholic education is heritage, a rich and cherished possession. It has given us the best fortification of the mind, a possession fundamental in human life, the truth. It has established our relationship to God, and our relationship to men, which is the first essential of an education.

THE VALUE OF A CATHOLIC EDUCATION

(By Deborah Flathery)

Spiritualize youth. Vitalize nations. A terrified world cries out to youth to save it from self-destruction. At a time when the threat of atomic war and possible annihilation dangles precipitously over the human race harried political leaders look to society's junior members for fresh new ideas to halt the impending crisis. Will youth take up the challenge? A survey of the lively youth forums held in this country and abroad would indicate that young people the world over are ready and willing to do what they can to bring about peace among nations. But good will is not enough to solve the problems of today's complex world. Young minds must be trained to clear, logical thinking, to ideas of freedom and happiness for all. Youth must be well-equipped intellectually before it can find practical solutions to current questions. Here in America the education of youth has always been a major concern as is illustrated in the opportunities offered to all by our public school system. A talented student may progress from nursery school through university free, with only a desire to learn and a will to work.

In our public schools young Americans are prepared physically and intellectually to take up their role as responsible adult citizens. But isn't something missing from this seemingly well-balanced curriculum? Youth needs more than physical and mental ability to meet its responsibilities. It must have a purpose in life to claim its energies. Here is where Catholic education steps in. It alone provides students with a truly well-rounded program, one which prepares them for a satisfying, fruitful life. A Catholic education begins and ends in God. It is geared to develop the mind that one may know Him and with the aid of this knowledge attain the final goal—union with God in Heaven. Secular education neglects the part of man that makes him a human being, a person—the soul. In the Catholic system the soul is the reason for education. Without a supernatural goal and an awareness of the dignity of each human being, of the soul in each person, youth cannot but slacken and lose courage and heart in the tremendous work and sacrifice necessary to bring about world peace. Here is the value of a Catholic education. Under divine protection and guidance it prepares today's youth to become complete persons, individuals who will assume responsibility with the zeal and ideals necessary for peace and justice among all men. Catholic education, then, has answered the call. It has truly spiritualized youth, and through them it will vitalize nations.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address by Senator Johnston of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to do so, the very excellent address delivered on April 9 by our esteemed colleague, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, when he was the orator at the flag raising and dedicatory exercises for the District of Columbia Home for Crippled Children, the organization before which he spoke on this occasion being the Woodmen of the World.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAG-RAISING AND DEDICATORY EXERCISES AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN, UNDER AUSPICES OF THE WOODMEN OF THE WORLD, CAMP NO. 4, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 9, 1960

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure for me to participate with you in these dedication ceremonies.

The cause being served by the Crippled Children's Society is worthy and needed. Possibly only here in free America are we permitted, without restriction or hindrance, to freely give and generously support organizations of the commendable character possessed by yours.

I have been a member of the Woodmen of the World longer than any other organization to which I have belonged in my entire life, except the church. I joined the Woodmen of the World in 1913 and even when I was a soldier in France I sent my dues back regularly. For nearly a half century I have been deeply interested in the excellent work which the Woodmen of the World have accomplished for the youth of our country. So it is a special pleasure for me to be here today speaking at this exercise dedicating this flagpole upon which will fly the flag of our Nation.

Our flag, the emblem of civil and religious liberty and freedom, well deserves to fly in honor and glory over our institutions dedicated to the service of worthy mankind.

Holy Writ teaches us, "Suffer little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for such is the kingdom of heaven."

The words of the Master imply physical fitness and mental development. We know that one's mental growth and full intellectual achievement may be retarded when handicapped by physical disabilities. To cure, mend, repair, and rehabilitate young children are to insure stronger, better, and more useful adults. The individual is served immensely by your efforts, assistance, and donations. The Nation is benefited by more useful and dedicated citizens.

You may recall the story of the visitor to a hospital for crippled children who, in talking to a little boy and trying to be considerate, asked, "Do you know many little boys and girls who are crippled?" The answer was, "I don't know any." That sort of spirit is the result of the work of organizations such as yours.

One of the happiest moments abroad is to enter our embassies or other American installations where we find Old Glory waving in the breeze. It gives you an uplift in spirit and thought. You have the same fulsome experience upon returning to America from abroad. There is always an indefinable feeling that fills your being. It was my good fortune and privilege to experience these feelings early in my young manhood as a member of our American Expeditionary Forces in France and Germany in World War I. The passage of the years has not lessened the feeling of joy or the spiritual uplift that comes to me on occasions like this. Last year Mrs. Johnston and I were on an official visit to Greece in connection with my duties as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The authorities at the hotel, upon learning of our official visit, placed an American flag outside our window. This simple demonstration made our visit more homelike and enjoyable.

The greatness of our country, its noble aims and purposes, the dedication of its people, all find a responsive chord in our hearts when we honor our flag at our meetings and on our buildings. Every civilized nation honors its flag. Every citizen of every nation is happy to honor its presence and welcome the meaning of its glories.

The flag abounds in our Nation's Capital over public and private buildings. This is natural. This is to be expected. It is a constant reminder to us of its significance. Our free institutions are honored by its ever-present flying. We who have followed it in time of war know its meaning. We who have been baptized by fire in battle have a deep reverence for what it stands. May she, to paraphrase the words of Nathan Hale, be always right, but right or wrong, I shall follow our flag.

The flag is a symbol of the principles for which it stands. It is our duty as Americans to see that these principles are right. They have made America strong. We must transmit them unimpaired to our children and they to their children.

There is abroad in our midst those who would degrade our flag, its meaning and the principles for which it stands. Against such subversion we must be on guard both day and night.

No other flag the world over has represented the dawn of individual liberty as has our flag. It bears no symbol of force, no fierce beast—just a simple banner that pictures the faith, aspirations, and history of freemen.

To Americans—and to freemen everywhere—our flag means honor, honesty, integrity, and faith in the divine power; it represents our homes, schools, churches; it symbolizes a heritage that is ours to cherish and maintain from generation to generation; it stands for the free enterprise system and the rights of the individual as the two basic principles of our economy.

May we always accept the flag in its fullness of meaning. It is our American history, it is our Constitution, it is our Republic. Let it be our prayer and struggle that we never forget the history and tradition which have made our flag the symbol of the highest form of government ever devised by man; and may we always be proud to call ourselves a part of those valiant patriots from Valley Forge through Heartbreak Ridge who were willing to make the supreme sacrifice for the flag of the United States.

Such is the nature of our flag. Such are the obligations to it. Let it ever fly over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Summit and the Captive Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, from this day on till the middle of next month, there will be increasing public discussion concerning the summit meeting in Paris. The Foreign Ministers meeting in Washington is just the first of a series of official presummit talks. But it has, nevertheless, stimulated a good deal of discussion in the press and elsewhere. This initial meeting has also occasioned the presentation of thoughts and ideas by our private citizen organizations, which cannot but serve a good purpose in estimating how many sections of American society think about the summit, its agenda, aims and significance.

One interesting memorandum which was recently submitted to the Secretary of State contains certain perspectives and views that merit the attention of every American concerned with the global struggle between the forces of freedom and those of slavery. Prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky in behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, this memorandum emphasizes the need for a united Western initiative at the forthcoming summit and concretely proposes the courses of action to express this virile initiative. One such course involves the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The proposal that is made on this subject can in no way be construed by Moscow as "interference in the internal affairs of another state."

Because of its provocative intellectual nature I request that this memorandum be printed in the RECORD:

APRIL 10, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On the eve of the presummit Foreign Ministers meeting in Washington, this national committee wishes to take the opportunity to express certain

observations and ideas which it believes deserve consideration in the formulation of an agenda for the summit conference of May 16. Many of these views are spiritedly shared by millions of Americans of this and numerous other national organizations, and with them, we earnestly hope that our Government will advance these views for the attainment of the strongest prepared position at the summit.

The points enumerated below are, of course, founded on a knowledge and understanding of the Russian imperialist menace which has been elaborated by us in numberless memoranda submitted to the administration for the past 7 years. However, developments of the past 2 years, highlighted by sputniks and other basically diversionary Russian performances, cannot but cause us to recall here the apt words of Karl Marx—words which still are unquotable in Khrushchev's supposedly relaxed empire:

"They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

This, to be sure, is a strong statement and, in part, exaggerated. But when one contemplates the paramount fact that, in this past century, of all the major colonial empires the Russian one was not only able to survive but also, behind the legalistic mask of the U.S.S.R., now even threatens the security of the free world, the aptness of this statement could scarcely be denied. It is most significant that this observation was made during the reign of Czar Nicholas I with whom Khrushchev now openly compares himself, as witness his address in Budapest last December.

Our views are based on the firm knowledge that the cold war techniques of Khrushchev are essentially those of Nicholas I and his other totalitarian predecessors. Nuclear blackmail threats of an East German treaty, exercises in Potemkin Village economics, and many other diplomatic strategems have their substantial precedents in the arsenal of imperial Russian diplomacy. This arsenal served to build an unprecedented empire which the Red czars have conserved and extended.

The very occurrence of a summit at this time symbolizes a victory for the pressuring propaganda and diplomacy staged by Moscow these past 2 years. The peace-at-no-price attitude shown by Moscow toward the summit indicates in itself the manner by which it seeks to exploit this given opportunity. Its propaganda machine has even gone to the length of attempting to compromise the position of Western Germany by unjust attacks upon Theodore Oberlaender, the Refugee Minister of our ally, in whose defense scores of witnesses in this country could be supplied by this committee. With no real loss to itself, it would not at all surprise us to witness 2 days before the summit a spectacular move by Moscow to dissolve its Warsaw Pact. Its carefully calculated game of bluff and bluster has reaped for it another summit: Moscow's objective now is to exploit it fully.

In urging your consideration of the following points, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the irony of the current situation lies in the overall fact that Moscow is able to advance diplomatically and propagandawise although it is really operating from basic weaknesses and multiformed necessity. Our memories are short. All evidence shows that at the time of the Hungarian Revolution the Russian Communist empire was pitched on the edge of a precipice. It has always been the rational belief of this committee that had we been prepared for this glorious opportunity and acted with skill and adroitness—and without committing our own troops—the area of freedom would have been much greater today. Needless to say, the passage of 4 years has not erased the inherent weaknesses in the structure of this far-flung empire. Out of necessity and for time to consolidate, Moscow is pressing for Western accommodation under the spurious label of "peaceful coexistence," along with the hope that its calculated propaganda of bluff and bluster would twist any degree of Western timidity into real concessions.

Unleashing Marx at Khrushchev, our thoughts and actions, should therefore, be dominated by the guiding dictum: "There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." We earnestly hope that this confident spirit will permeate the present Foreign Ministers meeting and, as a result, that the agenda of the summit would embrace points of leadership which may throughout the world be respectfully viewed as bold, imaginative, and reassuring. The following points, we believe, truly evince this spirit:

(1) The captive nations: Khrushchev's overriding objective is Western assent and acquiescence to his empire. In this, his role is identical with that of Nicholas I. His emphasis upon disarmament and other subsidiary issues seeks to deflect Western attention from this basic subject. Even the omission of this subject will be propagandistically exploited in the empire to mislead the captives that the free world's interest in them has waned.

We strongly urge that our Government seize every opportunity to insist upon this crucial subject as a major point of summit discussion. Failure to do so would be, in effect, an accommodation of Moscow's empire and a victory for Khrushchev, far surpassing what any army could achieve. We would be bolstering the security of the Russian colonial system and undermining one of our most powerful deterrents against Russian aggression and a hot war, namely, the captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and central Asia. The very implication of an assent to the status quo would make mockery of the Captive Nations Week resolution passed by the Congress and proclaimed by the President last year. In terms of bargaining position, the captive nations (not only just the minority captive nations in central Europe but also the majority captive nations in the U.S.S.R. and Asia) are of enormous value to the security of the free world. Any rationalization to the effect that this vital subject might be discussed later in a series of summits would not preclude the above effects.

(2) The cold war: As a corollary to the above objective, Khrushchev's additional aim is the curtailment of free world propaganda directed at his empire and also the Russian people. He might attempt what his colonial puppets have striven for years to do with their Draft Code of Offenses in the United Nations. A recent British reiteration of this idea under the cloak of a code of peaceful coexistence may be utilized by Moscow to propagandize at and after the summit for a cold war cessation.

This committee harbors no illusion about the possibility of ending the cold war. With its grounded, long-run perspective on traditional Russian imperialism, it empirically views the cold war phenomenon as an indispensable coefficient of the Russian Communist Empire. In short, a real and complete cessation of the cold war would spell the demise of the empire itself. Nevertheless, Moscow's pressure along this line should be met positively rather than negatively. We therefore urge the proposal of the idea of putting an end to the cold war, but with a rapid implementation to the extent of Moscow's dissolving its Communist parties in the free world and with a reserved intention to expand our propaganda, particularly as concerns the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., should Moscow balk at our wholesale plan. The behavior and utterances of Khrushchev and his minions in the period of the spirit of Camp David are usable evidence for such a proposal.

(3) West Berlin: Khrushchev's efforts at empire consolidation necessarily aim at the elimination of this island of freedom. As stressed in our previous memoranda to you, both historically and analytically, the Berlin issue is an integral part of the larger problem of German reunification, which in turn is inseparable from the composite problem of all the captive nations. Moscow rightly sees it this way: We must view it in the same integralistic manner.

We thus urge a firm stand on West Berlin with flexible points of offense: namely, (a) a plebiscite under U.N. guarantees for the people of all of Berlin; (b) a subsequent generalized plebiscite for all Germans under similar guarantees to determine the government of their choice; and (c) the holding of free elections in a reunited Germany. To bargain for a free West Berlin by making concessions on nuclear test bans is not only shortsighted but also dilatory and timid. It represents the species of purchasing peace at a price to us.

(4) Disarmament: This issue is in essence a superficial one. It is usable for Moscow as a diversionary technique. Only to a minor extent is Moscow's stress on it attributable to the necessities of empire control and consolidation. As a deflector from the real, fundamental issues, it has served Moscow's purposes well, as note the spread of the coexistence or codestruction neurosis.

In the judgment of this committee, to raise the so-called disarmament problem as the chief subject of summit discussion is to play Moscow's tune and to obfuscate further the basic issues of our time. As a subject of relative secondary importance, it should be treated with subsidiary report and for comparative propaganda advantage which, indeed, primarily motivates Moscow's maneuvers in this nebulous area. Against the mountainous record of broken Russian treaties for the past 40 years, a disarmament or nuclear ban treaty with Moscow would almost signify a trained neglect of historical experience.

(5) Disengagement in Europe: As pointed out in our memorandum to Secretary Dulles on December 10, 1958, the disengagement thesis is fraught with prodigious risks for the free world in the terms that it is usually presented. We urge again that this proposal be met squarely on the basis of comparability and geographic depth. Thus to parallel a neutralized free Germany, the inclusion of Ukraine would be a necessity for fair agreement on this subject.

(6) Diplomatic relations with non Russian republics in U.S.S.R.: It is often said that we are short on ideas for a diplomatic offensive. One idea that deserves every serious consideration is the creation of diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia, both charter members of the U.N. As an exploratory step, this idea merits Western consideration in the interest of forming bonds of peaceful relations between nations. Although, as Pope Pius XII soundly taught, we are faced with a "mirage of coexistence," this step cannot but produce long-run effects favorable to free world interests.

(7) Red China's admission to the U.N.: An additional mirage is the supposedly growing cleavage between mainland China and Moscow, as though they were entering into a mutual suicide pact. This apparition is the basis in the minds of some for recognizing and admitting Red China to the U.N. Moscow's shipment of close to $1 billion of industrial equipment to this captive area and the preparation of it for admission to the

nuclear club scarcely support such wishful thinking. In behalf of our Asian allies and our own principles, the position of our Government in this matter must be sustained at all costs. On careful analysis the dispersion of nuclear weapons is a far greater threat for Moscow than for us.

(8) The mythical Soviet monolith: It is also fervently hoped that in the summit talks every indication is given of our understanding of the uneasy multinational structure of the Soviet Union. Myths, such as "the Soviet people," "the Soviet Nation," and "the Soviets," hardly bespeak the power of understanding which can draw the respectful attention of even the Russian colonialists. Our evidence of this understanding can, more than anything else, freeze Khrushchev's play for Asian and African influence on matters of national independence and colonialism.

Only by sustained principles can our tactics remain maximally flexible. Along with countless other Americans, Mr. Secretary, we earnestly hope that for what may seem as short-run advantages of accommodation to the Russian Communist empire, we do not compromise on those principles enshrined in our own Declaration of Independence—principles which continue to make our Nation the unique vehicle of a living revolution and mankind's great experiment in freedom.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for our stand of firm conviction and fearlessness at the summit, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, under the present maritime law, west coast shipbuilders are allowed a 6-percent differential in the construction of all ships having a home base on the west coast.

Basically, this means that on a $10 million ship west coast shipbuilders have a $600,000 cushion before they even have to start being competitive with east coast, gulf coast and Great Lakes shipbuilders. This legislative favoritism, when it was enacted in 1936, was justified on the basis that this Nation needed shipbuilding facilities to support a two-ocean Navy and merchant marine.

At that time the west coast had no steel factories and component parts of vessels had to be shipped across the country so builders there were given the cushion to cover those extra costs.

There probably was justification then, but there is none now. The west coast now has shipbuilding facilities comparable to any area of the United States, and to allow this legislation to remain on the books is most prejudicial to the shipbuilding industries in other parts of our Nation.

Several bills have been introduced in this Congress to eliminate this differential, and testimony is now being heard by a subcommitee of the Commitee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Last Tuesday, Mr. William E. Blewett, Jr., President of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., appeared before this subcommittee with documents and exhibits. He explained this unfair situation with such clarity and forcefulness that I have asked permission that his statement be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that our colleagues from other sections of the country will have the opportunity of obtaining a better understanding of the serious issue involved:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM E. BLEWETT, JR., BEFORE HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 8093 AND COMPANION BILLS

My name is William E. Blewett, Jr. I am president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va., and president of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association. I appear before your committee in support of H.R. 8093 and companion bills which would repeal section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. This section provides that under certain circumstances vessel construction contracts to which the Federal Maritime Board is a party must be awarded to a Pacific coast shipyard if its bid exceeds the lowest responsible bid of an Atlantic coast shipyard by up to 6 percent. The only bases for inclusion of this provision in the 1936 act when it was enacted were, first, shipbuilding on the Pacific coast was practically dormant in 1936 and, consequently, of no national defense value. Secondly, Pacific coast shipyards had to obtain all of the steel, machinery, and other component parts of vessels from the eastern part of the country and the overland freight rates on such material prevented the shipyards from submitting competitive bids.

We intend to show in the course of these hearings that conditions have completely changed since 1936 and that neither of these considerations obtains today. Our presentation is keyed to the following points, and exhibits will be offered to substantiate each point:

I. Today, a strong shipbuilding industry exists on the Pacific coast, consisting of almost as many active shipyards as there are on any other coast, available to meet national defense needs. Should this situation change, the Federal Maritime Board has ample remedial authority through allocation under section 502(f).

II. Today, steel, aluminum, copper, and component parts are produced on the Pacific coast area at competitive prices.

III. Even as to components produced and purchased in the East, the freight differential is no longer a significant factor of cost.

IV. Finally, we will demonstrate the 6-percent preference afforded to the Pacific coast shipyards destroys completely the integrity of competitive bidding and, if continued, will have an adverse effect on the entire shipbuilding potential of the United States by forcing shipyards on the other three coasts of the United States to cease bidding on Federal Maritime Board construction contracts to which the preference applies.

POINT I

There is no longer any national defense justification for the 6-percent preference in favor of the Pacific coast. During the hearings prior to the enactment of the 1936 act it was stressed that there had been no shipbuilding activity on the Pacific coast since the First World War. This is shown in the questioning of Alfred H. Haag, Chief, Division of Shipping Research, of the Shipping Board, in the hearings on March 20, 1935, on H.R. 7521.

"Mr. WELCH. Mr. Haag, in your answer to Judge Culkin's question as to the ability of American shipyards to construct merchant ships to meet any emergency, are you aware of the fact that not one vessel for either the foreign trade or intercoastal trade has been constructed on the Pacific coast since the war?

"Mr. HAAG. I knew of that condition.

"Mr. WELCH. And that shipbuilding for merchant ships has, in fact, become a lost art on the west coast?

"Mr. HAAG. I knew it had declined very much" (pp. 67–68).

The national defense requirement for a shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast was the strongest argument advanced by the Pacific coast Congressman advocating the preference in the same hearings:

"Mr. HAAG. From the standpoint of strategy, it would appear there should be some yards on the Pacific coast.

"Mr. WELCH. And the Government should do something to encourage those yards as a matter of national defense. But the Government up to this time has refused every appeal made from California, Oregon, and Washington for a revival of shipbuilding on the Pacific coast as a matter of the national defense.

"Mr. O'LEARY. Have you any large yards there now?

"Mr. WELCH. Perhaps there is one yard on the Pacific coast where a vessel of magnitude or size or importance could be built, and even in that yard they would have to build ways at a cost of half a million dollars. In case of emergency tomorrow, there is not a shipyard from San Diego to Puget Sound which could lay a keel for an offshore vessel" (p. 68).

Exhibit No. 1, prepared from the American Bureau of Shipping Record, shows clearly that the national defense objective has been achieved. In 1936 there were only 3 shipyards on the Pacific coast, while today there are 7 yards with 29 ways. There has not been anything like a comparable increase in the shipbuilding capacity of the other three coastal areas. In fact, as you will note, on the east coast while the yards have increased from 8 to 9, there has been a decrease in ways to 49 active ways in 1959.

The same is true as to the actual FMB ship construction in the shipyards of the country today. Exhibit 2 reveals that there is presently under construction in the Pacific coast yards about 36.5 percent of the board's vessel construction work, although the Pacific coast is only one of four coastal areas of the United States. This striking fact alone shows the lack of need for the 6-percent preference. Exhibit No. 3 illustrates the situation even more graphically by showing the amount of the work on the Pacific coast as compared to the work in the yards on each of the other three coasts.

From these exhibits there can be no doubt that the shipyards on the Pacific coast are actively in operation today as compared to 1936 when there was practically no activity. Furthermore, these active yards on the Pacific coast afford a base which can be expanded to fully meet national defense needs of the United States. We all know that the reserve yards on the Pacific coast can be quickly reactivated in the event of an emergency and that additional ways can be constructed in the existing yards almost immediately. The ability and skill of the Pacific coast shipbuilding industry to rise to the occasion and meet national defense needs is illustrated by Exhibit 4 which shows the comparison of the vessel tonnage constructed in the Pacific coast yards and in the other yards of the United States during both of the world wars. I call your attention to the fact that while there was practically no shipbuilding on the Pacific coast in 1936, the industry was able to expand to the extent that in World War II over 44 percent of the war-built vessels were constructed in Pacific coast yards. Even more impressive is the fact shown in Exhibit 5 that the Pacific coast yards produced liberty-type vessels at a lower cost than the yards in any other area. On the basis of this record

of ability to expand and productive capacity at competitive cost, it cannot be validly argued today that the Pacific coast shipbuilding industry needs any preference in bidding or other artificial incentives to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

POINTS II AND III

In 1936 there was no steel produced west of the Rocky Mountains. Today, over 9 percent of the ingot ton capacity of the United States is located west of the Rockies. Significantly, the percentage of the overall steel production in the United States which is used in shipbuilding (both Navy and commercial) and marine equipment is only 1.4 percent of total production. Therefore, it is clear that while the west coast had no steel production in 1936, it is capable today of producing all of the steel required for shipbuilding in the entire United States. The same situation exists with respect to other materials and component parts used for shipbuilding. Exhibit No. 6 shows the tremendous overall growth in manufacturing activities on the west coast since 1939. In 1936 the Pacific coast area was primarily an agricultural, forestry, and mining economy. During the intervening years its population growth and industrial development has been far out of proportion to the rest of the country. It is my understanding that as of March 1, 1959, the State of California alone has about 26 percent of all Federal Government military prime contracts, although it is only 1 of 50 States.

In 1936 virtually all component parts necessary for vessel construction were produced in the eastern part of the country and transported to the Pacific coast. Today, not only are a large proportion of such conponents produced and delivered on the west coast at competitive prices, but they are actually purchased from Pacific coast suppliers by shipyards in the eastern part of the country at prices lower than quoted by local suppliers. This dramatic change in the flow of materials is illustrated by exhibit No. 7, which has been prepared from actual purchases made by shipyards on the Atlantic and gulf coasts and the Great Lakes.

Finally, even as to materials purchased by Pacific coast yards in the eastern part of the United States, the freight rate differential is no longer significant. Exhibit No. 8 contains copies of letters from General Electric and Westinghouse, major suppliers of turbines, gears, machinery, and electrical apparatus which are used in vessel construction, which show that the delivered price to all yards furnished by these two companies is the same regardless of point of destination in the United States. Further, Westinghouse has established a turbine plant at Sunnyvale, Calif., and when shipyards in the eastern part of the United States place an order for propulsion machinery, this equipment may be delivered from any of the Westinghouse plants, including Sunnyvale. Exhibit No. 9 is made up of excerpts from salesbooklets of other suppliers which show that freight absorption is a common practice among suppliers. To demonstrate the change in the freight rate differential situation, we have prepared exhibit No. 10 which shows the disadvantage the Pacific coast yards suffered in the delivered cost of steel in 1936, but shows that today, because of the steel production in the Pacific coast area, the differential has been reduced to an insignificant percentage. As steel represents about 10 percent of the material cost of a cargo vesesl, the 1.2 percent freight disadvantage on steel which the Pacific coast may have becomes a disadvantage of less than two-tenths of 1 percent with respect to the aggregate material cost, and less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the cost of the vessel.

Finally, to indicate the full impact of the elimination of all of the disabilities to which the Pacific coast yards were subject in 1936, exhibit No. 11 shows that, taking a vessel of the type now being constructed under the FMB program and breaking down the vessel into the major component parts, the materials which go into the construction of the vessel can be obtained on an overall basis as cheaply by the Pacific coast yards as by yards in the eastern part of the country. The insignificant difference in the delivered cost of steel and boilers which is paid by the Pacific coast yards is balanced out by the difference in their favor in the delivered prices of deck machinery, steering gear, and lumber. This demonstrates that the Pacific coast shipyards no longer labor under any disadvantage and should therefore enjoy no preference in competitive bidding.

POINT IV

The effect which the 6-percent preference has had upon the competitive bidding and which it will continue to have if retained in the law will be more completely covered by other witnesses from other shipbuilders. However, I would like to point out that as a result of the inequitable situation faced by Newport News in the award of the American Mail Line contract to a Pacific coast shipyard, it was necessary for us to give very serious consideration as to whether Newport News would respond to the invitations of the two other Pacific coast operators which were issued after the American Mail Line award.

Advice of Political Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a great source of amusement for the practicing politician at this time of each election year is to review the almost daily presentations of the "smoke filled typewriters," or, to put it another way, the political advice of those whose association with practical, down-to-earth politics is practically nonexistent. The smoke-filled room used to be considered the source of political strategy, but now the columnist is the one who advises the candidates as to the position they should take. The most startling of these efforts is the general one of advising Republicans to be something other than a Republican, a position which I can assure those seers has resulted in disaster whenever tried. A columnist with political understanding writes for the San Fernando Valley Times, and this man, George Todt, has so well pointed out some of the errors of the advisers that I ask unanimous consent that this particular column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—NO NEW DEAL TAKEOVER FOR NIXON

"Superiority is always detested"—Baltasar Gracian.

I am always amused, in a wry sort of way, whenever New Deal Democrats in the Nation's communications media become mentors for the Republicans—and graciously show them how to "win" the next election.

A case in point is Walter Lippmann, the New York Herald-Tribune, who—unless I miss my guess—is about to become the self-appointed campaign director for Richard Nixon.

At least I gained that impression from one of Lippmann's latest expressions. He suggested that all the Vice President needs now is a half nelson on Rockefellerism. He put it like this:

"Mr. NIXON's problem is to decide how far he can move into the Rockefeller-Democratic field in order to make up for the fact that the Republicans are a minority party. This is not an easy problem for Mr. NIXON to solve. To begin with, professional politicians who control the leading Republican organizations in the States were powerful enough to force Rockefeller to withdraw. They are not going to allow NIXON to adopt many of Rockefeller's ideas."

This bears some analysis. First, Rocky didn't withdraw at the order of GOP professionals—he simply failed to generate enough enthusiasm among grassroots voters for his synthetic Republicanism to justify the waste of his time and energy in 1960. Being a smart businessman, he picked up his marbles and pulled out before any damage was done him by unnecessary defeats.

And, frankly, Mr. NIXON appears already to have been adopting some of Governor Rockefeller's ideas—which may account for the fact that his popularity is beginning to dip.

The most fallacious reasoning is bound up in the implication that the Vice President has to move into the Rockefeller-Democratic field to keep his presidential hopes alive. One does not need to be a hoary septuagenarian to recall the fiascos of Republican "me-tooism" employed by Wendell Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

It was not until the Eisenhower campaigns of 1952 and 1956 that the GOP had a presidential candidate who punished the New Deal philosophy by a frontal attack—and he won going away.

Yet Lippmann today calls the "Eisenhower philosophy" old-fashioned, out of date. He suggests NIXON come up now with some new ideas. What are they? Why, a return to New Deal concepts of course. This could win an election for the Republican Party?

I do not think so and, while we are at it, let's explode another myth here. It is true that the Republicans are numerically inferior to the Democrats—mainly because of the Solid South, where there is no strong two-party system.

In presidential elections, the Democrats have been coming up with roughly 27 million votes each time since 1940. The GOP has ranged from 22 to 33 million in the same period. With "me-too" candidates it has been closer to the smaller figure. But General Eisenhower, who spoke out against New Deal philosophy in his 1952 and 1956 campaigning, won with pluralities of 7 and 9 millions.

This history indicates how far Mr. Lippmann is off-course. Republicans success undoubtedly is closely related to ability to stir millions of stay-at-home independents to go to the polls. These may be of, either Democrat or GOP complexion. But the point is that a bigger-than-usual turnout is vital.

The "me-too" Republicans of the past—and probably Rockefeller at the present time—have demonstrated conclusively that they cannot appeal sufficiently to the "great unconvinced" among the grassroots voters to accomplish this objective. How explain away that fact?

How Forest Conservation Benefits My Community—Prize-Winning Essay by Mary Cecilia Bacon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a prize-winning essay entitled "How Forest Conservation Benefits My Community." The essay was written by Miss Mary Cecilia Bacon, of Hickman, Ky.; and it was with this essay that Miss Bacon won the county soil conservation essay competition. The essay written by this talented young lady was published in the Hickman (Ky.) Courier of January 7, 1960.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION ESSAY WINNER—HOW FOREST CONSERVATION BENEFITS MY COMMUNITY

(By Mary Cecilia Bacon)

To me, a forest is one of the most beautiful and magnificent creations in the world. It reminds me of a stately row of kings ruling the world and dominating the scenery. Forests are not made up of trees alone; some have lakes, small ponds, flowering plants and wildlife. There are several famous forests in the world such as the Black Forest in Germany, the Sherwood Forest in England, and the Redwood Forest in California. Besides adding to the color and beauty of the countryside, they are useful and beneficial to man.

Wood, one of the chief products of my community, is used to build houses, furniture, and other implements which are most essential for living purposes. After going through many processes, wood is made into various forms of paper, which is a necessary article for school students as well as for the printing of newspapers and books. Wood is also made into cardboard boxes and crates in which are shipped many of our Nation's products which we buy daily. Many of the clothes we wear are made from a material called rayon which comes from wood pulp. Indirectly, forests help give us our food supply. They protect the important elements in the soil and help save the water.

These are some of the essential benefits, but they are really secondary since my community is a farming community.

The roots of trees help to keep the soil from eroding and their leaves help to save the water supply along with the aid of watersheds. The leaves form sort of a cover which breaks the pressure of the rainfall and makes it fall softly on the ground. Then it can be absorbed slowly, and emptied into the underground springs and streams. The water from these streams is distributed widely in the soil; consequently contributing to the value of the soil. The denseness of the plants and young trees of the forest catch and hold the melting snow and water from the mountains and uplands. This action helps in preventing the floods that would ordinarily occur if the water flowed directly onto the soil.

Naturally, there are some tracts of land which will not provide the richness or necessary elements for good crops. These tracts can be made useful by planting trees and nurturing them into woodlands or forests. They can be valuable for many years if the owner leaves the undergrowth and young trees which will eventually mature. The owner can sell the full grown trees for lumber and earn good money while making proper use of his land.

Our forests provide the best homes for our wildlife. Shelter, protection, and an abundance of food are there for the rest of their lives. Rare species of fish, for instance, can live in the cool streams of the woodlands and small animals can survive in the sheltered area of the forest.

We can protect our forests by keeping alert and concerned about their importance. Fire is the greatest destroyer of forestry. It is not ignited by itself, but usually by human beings. We should try to prevent these fires by obeying the rules of "Smoky" the bear. Matches should be put out entirely and broken in two. The sparks from cigarettes, pipes, and cigars should be extinguished before throwing them away. After a campfire has been built, it should be watched carefully and when it is put out it should be soaked with water or dirt. When burning brush is spotted, it should be reported to the forest ranger of firewarden.

Fire can lay waste an entire forest, burning young trees and old. It can also destroy the life of a forest by burning the surface of its floor. In this way the young seedlings, the future of the forest, are killed. Forest fires have always been a menace to our community, private homes and human lives.

Insects are responsible for a sizable part of the losses of our forests. Some eat on the foliage of the trees; others work their way into the trunk and do their damage. The forest can be preserved if the injured trees are removed or sprayed with insecticides. This can be done by the use of airplanes.

Another enemy of the forest is disease which kills numerous trees, reduces their growth, or destroys their heartwood. By protecting trees from injury and harvesting them before they are completely destroyed, we can increase their usefulness.

There are other enemies which are destructive but their damage is not as great or serious. Animals, for example, grazing in woodlands can injure the roots of trees and snap the young sprouts. The weather can also be an enemy when the soil of the forest is soft and is not strong enough to hold the roots. Winds can blow the young trees down; snow and sleet can overload tender branches and break them.

Be assured that the value, the necessity, and the importance of forest conservation cannot be overemphasized. As private citizens, we should be made conscious of our duties and obligations and preserve and protect our forests. Individually, we should assume our role with sincerity, loyalty, and a pround sense of national pride.

The Government has set aside some of the forests as national parks. It seems only natural that this should be done. Why? Could it be that she wishes to impress upon our minds the beauty, the majesty, the potentiality, the glory of Mr. Forest? I would like to think so.

Economic Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the trade journal Modern Packaging carried in its issue for April 1960, a significant statement by Alex M. Worth, Jr., president of the Shamrock Corp. of Greensboro, N.C. This statement contains some observations worthy of the attention of those of us who are concerned with the economic problems of small business. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aside from the many spectacular packaging developments of the past decade, one of the most significant developments has occurred within the industry itself: I refer to the unprecedented number of mergers or amalgamations. As president of a very small, successful company, I must state that this phenomenon causes us some uneasiness. Presently, we are not big enough to get swallowed up or perhaps even attract particular interest. Naturally, we want to grow, but I cannot help but wonder what the future holds if we do expand to the point where we would be more sharply brought to the attention of, and therefore of more importance to, some of the primary producers.

We recognize the invaluable contributions in new-product development and expansion afforded by large, diversified packaging corporations, integrated from top to bottom. Nevertheless, I am firmly convinced that if the industry is to continue to flourish, it is equally important for prime suppliers to recognize that the service requirements of the consuming markets are most adequately fulfilled by the small independent specialty converter of packaging materials.

This ingredient—service which is the main justification for the existence of small converters, is too important to be neglected and apparently it gains no benefit from bigness. We anticipate hopefully, during the next decade, a balancing trend which would give greater recognition to this fact. Toward this end, the contribution of the small converter would be considerably increased and the industry well served by the enactment of suggested legislation, permitting tax allowance for earnings, plowed back into the business.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was so large that my office was swamped for weeks with returned completed questionnaires and accompanying correspondence. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire, or attached supplementary letters. I have spent many hours personally reading all these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constitutents if he knows the views of his constituents on

important issues pending before Congress, than if he does not know them.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. The President has submitted a budget for fiscal year 1961 which contains an estimated surplus of $4.2 billion. Do you feel this surplus should be: (a) Applied to reduce the national debt, 64 percent; (b) applied to reduce taxes, 29 percent; (c) no opinion, 7 percent.

2. Do you feel Congress should pass a law to make illegal the rigging of television quiz shows? Yes, 58 percent; no, 31 percent; undecided, 11 percent.

3. There is now a surplus of over $3.4 billion in wheat stored by the Government under the present price support program. Would you favor legislation to lower wheat price supports in an effort to reduce such surplus production? Favor, 85 percent; oppose, 6 percent; undecided 9 percent.

4. Under present Federal law, there is no interest rate ceiling on Federal bonds of less than 5 years' duration, but there is a 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on bonds of more than 5 years' duration. President Eisenhower has recommended legislation to remove this 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term bonds. Do you favor or oppose the removal of this ceiling? Favor, 48 percent; oppose, 32 percent; undecided, 20 percent.

5. Would you favor legislation to authorize Federal registrars to be appointed to register voters for Federal elections where local registrars have discriminated upon the basis of race or color in registering voters? Yes, 64 percent; no, 24 percent; undecided, 12 percent.

6. A "national wilderness preservation bill" is pending which would require present wilderness areas in national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, and on public lands to be preserved from invasion or use by grazing, lumbering, mining, petroleum, and other commercial interests. Would you favor this bill? Favor, 77 percent; oppose, 14 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

7. The present Cuban Government has been seizing American-owned property in Cuba without any agreement for compensation to the owners. In view of this fact, do you feel that Congress should modify our Sugar Act to reduce our yearly commitment to import Cuban sugar at prices above world prices? Yes, 80 percent; no, 10 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

8. The present law allows the recipient of a social security pension to earn up to $1,200 per year before being disqualified from receiving the pension. Would you favor an increase in this exemption to $1,800? Yes, 88 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

9. Would you favor legislation to establish more stringent safeguards against the sending of obscene literature through the mails? Yes, 82 percent; no, 11 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

10. Would you favor legislation to require a secret ballot vote by union members before a strike is called by the union? Yes, 91 percent; no, 5 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

Answers from union members: Yes, 90 percent; no, 7 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

Answers from nonunion members: Yes, 92 percent; no, 4 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

11. Would you favor the elimination of all deductions under the Federal income tax laws (such as charitable, medical, and tax deductions), and establishing lower income tax rates which, because of the elimination of deductions, would raise the same amount of revenue? Yes, 37 percent; no, 48 percent; undecided, 15 percent.

The Ethics of Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the Indianapolis Times. In my opinion it is a straightforward statement of a problem that has caused me more worry than any other part of this job of being a Congressman.

As this editorial points out a Congressman does have considerable influence over any Bureau or any Department. We have the right to take to the floor and blast away at their policies; we can appear before different investigating committees to give a Bureau further trouble; and lastly we can try to cut off their money when appropriations are being considered. There is no question that an active and aggressive Congressman can and does have an influence on any agency of this Government.

The other side of the picture is that all of us are constantly receiving requests from our congressional districts for help in one Bureau or another. Frankly this was a matter of great concern to me when I was elected to the Congress. I made up my mind that I could cheerfully accept any criticism of my voting record or my statements on national affairs. This type of criticism can wound the vanity a bit, but it breaks no bones and leaves no permanent scars. It also offers the advantage of supplying a critical body of information and opinion on new projects and new ideas that have never been tested.

The one type of criticism that I do not want to take is criticism aimed at my personal misuse of a great office in the United States. At first I attempted to judge practically every request, but my administrative assistant, Mrs. Esther Pillen, who has had years of experience on the Hill, pointed out that I was elected not to judge but to legislate and to represent the people in my district. She also pointed out that it was the duty of the executive agencies to judge requests, and further that if I did not represent my people in requests, no one else would. I believe that she is about 95 percent correct, but I fretted that in the avalanche of requests we processed there might be a possible misuse of any power this office might possess.

To offset this 5-percent chance I have tried a few devices that I brought with me from private life. I decided literally to run my office in a goldfish bowl. In Indianapolis I have a one-room office, and the door is wide open. In Washington I have a two-room office with all doors wide open. This idea of working out in the open with absolutely no privacy is an idea that I brought back from newspaper city rooms and from the banking business.

Secondly, I publish each week every engagement for the coming week and send it to every news medium in my congressional district. I will see anyone about any problem, but it is right out in the open.

I see no other way to resolve this conflict-of-interest problem. The people of my district do have problems. They do need help, and part of my job is to help them. On the other hand there is no doubt that as a Member of Congress I do have more influence with Government bureaus and agencies than the average private citizen. The only practical way that I can see to do the public's business and still not abuse the powers of this office is to work in a fish bowl. As this editorial points out "If there is nothing wrong with helping a constituent, there is nothing wrong with having it known."

THE ETHICS OF INFLUENCE

Congress is wrestling once again with the morals, good tastes, and restraints for people who deal with the so-called regulatory agencies of the Government—those giant bureaucracies which license, prescribe, and otherwise rule much of our business world.

Laws have been proposed which, in essence, would prohibit any kind of backdoor influence, intended or inferred.

For instance, if a Congressman, say, should telephone the Federal Communications Commission in behalf of a constituent TV station, his call would be included in the official record of the case, even if he merely asked a question.

The idea is that if everything anybody did or said, officially or otherwise, were written down for all to see there would be a much less sinister influence brought to bear on these agencies. (Recent investigations indicate there has been plenty.)

Congressional investigators, the Attorney General, and the American Bar Association all have been talking about laws of this type.

However, Congressmen are the leading practitioners in this field. Their offices constantly are asking, pressuring or nagging these agencies about the affairs of their constituents.

It is a fact that the average bureaucrat will bust a gusset for a Congressman.

By a mere query, however innocent, a Congressman often can influence a bureaucratic action.

The on-the-record curbs now proposed would tend to protect a Congressman from any such implication, if he didn't mean it. If he did mean to influence an agency action, he ought to be willing to stand back of it.

If there is nothing wrong with helping a constituent, there is nothing wrong with having it known.

Republican Aid-for-Aged Plan Is Poor Substitute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there has been much talk recently on care for

the aged. The administration has various points of view on what type of programs we should have to assist our elderly citizens in taking care of their medical needs.

While the administration has not, to date, come forward with a plan, several Republican Senators have introduced a medical care plan which would not be self-financing but would be subsidized by Federal and State Governments. There are rumors that this plan may be adopted by Vice President NIXON and the administration.

The Evansville Press recently discussed this plan in an excellent editorial entitled "Republican Aid-for-Aged Plan Is Poor Substitute."

Mr. President, I deplore the fact that our elderly citizens must be kicked around as a political football. I believe a plan is good or bad because of its substance not because of its sponsorship, whether it be by Democrats or Republicans.

If this plan is being offered solely because the Republican Party is distressed at the appeal of the Forand bill because it is sponsored by a Democratic Congressman, as suggested in the editorial, then our elderly people have every reason to feel indignant.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Evansville Press of April 10, 1960, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET BUSTER—REPUBLICAN AID-FOR-AGED PLAN IS POOR SUBSTITUTE

Budget-balancing Republicans have come up with a real budget buster as their answer to the Forand bill to provide hospitalization for the aged.

The Forand bill proposes self-financing, at least in theory. It would require a hike in social security payroll deductions, setting up a fund to pay hospital and nursing home bills of those over 65.

The new plan, put forward by a group of Republicans, in contrast, would be pure handout. The elderly would buy hospital insurance from private companies at a sliding scale of rates, depending on income. These fees, apparently, would pay about a fourth of the cost. Federal and State governments would pay the rest out of general revenues. This annual subsidy would amount to around $480 million for the Federal Government, $640 million for the States.

The Republican group is said to be distressed at the political appeal of the Forand bill, which largely bears a Democratic trademark. The Republicans think it is incumbent on their party to present a positive program as substitute.

We think they ought to try again.

Government by the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House and revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a letter of April 5, 1960, to me from Mr. Ernest A. Tupper, manager of Government relations department of the American Can Co., of 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

This letter speaks for itself but, Mr. Speaker, I am also including an address by one of the ablest men I have ever met, Mr. William K. Stolk, president of the American Can Co. He made this address before the Association of the Reserve City Bankers at far away Phoenix, Ariz., on April 5, 1960, and the title is "Government by the People."

I have read every word of this great address this Sunday morning when I am dictating this little observation, and I have never read a greater speech. I hope, and truly hope, that every Member in the Congress of the United States, who represent every human being in this Nation, will read this great speech. There was a lot of time and a lot of thought put in this wonderful talk that was made by my good friend, William C. Stolk, the president of this great corporation that has spent over $100 million down in the First District of Alabama at Naheola, Choctaw County, Ala., on the Tombigbee River.

Well, I was there with William Stolk and his directors when we dedicated this plant. I wish every man, woman, and child in Alabama and everywhere else could see what they are doing and what they are making and what they are building. In many instances, they are making practically the finest articles that can be used on this earth out of what we used to consider waste woods. Well, it is a beautiful sight, while we were there in their wonderful office overlooking the great Tombigbee River, that we are developing, Mr. Stolk and his directors and his managers and people there, announced that they would have a new expansion program of another $20 million.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of money anywhere, but especially down in our beautiful Choctaw County, where we used to have the Choctaw Indians there. Well, now, we have the finest people there on earth. He is using the homefolks. They not only come from Choctaw County, but Marengo County, and many other counties, and reach on over to beautiful Meridian, Miss. Many, many of the men and the women that work there live in Butler, Ala., the county seat of Choctaw County; and another county seat just across the river is Linden, Ala. Hundreds of the people live there—the people that work for the American Can Co. at Naheola, Ala.

Well, it is making that country blossom like a rose; it is bringing health, wealth, and happiness to our people there, and they are getting the help and the cooperation from men and women from every walk of life. The Governor, the Senators, and all of us there were represented when these men came from far away what was then known as the Marathon Co. to cast their lot with us, and they were joined a little later by the great American Can Co.

It's a beautiful sight; it's like going in partnership with God and building and building and building, and all of the people are so happy and they are working together so well. They have their own wonderful railroad that runs from Meridian, Miss., right to this beautiful mill the American Can Co. has there at Naheola, and then on across the river, where they have so much beautiful timber and land. As I have said, they have spent over $100 million with us there in Naheola, Choctaw County, Ala., and Linden, Marengo County, Ala., and it is appreciated, and we are helping in every way we know how.

In just talking to Gov. John Patterson and a group of his men that were here working to get money to build roads, not only to this great plant but many others, they told us how much they appreciated what these fine folks from so far away had done by casting their lot with us there in Alabama.

It was a great day when we dedicated these beautiful buildings there and it will be a great day when we dedicate that expansion of $20 million. All of our people are so happy to have these wonderful men and fine women, not only from New York, but Wisconsin, Ohio, and from all over this Nation, there helping us develop our wonderful resources there on the Tombigbee River, that we hope will soon be developed, and where we will have a direct route from Sioux City, Iowa, right on down through Cairo, Ill., and on down through the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers and right on to the Tombigbee that runs right by this beautiful mill at Naheola, Choctaw County, Ala.

I read this letter, as well as his speech, to the Alabama delegation, Senator LISTER HILL and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Congressman GEORGE GRANT and all of the Congressmen representing the great State of Alabama, and they feel as I do about these people and their work, and they asked me to tell them so, and of course I am telling them now, and I will send many of the men and women copies of this great speech that was made by one of our greatest men and the greatest industrialists we have in this Nation or anywhere else; and I am speaking, of course, of Mr. William C. Stolk, president of the American Can Co.

The letter and address follow:

AMERICAN CAN CO.,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1960.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOYKIN: You will be interested, I believe, in reading the enclosed speech delivered today by Mr. William C. Stolk, president of our company, at the annual meeting of the Reserve City Bankers Association in Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Stolk, as you will see from his speech, has an excellent appreciation of the staggering burden voters put on their friends and neighbors when they elect them to Congress.

Our public affairs program, discussed in this speech, is designed to help our employees get a better understanding of the problems of elected officials—the problems of the country—and thus of their own citizenship responsibilities.

To the extent that we and other companies with similar programs are successful, we are confident some of your problems and those of other elected officials, will be eased.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST A. TUPPER.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

(Address by William C. Stolk, president, American Can Co., before the Association of Reserve City Bankers, Phoenix, Ariz., April 5, 1960)

Ninety-seven years ago, on a bleak November day, Abraham Lincoln closed what he called his "little speech," the immortal Gettysburg Address, with these words: "That Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." Thus he charted the course for future generations of Americans to rededicate themselves to this concept. Today we can find solutions to the many serious problems confronting our Nation by restudying Lincoln's call for steadfast adherence to the democratic principles on which our Nation was founded. We cannot achieve government "by the people" unless the people themselves take an active interest in government and are sufficiently well informed to be able to demand good government from their elected representatives. A broader, deeper, and more fundamental approach to an informed citizenry is imperative and, in my opinion, the key to solving most of our national difficulties. This is the basis for the American Can Co.'s public affairs program.

To crystallize our thinking, let us examine one of the major problems confronting our country. International competition. I refer to this subject inasmuch as the company I represent is not directly affected by competition from overseas; this gives me an opportunity to look objectively at the problem and its possible solutions. It is significant that examination of this question cuts across our most pressing national problems. I am sure you are aware of most of them.

Prior to World War II, we Americans had developed uniqueness through the management philosophy of striving for constructive change through planned obsolescence. This philosophy made possible higher standards of living through higher wage rates without correspondingly increasing unit costs. We have long been accustomed to battle the old with new and better facilities. We deliberately quickened obsolescence through research and development. For three-quarters of a century of rapid American economic growth, our European friends looked with scorn upon our practice of tearing down facilities which had not yet worn out.

Although this part of our management philosophy was never fully understood by others and, therefore, not accepted, the obsolescent plants were effectively removed by our bombers during World War II. With the advent of the Marshall plan, American generosity undertook the task of helping to rebuild the economies of our futures competitors. We supplied them with the most advanced production facilities and also gave freely of our knowledge and techniques.

In the decade of the 1960's, our country is confronted with strong high quality-low cost competition from the European Common Market, from the countries associated in the Outer Seven, and probably from a new Latin American Common Market. We are now receiving increased imports in many product lines from Japan, and this, too, will be augmented as other Asiatic peoples become industrialized. In time, mass markets abroad will consume the products they manufacture, but before this takes place, the American people will be faced with the problem of competition from this added output. The American market is obviously the most attractive one for others to develop, so unless we can improve our own productive efficiency now, we will be in real trouble before the consumption abroad rises to a point where their domestic requirements will absorb these added goods and services.

As this competition grows—and it surely will—unemployment will become a major problem in this country.

Any failure to recognize that this problem is already upon us, that it will grow rapidly in seriousness, and any failure to start now to take basic and constructive steps toward solving it, will have the gravest kind of implications for the future of our system.

No Member of Congress, who wants to remain in Congress, can face a steadily rising volume of unemployment and refuse to deal with it. If the proper groundwork has been laid, if basic studies of the prospective developments have been completed, if an adequate educational job has been done, Congress will be able to deal with the problem calmly and wisely.

If, on the other hand, we fail to face up to this problem, if business executives follow the historical pattern—and wait for the crisis to arrive before starting to do something about it—the losses will be terrific.

Under these circumstances Congress will have no alternative—which has been so often true in the past—than to legislate unscientifically, in a highly emotionally charged atmosphere.

Pressures for action will grow and take many forms. Sponsors for the abolition of the Trade Agreement Act, who are already active, will increase their efforts. Suggestions for import quotas will develop rapidly. Bills for aid to depressed areas will gather support. Demands for newer and bigger Government spending programs, to sustain employment and purchasing power, will mushroom. Proposals to provide further artificial stimulation for the declining domestic economy will be pulled out and dusted off, and new ones will be dreamed up.

These palliatives would perhaps offer some temporary relief. However, they are, generally speaking, no more practical, nor realistic, than will be the proposals—which will certainly come—to cut wage rates.

The only practical and realistic solution—in my opinion—will be to remove legislative handicaps to business initiative. I am referring to those handicaps which were designed over the years to meet individual major domestic problems and crises, as they arose. Some undoubtedly served a good purpose in the world in which we then lived, but have no place in today's world, or in the world of tomorrow.

I also want to make it very clear that we have no desire to turn back the hands of the clock and thus open up our system to abuses which prevailed in the past.

If American industry is unfettered and its energies are directed at product and market development, it can hold its own in any field. Simple arithmetic proves that American industry must be more effective to overcome the prevailing wage level in other countries, which is fantastically low and is only a small percentage as related to our own. In addition, our statutory law requires the payment of overtime. Furthermore, we grant our workers fringe benefits and absorb countless other additional costs which are imposed by Government. Unless each hour of labor here is more productive than abroad, how can we hold our markets? It is too often forgotten that labor costs in their broad context represent 70 percent of our national income. Hence, this expense must result in high output of goods and services. No one should misunderstand my purpose. I am advocating conditions that will support a high standard of living for American workers.

In addition to the large advantage in lower labor costs, other nations have the added edge of not being subject to laws and regulations which inflate our costs of production, nor do they have the heavy tax burden we carry as a result of financing the major portion of the free world's defense.

When domestic competitors vie with each other for the home market, they are all operating under the same ground rules. Now they are threatened by strong competitors from other lands, made stronger by the advantages we have given them * * * and continue to give them. In other words, unless we come to our senses, we deserve to be put out of business. The time has come for more enlightened self-interest and less unbridled altruism.

I have great faith in America and Americans and I am firmly convinced that our ingenuity, our high standards of quality, our talents for developing and manufacturing products at high speed can compete successfully with the wage difference.

I believe the American business manager's basic competitive position in international trade is the same one we use every day here at home: "Let's compete; let's see who can produce the most of the best at highest efficiency and lowest cost; and let's see who can supply consumers in America, or anywhere else, with what they want at lowest possible prices under the influence of a risk-for-profit private enterprise economy."

Some people believe the answer is higher protective tariffs. I do not share this view. Could you have imagined a few years ago that labor unions would some day cry for tariff protection? At least three American unions are now demanding that Congress put up tariff bars on imports, and they want to negotiate contracts prohibiting American employers from handling foreign goods. These unions do not suggest, however, that they or their members try out such realistic actions as reducing inflationary pressures by holding the line on labor costs, or by reducing unit costs through higher efficiency and productivity.

This leads us into another critical area of business-manager responsibility for an all-American problem. The problem I speak of is labor union power.

To start with ourselves, management should reexamine the source of union power. When I have talked to business friends about their concept of union power, and what to do about it, I find they usually concentrate their attention on the power unions have, under Federal law, to bargain for workers in an entire industry or company and, consequently, are able to strike that entire industry or company. This attitude results from the truth that Federal law does grant union monopoly power at the collective bargaining table, and that our labor laws support the principle of monopoly. Hence, they are in conflict with our antitrust laws, which are based on the principle of competition. The suggestion therefore is frequently made that the remedy is to apply the antitrust laws to unions as well as companies. While the basic objective of fostering competition is a worthy one, we have seen the destructive impact of the inhibitions and shackles which the interpretation and the maladministration of such laws impose on the constructive opportunity for American business to operate in the best interest of the entire economy. I could find only negative solace in watching the Federal Government try to apply those particular curbs and penalties to unions. Frankly, I can't see how the government could use the current antitrust laws to deter and penalize union leaders in their monopoly use of power.

Many business managers would like to see a Federal law prohibiting industrywide or companywide collective bargaining. I hold a minority viewpoint on this. I think it would not be workable, enforcible, nor practical—and I do not believe that by itself it would effectively reduce union monopoly of bargaining or striking power. Without seeking to make policy either for my own company, or any other, as to the proper scope of col-

lective bargaining under any particular set of circumstances, I would certainly oppose any effort to assign to the Federal Government the added power to judge the size and shape of either a union's or a company's approach to the bargaining table.

A great many businessmen would be elated to see a law outlawing the union shop—preferably by Federal edict, but failing that, through State so-called right-to-work laws. Arguments on both sides of this controversy are charged with high passion. But the emotional appeals on both sides ignore one essential fact, which is that for more than 20 years Federal law and collective bargaining has given a recognized union absolute power to bargain collectively for every employee in the bargaining unit, whether he is a union member or not. The same law prevents the nonmember, as an individual, from delegating someone else to bargain for him. Nor can he do the job himself. The fact that he is not a member and cannot attend union meetings just means that he doesn't have an active voice or vote in the way the union acts for him.

I believe that people in a free society who find that certain of their interests have been delegated to someone else for collective handling should make it their personal duty to keep posted on what their representatives are doing and to let them know whether they agree or disagree. This goes for the town meeting, the State legislature, Congress, The White House—and also the union hall.

My disenchantment with the popular proposals we hear for curbing union power is that they seek to limit labor union monopoly power only by government regulation of the technical processes of collective bargaining. Union monopoly power in bargaining is a danger secondary, in my opinion, to the union leader monopoly power of control over men, achieved independently of law and not susceptible to control by law. This power results essentially from union leader control over the thinking and actions of men. Should we seek to curb this type of power by Federal law or regulation, we would, at the same time, be encouraging government to take charge of all human relationships—on the job, at the union hall, everywhere.

Union leader power over men exists because union members have delegated that power to their leaders—either deliberately, accidentally, cynically, or even by default. We should also remember that a union official, like any other politician, has to run for office and keep on running to stay in office. This being so, the only people who can influence and, in the long runs, reward or punish him are his own constitutents—our employees, who, as his union members, delegated their individual power in the first instance. On this premise, we must rely on enlightened and well informed union members to influence their own leaders to seek sound solutions to the problems which confront all of us. Take for example the so-called "work rules" or "local practices" clauses in labor agreements. Some of them dangerously restrict management opportunity to improve production efficiency; this was the major issue in the last steel negotiations. It was also critical in our own company's recent steelworker union negotiations—not to recapture, but to retain basic management responsibility for efficient, productive operations. Let me emphasize that the American Can Co. did not relinquish nor share that responsibility; we are still managing our own business.

While on the subject of our labor negotiations, let me be specific about contract settlement costs. Soon after the steel industry settled its strike, public statements by steel industry and government officials announced that the new contract would cost the steel industry 40 to 41 cents an hour for a 20-month contract.

Some of the same spokesmen went on to say that if the steel industry had accepted union demands to meet the terms of the earlier can industry settlement, this would have cost the steel industry 52 cents an hour.

To try to compute the cost of any one industry's union contract, as applied to the operating conditions of another industry, is a purely arbitrary and selective exercise of mathematical theory. The steel industry says it settled for 40 or 41 cents—and I have no reason nor basis to challenge these figures. Nor do I have any practical reason or factual basis for trying to estimate the possible cost of the steel industry settlement if it were to be applied to the can industry.

I do know, of course, what our own can industry negotiations are going to cost the can industry. We are going to pay an average 34 cents an hour for our 3-year contract. This is substantially less than the 41 cents that the steel industry estimates for its own settlement cost, and is not even close to the higher speculative estimates you may have read about in the papers.

Let us turn now to the second area of disadvantage in our cost sheets; government laws and regulations—which do not apply to our foreign competitors.

In the absence of a constructive program based on careful study and appraisal of the facts, any legislation which would accompany substantial increase in unemployment would jet-propel us along the road toward more government in business. What I am urging is the alternative to a crisis-type solution. It is a reappraisal of public policies, laws, and regulations which inflate our costs of production and which involve such things as:

Huge personal and corporate income taxes which restrict accumulation of capital needed to accelerate the growth of our economy; unrealistic tax depreciation policies; government fiscal and monetary policies which put an upward pressure on prices, thus increasing the differential between U.S. and foreign costs; unnecessary foreign-aid programs; lack of adequate laws, policies and supports designed to promote U.S. exports; laws and regulations which set arbitrary restraints on efficiency of big units; and uneconomic farm policies.

I believe that we in American business should not wait for changes to be proposed by others, but should ourselves actively explore on a long-range study-in-depth basis, some of these areas. Only then will we be able to recommend policy and legislative changes that will remove costly procedures that hamper effective competition. It is this approach to the problem of meeting foreign competition and expanding our exports that seems to offer the most promise.

I, therefore, suggest that thoughtful and intelligent men and women in all segments of our national life—government, business, finance, labor unions, agriculture, and in our colleges and universities—should develop a scientifically constructive approach to the problem of increasing international competition, and explore how government policy, laws, and regulations can be modernized to meet this great threat.

Such an approach should be completely nonpartisan. It should be undertaken by a group such as yours, and be so constituted that its work could proceed regardless of the outcome of the next election. This work should be financed by private grants, utilizing existing voluntary agencies wherever possible. I do not suggest that you gentlemen carry the entire financial burden, as I cannot imagine any industry or business who, understanding the problem, would be unwilling to support such an undertaking. In my book it is a must.

In talking about elements of cost other than labor, we naturally are led to that body of men and women in Congress who are responsible for our country's laws and regulations, and whom I like to think of as the board of directors of these United States. These are the people to whom we must communicate our ideas, our hopes, and recommendations. Based on our experience in contacting legislative members of both parties, we are convinced that they are honest, dedicated individuals. We have found no group of people who are more overworked, or more harassed by bewildering and complex problems. Few of us would leave or chosen work to take up the burdens which Congressmen assume when they are elected. How many of us are sufficiently well informed to express opinions on every conceivable issue ranging from labor relations, foreign relations, national defense, the problems of health, education, and welfare, taxes, money and banking, agriculture, minerals, public lands, to the rigged television programs or payola in radio? These are only a few of the subjects that come before Congress; yet, we elect our neighbors to represent us in Washington and request them to record their positions on hundreds of such issues during each session. They cannot say "I am sorry, this is not my specialy"—and, furthermore, they must be prepared to defend their voting records when they come up for reelection.

At the end of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, 10,676 measures had been introduced in the House and 3,161 in the Senate; 383 new public and 236 new private laws had been enacted. In addition, the Senate confirmed 43,567 presidential nominations. I cite these data as they show that the burden on a conscientious legislator is staggering. I know of no one in our organization, or, as a matter of fact, in any organization who is fully qualified in all of these fields. If such a person could be found, we would have difficulty in paying him a salary attractive enough to warrant his complete devotion to our corporate needs. Yet, we expect a Congressman or Senator on an annual salary of $22,500 to discharge his many tasks while maintaining a residence in Washington and also in his home district.

Finally, our costs are also affected by the policies of management. We who have that responsibility must make sure that our company is run efficiently, that we have a lean, hard-hitting organization, and that we have replaced the complacency and smugness of the years immediately after World War II and Korea with the realism that only the strong can survive.

The working people in this country, who influence the labor costs in our balance sheet, need and, in our experience, welcome impartial information to help them obtain enlightened union leadership. Similarly, experience has taught us that our representatives in Congress recognize fully that they can do a better job of serving as our country's board of directors with facts and advice from their constituents.

To cope with the need for information and communications with people who are so vital to our future welfare, we in American Can Co. decided to embark on a full-scale public affairs program designed to do certain things. This program has two objectives. One is to provide facts and information which will help individual citizens—particularly our employees—to formulate personal judgments as to what constitutes good government—good in the long-range interest of themselves, their families, their company and their country.

The second is to stimulate, encourage and help citizens—again primarily our employees—to work for good government. We urge them to work for their independently formulated concepts of good government, through the political party of their choice.

As we see it, working for good government involves doing four separate but related things:

1. Obtaining a correct understanding of major issues facing the Government and the probable impacts of alternative courses of Government action.

2. Standing up and expressing our convictions, regardless of occupation or profession—or position in an organizational structure—and thus give other citizens the benefits of our individual points of view.

3. Working actively through the party of our individual choice to induce the best possible people to compete for and get elected to public office.

4. Helping to supply elected officials with the information they require in order to make sound legislative decisions.

I can promise you this program of employee education will work—because after 4 years' experience in our company it is showing tangible results. We know, from the response we are getting, that our people understand what we are talking about, and they intend to make use of what we are saying. Our response has come from local union officers as well as rank-and-file employees. In many plants they have asked our management this question: "What can we, as local union officers and as employees, help do to keep our plant alive, competitive, and prosperous?"

I am also very enthusiastic about the number of people in our company who have taken a keen interest in their community politics. We have trained 80 members of our management group to lead discussions in the art of practical politics. Approximately 100 courses, comprising groups of 15 to 20 individuals, are now underway in our company. By July 1 of this year we expect that practically all of the 5,000 people in our management group will have completed this course, which consists of six 2-hour sessions.

We are thoroughly convinced that there is much to be gained by our efforts to give the people the facts. Thomas Jefferson wrote the prospectus for our public affairs program when he said: "I know of no safe depository for the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion through education."

Conservatives Favor Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Manchester Union-Leader recently carried an interesting editorial about the activities of my colleague, Senator STYLES BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union-Leader, Apr. 7, 1960]

CONSERVATIVES FAVOR COMMONSENSE

In three brief statements on March 22, Senator BRIDGES graphically summarized the philosophy of American conservatism.

Conservatives believe that there are few finer virtues than loyalty to one's country. They favor reasonable loyalty oaths, such as the non-Communist affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act. Defending this belief, Senator BRIDGES said that while loyalty oaths "are obviously not foolproof, they do nevertheless serve a useful purpose. While they may not prevent a person from committing a subversive act, they do furnish a basis for perjury, and let us not forget that it was on perjury alone that Alger Hiss was meted out his just deserts."

The American conservative is strongly opposed to the idea that Federal aid should be shoveled out indiscriminately. Senator BRIDGES expressed his horrified amazement at discovering that the tiny African country of Mauritania has just been given a loan of $66 million by the World Bank. BRIDGES said this means that each resident of that country, which has a population about the size of New Hampshire, has been given approximately $100. The major share of this loan will come from American taxpayers.

But while opposing lavish and wasteful foreign aid, little of which reaches the people who need it most, the American conservative is just as strongly in favor of true charity. Senator BRIDGES proved the point by calling on all Americans to contribute to the current appeals of America's religious faiths for support of their worldwide overseas relief programs—the Protestant One Great Hour of Sharing, the Catholic Bishops' Relief Fund appeal—both scheduled for March 27—and the year-round United Jewish Appeal.

That's the conservative belief in a nutshell: Loyalty to country, true charity, and government economy.

Jim Sharp's Recollections of the Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the States along the historic pony express route this year are celebrating the centennial of that colorful mail run. In Utah, a central figure in the observance is a man who has trekked every foot of the pony expres trail in Utah many times. He is James P. (Jim) Sharp. One of Utah's most colorful citizens, Mr. Sharp also is one of the West's leading collectors of historical color and an authority on pony express. He compiled some of his recollections about the pony express—drawn from his many conversations in his youth with men who saw the pony express in operation and frequented the stations on its route—in an article which appeared April 3 of this year in the Sunday magazine of the Salt Lake Tribune. He is serving as a special adviser to the committees staging Utah's centennial reenactment of the pony express run, which will take place in July. His knowledge and his personality carry an authentic touch of the old West. His recollections of the pony express help to provide a meaningful background for this reenactment. I commend his article to your attention:

RECOLLECTION OF THE PONY EXPRESS—A HARDY BREED OF RIDERS CARRIED THE MAIL FOR 1,966 MILES FROM MISSOURI TO CALIFORNIA

(By James P. Sharp)

Just a 100 years ago today, at 6:30 p.m., William H. Russell of the famous freighting firm of Russell, Majors & Waddell, locked a letter pouch on a pony in St. Joseph, Mo., and its rider, Billie Richardson, kicked the horse into a gallop, heading west.

The first mail carried by the pony express was on its way to California, opening one of the most colorful chapters in western history.

Before that run—which began April 3, 1860—was ended, the mail would travel 1,966 miles in 10 days and would be carried by relays of horses and riders spaced along the long hazardous route to Sacramento, Calif.

That same day, mail left San Francisco, was carried by steamer to Sacramento and left just after midnight of April 3 in the saddle pouches of a horse and rider headed east.

I first heard about this amazing enterprise when a boy about 7 or 8 years old—and that was a long time ago. A group of men along in years used to gather almost every week during the summer months, their favorite gathering place being Uncle Adam Sharp's woodpile.

I went once and from then on was a regular member of the group, which numbered variously from half a dozen to 10 and 15. Some of these oldtimers would be braiding, others tieing knots, and others were just "whittling," as one or another of them would tell stories of "the good old days."

Among these oldtimers were Uncle Adam, the man Brigham Young selected to deliver the poles for the telegraph line when the contractor failed to do his work. That was the time that Brigham Young said, after looking at the contract, "Your poles will be delivered on time if it bankrupts the Mormon Church." The poles were delivered in the early fall of 1861.

My father was John C. Sharp and as a lad of 11, he went along with Uncle Adam on his trips. Later, in 1891, he took me with him in a sheep wagon and showed me where every station was—or had been—between Salt Lake City and Deep Creek.

Others whom I met during those early years, and who were connected with the pony—or said they were—included H. J. (Doc) Faust, who was station keeper at Rush Valley, only 5 miles north of my birthplace.

Uncle Horace and Aunt Lib Rockwell tended the station at Lookout, and there is where you'll find the famous dog cemetery where they buried their dogs. Yes, I knew them well, along with some of the dogs buried there—Jenny Lind, Josephine Bonaparte, Bishop, and Toby Tyler.

Oscar W. Quinn was station keeper at Riverbed and Pete Neece was the keeper at Willow Springs—now Callao.

There were some former riders in the group, too. The one I liked to best listen to was "Uncle" (every old man in those days went by the title of uncle) Bill Streeper.

He was a veteran of the old jackass mail, a mule-powered service organized by Maj. George Corpenning, Jr., Samuel H. Woodward and others to carry mail from Sacramento across the great American desert to Salt Lake City. He worked for the jackass mail from 1851 to 1854, and later "rode the pony" from Ruby Valey to Robbers Creek in Nevada. Alec Toponce rode the Slade division out of Julesburg, Colo., and also out of Fort Kearney on the Lewis division. William (Billy) Fisher, and I knew him well, brought the first mail from Fish Springs to Rush Valley, 75 miles in 5 hours.

There was another, a Goshute Indian from Deep Creek. He was Ibapah Jack (Iba means "deep" and pah means "water"). Ibapah Jack worked for me during the summer for 3 years from 1897 to 1899, and remembered seeing the first pony come in from the west, as well as the one from the east at Deep Creek.

When the pony started, there was no Colorado, Wyoming, or Nevada. Utah extended along its present northern boundary from

California to the Continental Divide. Of the 1,966 miles between St. Joe and Sacramento we had 767 miles, and of the 190 stations, we had 65. When the States were admitted Wyoming gained 9 of these, Nevada got 33, and Utah had only 23 left.

The pony riders had fast horses and were supposed to ride about 10 miles an hour. They had a special light saddle weighing about 13½ pounds and over this was a "mochila," which I have been told is an Indian word, but do not know what it meant. Anyway, it was a piece of rather thick leather about 29 inches square and had a hole cut in it for the saddle horn and another for the back of the saddle. It was placed over the saddle and the rider sat on it. On each corner of the mochila was a locked pouch or cantina. Three could be unlocked only at St. Joe and San Francisco (later Sacramento). The front left hand pouch was the way pouch and each home station keeper had a key to unlock this one so he could take any mail out for his run and put any outgoing mail in after he had collected $5 per half ounce letter postage. This was to be a weekly mail each way. There were two kinds of stations—a home station and a way station. A home station was where riders changed, and a way station was where horses only were changed. Saddles were never changed.

When a rider arrived at a home station, the keeper was allowed 4 minutes in which to sort the mail and get the rider on his way. At the way station, a horse with saddle and bridle was waiting and the rider was allowed 2 minutes to bring his charging horse to a stop, dismount, take the mochila from one saddle, place it on the other, gossip and do almost as he pleased, so long as he did not take more than 2 minutes.

As I said before, the first rider left St. Joe at 6:30 p.m. on April 3. This mail arrived in Salt Lake City at 6:25 p.m. on April 9. The mail from the West, which left Sacramento early on April 4, arrived in Salt Lake City at 11:45 p.m. on April 7.

How far one man would ride and how many horses he would have is a question, for some home stations were only 45 miles apart while others were as much as 82 miles.

Salt Lake was a home station—in fact the historical marker identifying the site is placed in front of the Tribune Building. The rider would mount a horse there, change horses at Traveler's Rest, with other changes at Rockwell, Joe Dugout's, Camp Floyd, The Pass and then on to the next home station, Rush Valley. This meant a journey of 75 miles southwest from Salt Lake City, with an average riding time of seven and a half hours.

Russell, Majors & Waddell never had a Government contract—only a promise of a subsidy—but in the spring of 1861, Congress passed the Overland Mail bill which, among other things ordered the pony to make semi-weekly trips and to reduce the rates to $2 a half ounce (some say to $1). The same Congress also declared that when the telegraph line from the East and the one from the West should be completed at Salt Lake City, the pony should cease to run.

Creighton brought the line in from Omaha on October 18, 1861, and Gamble brought his in from the West and connected the line, and as one man wrote at the time—"They murdered the pony express on the streets of Salt Lake City, October 24, 1861."

The promised Government subsidy was never paid to the pony, and it was estimated that it cost Russell, Majors & Waddell $16 to carry each letter and in return they received an average of $3, leaving a loss to the firm of $13 for every letter carried.

And now, here's a word of warning. It being the pony's centennial year, you might think it a fine idea to take the family for an outing along the old pony trail. Just be careful. Last year, I had the privilege of going from Salt Lake City to the Nevada line with some of the officials concerned with the reenactment of the pony express run this July, and found it a mighty hard trip.

After we turned off Highway 73, 5 miles south of Camp Williams, we did not meet, nor pass another car until we had reached Deep Creek, about 165 miles away. Water is available at some points, but there are stretches of many miles when it is not. And modern cars are not built for the kind of roads you'll meet up with on the trail. Better think twice.

Big Spenders Overlook the Waste in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star, entitled, "Big Spenders Overlook the Waste in Defense." This is a timely editorial, suggesting an objective study of our huge military and foreign aid programs for the purpose of sorting out the essential from the nonessential activities.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 16, 1960]

BIG SPENDERS OVERLOOK THE WASTE IN DEFENSE

A cult of thought is flowering which demands much larger expenditures for public—as opposed to private—spending. The high priests of this cult insist that much more should be spent on national security in particular. Still, to the average taxpayer 41 billions for defense and another 4 billions proposed for foreign aid look like a great deal of money.

We are being told that this isn't enough to guarantee our survival. The fact is, there is no such thing as absolute safety in this era of missiles and hydrogen bombs. All we can do is strive for what responsible leaders consider to be reasonable preparedness for as many contingencies as possible.

For an example of the still bigger spending approach, consider a report in the current issue of the Harvard Business Review. Its author, Manuel Helzner, had helped prepare a similar study for the National Planning Association that has been much quoted by advocates of greater spending. The new conclusion is that country has adequate resources for a $10 billion increase in national security outlays over the next 3 years, in addition to an expected increase of $2.3 billions under existing programs.

This view is widely accepted in academic circles and among critics of the administration's defense policies. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, for instance, would spend $10 billion more a year starting immediately. General Taylor, unlike some of the critics, has exact ideas on how the extra money would be used.

We don't pretend to know what the level of spending should be. It comes down to a question of individual judgments. Security is relative. It can never be absolute because it is impossible to prepare for every eventuality. This would still be true if billions were added to the price tag on defense. This is not mentioned by the defense critics. Nor do they bring up the fact that the present defense program is saddled with considerable waste.

One example is the Air Force duplication of a medium-range missile which the Army was ready to provide. Hundreds of millions were thrown away on this pointless competition. More wasteful rivalry came when the Air Force proudly shunned the Army's top-notch team of German scientists, the most experienced in the country, to start an ICBM research organization from scratch.

We would like to see an objective study made of huge military and foreign aid programs. It should be intended to sort out essential from nonessential activities. The occasional evidence of soft spots in defense and aid programs suggests that there may be others, perhaps many others, that could be discarded without jeopardizing our safety. Presumably in other departments greater expenditures will be required. The outlay for missiles has already increased enormously.

Certainly there is no assurance of greater safety in the cult of spending for the sake of spending.

I Dream of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting the following editorial, written by Mr. Roger Cramer of Jamestown, N.Y., who is Chautauqua County agricultural agent. Mr. Cramer is deeply respected by our farmers and our city folk alike in Chautauqua County. His thoughts with reference to our present tax structure are worthy of the consideration of every Congressman. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

I DREAM OF TAXES

(By Rog Cramer)

I've tried it out on several people. I mean my tax program. The fact that not all have ridiculed it has given me the incentive to put it in print. The fact that, as yet, it is not politically labeled gives me the license to do so. The time spent in reading it should, at least, be as valuable as reading the Sunday comics.

Is our tax base outdated? Has our tax structure grown, like Topsy, like a lot of dairy barns, an L here, a wing there, a lean-to here, a dormer on one side, a pole shed on the end, until it is terribly inefficient and no modern laborsaving equipment fits? Does anyone know what we're paying to collect all the taxes we have? Does anyone know what his total tax bill is? Is it true that, eventually, every tax must come out of your pocket and mine? Is it true, that in a democracy, everyone should pay his fair share and no more?

How about taking all taxes off of real estate? This is the beginning of my tax program. Would this mean more people would own their own homes? Would this mean many would have better homes? Might we have a better looking community since the relationship between a coat of paint or some shrubbery or a fence and the assessor would be removed? Might we not have more people interested in planting trees and doing other conservation work which would result in helping to stem some of our soil erosion,

water, and land use problems? Would we have more people and families involved in wholesome outdoor recreation? Might not many older people be more secure with less dependence on welfare? How many problems like tax-free property, partial exemptions, and inequality in assessments would no longer exist? And how much is the present assessor, assessment, equalization bill that would be saved?

Then, suppose we settled for two taxes: income and sales. What would the ramifications be? What would some of the problems be that would have to be met?

Then, suppose that the Federal Government established its tax rates, the State established its tax rates, the county established its tax rates, each town and city established its tax rates, and each school district established its tax rates. Would this be far different from what we have now?

Then, further, suppose we had county government responsible for the collection of our sales and income taxes and the apportionment of these taxes to the Federal Government, the State government, the county government, the towns, cities, and school districts. Would our tax procedure be simplified? Would the cost be more or less than our present maze of Federal collectors, State collectors, county collectors, and district collectors? Would people feel the same under this system about constantly asking for more and more services, bureaus, departments, etc.?

Now we find out this isn't a tax program at all—just a lot of questions like everybody else is asking. Come to think of it, I still haven't filed my State and Federal returns for 1959 yet. Let's see, how many forms do I need?

Investigation of General Services Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently there was a congressional hearing in Kansas City in regard to charges of mismanagement at the regional office of the Government Services Administration. Much testimony was taken at the hearing and the matter is now being considered by the committee.

In the March 29 issue of the Kansas City Times there appeared an editorial entitled "Much Ado About the GSA Probe." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUCH ADO ABOUT THE GSA PROBE

The House Subcommittee on Government Operations opened its hearings Friday on the regional office of the General Services Administration with hints of sensational revelations. The chairman spoke of "a rather sordid picture of irregularities," and the word "fraud" was voiced repeatedly.

The hearings ended much more quietly. The chairman spoke of "some careless administration" and said that "it seems apparent that many of the reports of maladministration in GSA's region 6 are well founded."

The word "maladministration" means to "administer badly," and not everyone who followed the hearings closely would agree that such a condition was disclosed. But if there were evidence of maladministration it didn't justify charges of "fraud" and "sordid irregularities." There was no evidence of ill-gotten gains or profitable influence. Probably the GSA operation here could be tightened and very likely there were individual acts of carelessness. We have no doubt that the same is true of any governmental bureau on any level.

No bureaucracy is above suspicion, and congressional investigations are a valuable function of the legislative branch of government. Even when the zeal of one party is motivated by hopes of embarrassing the administration, the investigations frequently are in the public interest. But this time it didn't seem to come off.

Interest Rates and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, despite the administration's request of 10 months' standing for repeal of the archaic 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on marketable securities, inaction by Congress continues to hamper the debt management operations of the Treasury Department.

On June 8, 1959, President Eisenhower sent a message to the Congress calling for the repeal of the ceiling in the interest of facilitating economical and efficient management of the public debt in a way that would be least inflationary. The Democratic majority in the Congress has blindly refused to face up to this urgent responsibility. The Democratic majority has supported budget-busting spending measures that if enacted would result in inflationary deficit financing but the Democratic majority has refused to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the necessary tools to finance the debt in the least inflationary way.

The Democratic Party advocates cheap money regardless of the fact that it would result in higher prices and inflation. Higher prices and inflation mean less purchasing power for persons living on fixed incomes such as the aged. Thus, the Democratic Party seeks to deprive the aged of their independence and impose on them governmental bureaucratic regimentation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just the aged who will suffer from the fiscal policies of the Democratic Party. Every living American and future generation will pay the cost of the "fiscal folly" being imposed on our Nation by the Democratic majority in the Congress. Our present national debt of $290 billion is largely the result of the spending proclivities of Democratic controlled Congresses. The Democratic Party is also responsible for the fact that the public debt is becoming shorter and shorter in maturity. By its refusal to repeal the 4¼-percent interest rate ceilings the Democratic Party has forced the Treasury Department to rely almost exclusively on refinancing the debt in the short-term money market through the issuance of securities with maturities of under 5 years. Thus, the Federal Government is compelled to compete with American consumers and business for short-term funds, thereby driving the cost of such borrowing upward for all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal for April 11, 1960, there appeared an editorial captioned "Shiftless Sam," referring to Uncle Sam, which deals with the interest rate problem. In the April 18 issue of Newsweek magazine in a signed opinion by Mr. Henry Hazlitt there appeared an article dealing with this same subject captioned "Cheap Money Is Dear." I will include these editorial comments as a part of my remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 11 1960]

SHIFTLESS SAM

Then there's the story about the shiftless fellow who had a leaky roof. He couldn't fix it when it was raining; and when it wasn't raining, why bother?

This has been pretty much the attitude of the Democrats in Congress toward the Government's leaky fiscal structure.

When interest rates were high and rising the Treasury found it impossible to borrow any money at all on bonds at 4¼ percent, the maximum the law permits it to pay. But, said the Democrats, the law shouldn't be fixed then because it wouldn't do to let Uncle Sam pay more when money was already tight. Then when interest rates dropped somewhat, and it looked as though the Treasury might float a 4¼ percent bond issue, the Democrats said, "Why bother about changing the law?"

Now it's turned out, of course, that the Treasury can't borrow money that way in any appreciable amount. Secretary Anderson offered the public a 25-year 4¼ percent bond issue, expecting to sell a minimum of $500 million and hoping for $1.5 billion to bail him out. Mr. Anderson got offers of barely $370 million. So there you are.

Naturally, this altered the Democrats' views not a whit. With much grave shaking of heads they decided the failure of the Treasury's bond issue meant this was not the time to fix the law. In one of the most magnificent nonsequiturs of the season, Senator DOUGLAS said this was just "proof that the Treasury should develop better methods for marketing bond issues"—without the slightest intimation that meeting the market price for bonds is one of the best methods ever devised.

Oh, well. We suppose nobody should be surprised. After all, it's the same attitude that says Uncle Sam can't afford to cut his budget in hard times and in good times it ain't necessary. Shiftless Sam is just goin' to set 'till the roof falls in.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 18, 1960]

CHEAP MONEY IS DEAR

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The word from Washington is that as a result of the success of the Treasury in selling some long-term Government bonds at the legal ceiling rate of 4¼ percent, no action is likely to be taken to repeal or even modify the ceiling in this session. Such a failure to act would be irresponsible. Retention of the old legal ceiling would do no good, and might do incalculable harm.

There is no reason to suppose that the legal interest ceiling in itself saves the Government a single dollar in interest costs. It is the plain duty of the Secretary of the

Treasury to borrow at the lowest rates, at the smallest costs in the long run, that the market allows him to get. If we ever had a Secretary who was not willing to do that, or not competent to do it, the 4¼ percent legal ceiling on long-term bonds would be futile anyway; for the Secretary can borrow at any rate he chooses on securities with less than 5 years to run.

Last week I pointed to the administrative folly of retaining a 42-year-old prohibition that today simply ties the hands of the Treasury experts, in daily touch with the market, and prevents them from exercising their best judgment concerning what length maturities to offer. It forces them to glut the market for short-term securities, and rates the average rate at which they can borrow. But the economic folly is much more serious, and deserves longer examination.

CHEAP MONEY INFLATES

A policy of cheap money (i.e., a policy of arbitrarily keeping interest rates down) is only another name for a policy of inflation. The only way interest rates can be held down even temporarily to an arbitrary ceiling is by an increase in the money supply. This increase may be achieved by a direct resort to the printing press. It may be achieved by a return to the policy of forcing the Federal Reserve banks to buy at the predetermined low interest rate all the Government bonds offered. The Fed would pay for these either by creating deposits or printing notes against them. This is what is known as monetizing the national debt.

Instead of reducing or holding down interest rates by increasing the supply of money and credit, we may increase the supply of money and credit by reducing interest rates. Low interest rates encourage borrowing at the banks. Other conditions being unchanged, more projects will be undertaken and more money will be borrowed at 4 percent than at 5, or at 3 percent than at 4. When the banks lend, they create deposits against the loans; that is, they in effect create new money. Low interest rates are inflationary when they lead to an undue increase in the money supply. Conversely, the only way interest rates can be held down below the natural rate at any time is by an increase in the money supply.

WHAT IT HAS COST

This inflationary cheap-money policy cannot be kept going indefinitely. The consequent increased number of dollars, of course, cheapens the dollar in terms of goods. In other words, there is a rise in prices. As a result, cheap money eventually costs the Government far more in total dollar expenses and interest charges than tight money would have cost it. Further, if the inflation and the rise in prices is expected to continue, lenders will begin to insist on a higher interest rate as a sort of insurance premium against depreciation in the value of their loaned dollar capital.

The irony is that it is precisely the people in Congress who are now protesting loudest against high interest charges whose policies in the past have done most to raise those charges. It is their spending policies and deficit financing policies that have built up a Federal debt of $287 billion and an annual interest charge of $9.4 billion.

Whether or not Congress now votes to repeal the legal 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds is no mere technical matter, of interest only to experts. It may be a fateful decision. It may crucially affect confidence in the dollar at home and abroad. A failure of Congress to repeal at this session may prove, in effect, a vote for inflation. If the Democratic leaders in Congress make that decision, they must bear full responsibility for it.

Federal School Funds Without Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill—H.R. 11705—which is my proposal to meet the problem of financing public education without permitting Federal control in any way, shape, or form. This legislation would give Federal aid in a manner that would preclude any risk of reducing local and State responsibility for the administration of public education. Substantial and increasing amounts would be available to each State to be used as the State legislatures direct, under my plan, by the return to the respective States for education of three-quarters of the Federal cigarette tax collected by the Federal Government on each package of cigarettes sold in each State.

Some of us honestly feel that education should be administered locally in order to insure its freedom from regimentation and regulation such as once lead Japan, Germany, and Italy to thought-control and dictatorship, and is presently the basis for Communist domination of almost half the population of the world.

Aside from the risk of Federal control, however, I see no valid reason why the Federal Government should not cooperate with the States by giving up certain revenues so that the States can better meet the pressing needs of public education.

In this connection, last year I made a suggestion and introduced legislation providing for the return to each State of a portion of the amount each State contributed to the Federal Treasury through income taxes.

Objections were raised to this plan in that certain large taxpayers do not pay their taxes in the State where their profits are earned and thus branch office areas such as Seattle would not get their fair share of the money to which they would be entitled. In the meanwhile, some major school legislation is under consideration by Congress and there is much difference of opinion on various plans so that considerable doubt exists as to passage of any school bill at this session.

That the total cost of public education will require greatly increased finances I don't believe anyone denies. The Federal Government of course already is aiding education. The Library of Congress tells me that the expenditures for federally impacted areas and other school aid in fiscal 1959 was $294,490,051, so those of us who voted for such funds certainly are not flatly opposed to Federal dollars for schools. We are opposed only to controls over the dollars. We want the States to control.

Because I am convinced that the school experts are justified in seeking additional sources of revenue, I am offering this new proposal. For the convenience of my colleagues I will insert a table showing by State the money which is estimated under my new bill would be available based on fiscal 1959 cigarette sales. The total transfer to the States under this proposal would approximate $1.2 billion per annum.

The tabulation also shows the sums available the first year under three other plans. These latter ones are those feared to contain toe-in-the-door controls and that could lead to Federal regulation of public schools.

Before setting forth the comparative table showing the amount each State would receive under my bill as against various other bills, I think it would be in order to say this: nobody at the moment can foretell what action the Rules Committee will take on any education legislation. Each proponent of a plan to help the schools hopes to offer an amendment if and when a bill is considered by the House. Each would substitute or add provisions which coincide with his ideas. I hope to offer my plan.

However, while the dollars involved may not vary as between different plans, the philosophy of how and why assistance is given to public education is the basic issue. Certainly the House cannot pass a bill that does not satisfy the objections of the President. Congress could not override a veto. Of that I am sure.

Thus and in view of widespread concern of legislation which might involve Federal controls, I want to point up the philosophy and absolute simplicity of my proposal.

The objective, of course, is to strengthen State finances so each State is itself better able to provide an adequate education to every child residing in that State.

The bill clearly declares that responsibility for and over education is one of the powers not delegated to the Federal Government but reserved under the 10th amendment of the Constitution to the States.

Secondly the bill affirms and reenacts a part of article III of the Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Confederation Congress, that religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Encouragement of education is then provided for by the financial strengthening of the States and in this connection the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to return to each State 6 cents of the 8-cent Federal cigarette tax.

In conclusion, let me just say that friends and foes of Federal aid to education are, so to speak, locked in mortal combat as far as the Murray-Metcalf and other school bills are concerned. But here in my proposal is a measure that both sides could agree on. It is a bill—the only one in my opinion of all the various bills—that could be enacted

into law. I hope those who are dedicated to preserving our schools from Federal regimentation, and my friends on the other side of the argument who are equally determined that each child in America have the opportunity of quality education will think this over and study my plan.

Meanwhile, here is a computation of the amount each State would receive under the three bills now being considered:

A comparison of estimated 1st year Federal allotments to individual States under various bills

	H.R. 11705, the Pelly bill to strengthen State finances for education	H.R. 22, as amended, the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill for school construction and salaries	H.R. 10128, the so-called Thompson bill for school construction	S. 8, as passed by the Senate for school construction and teachers' salaries		H.R. 11705, the Pelly bill to strengthen State finances for education	H.R. 22, as amended, the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill for school construction and salaries	H.R. 10128, the so-called Thompson bill for school construction	S. 8, as passed by the Senate for school construction and teachers' salaries
Alabama	$17,232,000	$22,275,000	$6,695,000	$25,855,000	Nevada	$3,006,000	$1,750,000	$488,000	$1,125,000
Alaska	1,314,000	1,350,000	358,000	623,000	New Hampshire	6,768,000	3,425,000	1,008,000	2,932,000
Arizona	8,556,000	7,975,000	2,275,000	7,985,000	New Jersey	46,692,000	3,425,000	9,653,000	17,937,000
Arkansas	8,874,000	11,675,000	3,575,000	13,749,000	New Mexico	5,346,000	6,300,000	1,853,000	6,866,000
California	(1)	87,800,000	25,000,000	50,211,000	New York	140,802,000	90,350,000	26,520,000	44,220,000
Colorado	(1)	11,100,000	3,218,000	9,660,000	North Carolina	(1)	31,325,000	9,328,000	36,051,000
Connecticut	21,510,000	13,525,000	3,933,000	5,626,000	North Dakota	3,516,000	4,440,000	1,300,000	4,742,000
Delaware	3,912,000	2,775,000	813,000	1,256,000	Ohio	67,170,000	58,650,000	17,030,000	43,490,000
District of Columbia	7,980,000	4,025,000	1,170,000	1,689,000	Oklahoma	14,550,000	13,952,000	4,193,000	13,411,000
Florida	36,798,000	20,700,000	7,605,000	23,399,000	Oregon	(1)	11,250,000	3,283,000	9,521,000
Georgia	21,462,000	26,275,000	7,930,000	30,013,000	Pennsylvania	77,526,000	64,925,000	19,175,000	47,662,000
Idaho	3,846,000	4,525,000	1,333,000	4,701,000	Rhode Island	7,176,000	4,875,000	1,430,000	3,642,000
Illinois	78,246,000	57,950,000	16,933,000	34,008,000	South Carolina	12,816,000	17,925,000	5,330,000	22,005,000
Indiana	33,534,000	29,250,000	8,515,000	24,687,000	South Dakota	4,122,000	4,600,000	1,365,000	4,877,000
Iowa	17,754,000	17,250,000	5,103,000	15,679,000	Tennessee	19,698,000	22,900,000	6,825,000	25,338,000
Kansas	13,404,000	13,250,000	3,868,000	11,766,000	Texas	61,746,000	63,825,000	18,525,000	62,901,000
Kentucky	20,628,000	20,457,000	6,143,000	23,039,000	Utah	3,420,000	6,425,000	1,853,000	6,836,000
Louisiana	19,230,000	22,050,000	6,468,000	24,239,000	Vermont	3,120,000	2,325,000	715,000	2,231,000
Maine	7,692,000	5,825,000	1,723,000	5,571,000	Virginia	(1)	25,450,000	7,475,000	25,538,000
Maryland	22,158,000	19,000,000	5,493,000	14,784,000	Washington	17,676,000	17,675,000	5,135,000	14,004,000
Massachusetts	38,268,000	27,050,000	8,028,000	16,047,000	West Virginia	11,472,000	13,175,000	3,998,000	14,067,000
Michigan	56,328,000	51,400,000	14,885,000	41,164,000	Wisconsin	24,984,000	24,675,000	7,248,000	21,541,000
Minnesota	21,474,000	21,550,000	6,338,000	19,762,000	Wyoming	2,508,000	2,175,000	650,000	1,927,000
Mississippi	10,176,000	15,625,000	4,680,000	18,857,000	Hawaii	(1)	(1)	1,203,000	3,993,000
Missouri	33,030,000	24,900,000	7,345,000	19,566,000					
Montana	4,530,000	4,525,000	1,333,000	4,167,000	Total [2]	1,200,000,000	1,085,000,000	325,000,000	916,600,000
Nebraska	8,898,000	8,900,000	2,633,000	8,070,000					

[1] The separate statistics for cigarette sales in 6 States presently are not available so these figures are omitted although they are included in the estimated total.

[2] Estimated total includes the new State of Hawaii and territories of the United States.

Ukrainian Nationalism Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, we of North Dakota are very proud of the people of our State of Ukrainian descent. Not many are familiar with the history of these great and proud people and their long and hard fight for freedom. The Bismarck Tribune of Bismarck, N. Dak., had a very fine editorial on April 1 of this year regarding these people entitled "Ukrainian Nationalism Lives On." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN NATIONALISM LIVES ON

Few ethnic groups in America are more aggressively and proudly conscious of their heritage than the Ukrainians, of whom there are quite a number in North Dakota.

The Ukraine ordinarily is considered a part of Russia, and is today a part of the Soviet Union. Actually, say Ukrainians, the Ukraine is or should be a distinct separate political entity, with its own customs, language, and traditions.

The Ukrainian fight for independence and recognition dates far back. Before the Bolshevik Revolution, Ukrainians battled with the czars of Russia for their freedom. Today they are among the stanchest opponents of Russian Communist domination.

Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, Steele, who is president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, sees in the upcoming Federal census an opportunity for Americans of Ukrainian descent to establish their ethnic identity. He emphasized this in a recent letter to the edition.

For the first time, he pointed out, the Federal Government will recognize the Ukraine as a separate country and the Ukrainian language as a separate and independent tongue. This means that people of Ukrainian birth will list the Ukraine instead of Russia as their place of birth when the census taker calls this month. They will list Ukrainian instead of some other language as their native tongue.

Robert W. Burgess, director of the Bureau of the Census, has confirmed this information in a letter to one who inquired.

"We do plan to recognize the Ukraine as a separate entity in our coding system," he wrote. "In the case of mother tongue, Ukrainian represents a separate item in the classification and will appear in most of the tables in which data on the mother tongue are presented."

For Ukrainian-Americans, this appears to represent a triumph. Their homeland may still not be under an independent government; but as far as the U.S. census is concerned, it is an identifiable entity.

Barge Lines Face "Year of Decision"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Patrick Calhoun, Jr., president of the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association, entitled "Barge Lines Face 'Year of Decision.'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARGE LINES FACE YEAR OF DECISION

(By Patrick Calhoun, Jr., president, Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association)

The year 1960 will be a year of decision for the common carrier barge companies, Washington observers believe. During the next 12 months, men familiar with transportation problems both on Capitol Hill and in the executive branch of the Government feel, the railroads will make a determined effort to obtain changes in current transport policies.

Last year the Senate and House passed the Smathers-Harris Transportation Act because some railroads said they were in trouble. I have been looking over the recent financial statements of a number of railroads, and from these reports it is clear that during the present year they have been doing very well. In the interest of a healthy transportation system, we are pleased with this trend. To implement it, and improve their position, we feel the railroads should do everything possible to provide better service, modern equipment, and more efficient operating procedures.

Most experts in transportation think that the effects of the 1958 Transportation Act should be studied this year, and that only after it has been effective for a period of at least 1 year should any major alterations be considered. Added to this reason for delay in considering changes in the legislation is the fact that two study committees will be devoting the remainder of this year and some of next to analyzing problems confronting the transport industry.

The direction which the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee study will take is uncertain. However, judging by past

actions of this committee and the makeup of the committee itself, all sides will be afforded full and lengthy hearings.

The study under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, however, is an entirely different matter. Many are fearful that the new Commerce Department study will follow closely the recommendations made by the Weeks committee some years ago. They feel that the committee will be unfriendly to water and other carriers, and basically friendly to the railroads.

Railroad representatives in Washington are planning their campaign for the months ahead, and much of their planning is directed toward their relationship with other carriers. There are three particular areas in which the railroads wish to obtain special favors.

One is in the field of rates. That is, they want to lower rates where they have competition from the barge lines and other carriers, and raise them where the consumer is the prisoner of railroad service. The railroads seeks high rates in areas where low-cost water transportation is not available, to counterbalance losses they would take in places where they want to cut charges in an attempt to take business from the barge lines.

American railroads must not be allowed to punish consumers and industries in certain States in order to make possible continued financing of their own private rate wars.

Common ownership is another area where the railroads seek special advantages. The railroads' desire to enter the fields of trucking, barging, and air transportation cannot be traced to any failure of these modes of transportation to provide adequate service.

In other words, the railroads are not seeking to enter a field where the consumer is crying for help. Consumers are certainly not looking for the expansion of railroads into new fields. They are all too well aware of the antiquated railroad techniques which have brought railroad service in this country to a rather less than desirable state.

Still further, the railroads are trying to have user charges levied on river transport operators, not because it is their desire to see that revenue is brought into the Public Treasury (as a matter of fact, tolls would result in less total revenue) but in order to handicap water transportation.

It is felt that the pressure for user charges coming from the Budget Bureau and Commerce Department may be generated primarily, therefore, by friends of the railroads and the railroads themselves.

The country would be better off, we feel, if the railroads would devote their energies to running an efficient form of transportation instead of dissipating their strength and energy fighting other forms of transport. The common carrier barge lines wish to extend the benefits of coordinated service with the railroads, but have received little cooperation in this area from the rails.

The officers and members of the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association have consistently tried to show how the regulated barge lines are rendering a maximum of public service as an important part of the Nation's transportation system. The common carrier barge lines, as they face the coming year, feel more strongly than ever before that one of the most important things river carriers can do to bolster their position is to render better service at a low cost, and to avoid pushing for legislation which would curtail or hurt other modes of transportation.

The barge lines, in an effort to be constructive, are doing everything possible to bring new companies and new plants to the rivers, and so spread the benefits of river locations still further to the American consumer.

The economic outlook for the country is one of healthy prosperity. The barge lines must be prepared, and they are prepared, to render maximum public service at a time when manufacturers and consumers will be looking for economical, efficient water transportation.

It is important that the barge lines' constructive role be recognized and appreciated. The best public relations for the industry consists of public knowledge of the good service, low-cost, modern equipment, able personnel and cooperation with other carriers for the benefit of the Nation as a whole which barge companies offer. To illustrate this approach I commend to readers' attention these constructive articles about the common carrier barge lines:

The Journal of Commerce, April 14, 1959—"Inland Waterway Traffic Gains," by Stanley Ferguson.

The New York Times, February 8, 1959—"Towboat Trade Shows Big Gain," by Jacques Nevard; January 27, 1959—"Ol' Man River Keeps on Fooling Even Most Modern Towboats," by Jacques Nevard.

The Saturday Evening Post, March 14, 1959—"River-Boat Revival on the Ohio," by James A. Maxwell.

New York Herald Tribune, February 22, 1959—"Inland Lines Head Tells of South's Vast Potential," by Walter Hamshar; February 21, 1959—"Inland Waterways See Threat in Labor Costs," by Walter Hamshar.

Owensboro, Kentucky, Messenger-Inquirer, January 25, 1959—"Coal and Barges Sparking Industrial Boom in Ohio Valley."

Traffic World, February 14, 1959—"Revolution on the Rivers," by Gordon Huffines.

The Wall Street Journal, March 24, 1959—"Barge Lines Eye New Technology in Fight to Hold Traffic Gains Despite Rising Costs, Rail Rate Cuts," by Roger Benedict.

Interested readers who may have missed one or several of these articles may feel free to write to me at the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill., and I shall be happy to send copies of the individual articles.

Pentagon Promotion for Hon. Errett P. Scrivner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, his former colleagues in Congress will be gratified to learn that after 14 months as special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, the Honorable Errett P. Scrivner has proven his worth and has been promoted to Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Public Affairs.

A news story appearing in the Johnson County Herald, and other papers, follows:

Appointment of Errett P. Scrivner, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), as Deputy Assistant Secretary (Public Affairs), effective March 7, is announced by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Scrivner, Kansas City, Kans., formerly a Member of Congress representing the Second Congressional District of Kansas, replaces Chauncey Robbins, who resigned February 22. Mr. Scrivner who joined the Defense Establishment on January 19, 1959, was elected to the 78th Congress in September 1943, and was reelected through the 85th Congress.

Born in Newton, Kans., March 20, 1898, Mr. Scrivner was graduated from Kansas University with an LL.B. He is a member of the Wyandotte County Bar Association, Kansas State Bar Association and of the Bar of the U.S. Supreme Court. He served overseas with the 35th Division in World War I, having enlisted in Battery B, 129th Field Artillery. He was awarded the Silver Star and Purple Heart.

Mr. Scrivner was married to Jean Lorraine Marshall in 1921. The couple has one daughter, Mrs. Nancy Lee Tiffen, who resides in Kirkwood, Mo.

Residual Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, approximately a year ago, the President of the United States issued a proclamation establishing import quotas on crude oil, petroleum products, and residual fuel oil. This step, said to have been in the interest of national security, set the amount of oil to be imported at the level of 1957—a year in which substantial quantity of oil was brought into this country. It was determined by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization that the level of imports in 1957 could not be greatly exceeded without endangering the stability and well-being of America's domestic fuels industries. This decision led to the Presidential proclamation.

Since that time the administration of the mandatory controls on oil imports has been a considerable problem. The quotas granted oil importers have been revised upward several times by the Department of the Interior—the executive establishment unit charged with responsibility for this program. The basis on which these revisions were made seem to have always been nebulous at best; yet a recent development with regard to imported residual oil indicates that the entire program of mandatory controls is now in jeopardy.

The development to which I refer is the decision of the Department of the Interior, on April 9, to grant additional quotas for the importation of residual oil for the months of April, May, and June 1960, despite the fact that reasonable quotas for the period January through June 1960 had already been established by that Department.

This increase appears to have been made in response to the pleas of several large oil importers who had unwisely, I believe, used up the greater part of their 6-month allowance in the months of January and February alone. The damage done the domestic coal industry—an industry of vital importance to the State of West Virginia, as well as many other States of the Union—by this quota augmentation is very serious. At a time when the coal industry is fighting for survival this decision could have far-reaching effects.

Recently, a significant letter was sent by Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, which I comment to my colleagues. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We continue to hear disturbing rumors, perhaps inspired by international oil importing interests, that there may be an increase in residual oil import quotas for the remainder of the present 6 months' quota period. We want again to call your attention to the serious effect such action would have on the 2 million American people in this country who are dependent on the domestic coal industry.

We find it hard to believe that our Government could seriously consider an increase in quotas, which are already 26 percent higher than the level of 1957 established in the President's proclamation of mandatory controls last year, merely to meet a situation brought about by the frantic sales efforts of three or four giant international oil companies seeking to extend their markets.

It is obvious that a few of these large international companies, who have imprudently exhausted much of their half year's quotas while creating an artificial demand through sales well below listed prices, are using this rigged situation to claim that shortages will soon deprive many users of essential fuels, and are thus putting tremendous pressure on your Department further to increase allocations between now and June 30.

We do not refer to the many companies who, as Mr. Bennett pointed out in his recent letter to the president of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), have "fully met" a "responsibility equal to that of the Government in connection with this (program), as with other national security programs." Instead, the present situation has been created by a few companies which have expended a large percentage of their quotas in the first 3 months, and are now exerting pressures for an allotment increase which would virtually wreck the import control program and would be disastrous to the domestic coal and domestic oil industries.

We trust that imperative considerations of the welfare of millions of Americans, as well as of national security, will prevail and that these attacks on the President's mandatory control program will be unsuccessful.

Indeed, we believe the facts prove that, instead of increasing import quotas, the amount of residual oil now being permitted to be imported into this country should be materially reduced.

When the President was forced to impose mandatory quotas on petroleum and petroleum products in March in 1959, following unsuccessful attempts to limit imports voluntarily, his proclamation provided that the imports of residual fuel oil should not exceed the level of imports of that product into district I–IV during the calendar year 1957 (or 343,445 barrels per day.) The mandatory program was extended to residual oil because of a finding by the President that unrestricted imports posed a threat to the national security.

Twice since then the Department of the Interior, by administrative decision as permitted in a revision of the President's proclamation, has increased quotas above the 1957 level so that present quotas permit the import of 425,000 barrels daily. On an annual basis, this is the equivalent of 38 million tons of coal, compared to 30 million tons lost to imported residual oil in 1957.

The loss of this tonnage is a severe economic blow to the domestic coal industry. Recent press stories have pointed to the pitiful plight of thousands of unemployed coal miners in this country, and any further inroads on coal's markets by cheap imported residual could only add to their suffering. Also, it should be realized that the effect of this unemployment spreads widely throughout the communities and areas in which it exists—to merchants, school and tax districts, transportation agencies, service establishments and all who depend secondarily on a healthy coal industry for their prosperity.

Mr. George H. Love, chairman of the National Coal Policy Conference and chairman of the board of Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, recently told the annual dinner of the conference that residual imported at a level higher than that for 1957 would "tend to put the coal industry and railroads on a standby basis, and on such a basis there is no way to maintain either of them."

"Certainly the threat of war prevents us from letting our country become dependent on these importations, but even without war, governments and circumstances can change and foreign oil sources be cut off," he pointed out.

In view of all these facts, we think that the Oil Import Administration and the Department of the Interior should give serious consideration to an immediate reduction on quotas to no more than the 1957 levels originally contemplated in the President's proclamation.

Since the heavy burn season is now ending for this year, demand will be considerably less for the next several months, even despite the new consumption recently stimulated by the price-cutting marketing activities of certain importers. Therefore, we urge that the next quotas be set for a 3-month period beginning July 1, and be based on a 1957 level (daily) seasonally adjusted downward to allow for the normally low consumption during the summer. If this resulted in any legitimate shortage of stocks by fall, ample time would remain to rebuild them for heavy winter demand beginning in October.

Meantime, however, such a firm stand by the Department of the Interior would serve to convince these few large international oil companies that they must meet their responsibilities to the Nation and to national security.

It would likewise be of tremendous encouragement to the millions of American citizens dependent on the domestic fuels industries and to all those seriously concerned with a self-sufficiency of dependable fuel within our borders to meet any demands of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I request also that a joint statement issued to the Associated Press, April 10, 1960, by my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and me, in response to an inquiry, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following Mr. Moody's letter to Secretary Seaton.

There being no objection, the joint statement by the Senators from West Virginia was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Joint statement by Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrats, of West Virginia, April 10, 1960)

UNITED STATES BOOSTS IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL OIL

The Government yesterday boosted import levels for residual fuel oil by 12 million barrels for the April 1–June 30 period.

The action came shortly after the National Coal Policy Conference asked Congress and the Interior Department to investigate what it called efforts to sabotage the oil import control program. In is protest it named the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Texaco, Inc., and Hess, Inc.—the Nation's three largest residual oil importers.

The increase for the area east of the Rocky Mountains was announced by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. He said it was needed because of higher than anticipated demands resulting from coal weather in March and the "irregular marketing pattern of a few major importers."

(After publication of the above, the Associated Press asked for comment from the Members of the U.S. Senate from West Virginia, and in response Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD jointly issued the statement below:)

"The 12-million barrel increase in the April through June quota for residual oil imports is, of course, a disappointing development because it highlights the fact that the Secretary of Interior has relied too much on voluntary response by the international oil companies to the mandatory quota system.

"But out of this situation the Senators from West Virginia were assured Saturday, April 9, during a conference with Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton and his principal assistants, that major changes in departmental policy for administration of the import controls will be ordered.

"The most significant of the revamped procedures impending, we were told, will be a shortening of the period for which quotas will be set from the present semiannual arrangement to a quarterly basis.

"This change, while potentially helpful, we suggested to the Interior officials, will not be effective unless the Department more stringently controls inventory replacements such as the 12-million barrel addition just authorized for the April through June period.

"Assurances were given in response to this suggestion, that the Interior Department will establish a plan for bringing inventory buildup within the quarterly quotas—and hopefully at 1957 import levels. Unless this is accomplished we will consider the quota system breached and we will suggest corrective procedures."

Proposed International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald published an editorial calling attention to the proposed International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that this brief but pointed editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1960]

HAWAII MEETING PLACE

Indications are mounting of impressive bipartisan congressional support as well as stronger backing from the administration for the early launching of an international study center in Hawaii. This is good news, coming after Secretary Herter's disappointingly vague endorsement in February of the proposal to establish an institution in which students from Occident and Orient could study together and compare cultural experiences and viewpoints. But there is still danger that the plan may become submerged—and its value may be largely lost—in the mutual security legislation to which it may be attached. Properly the so-called East-West center ought to be wholly free from cold war considerations, although there is no doubt that an ambitious Soviet undertaking along somewhat different lines has given impetus to the American plan.

Missile Monitor Soon in Europe With U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a release concerning the development and operation of the missile monitor:

MISSILE MONITOR SOON IN EUROPE WITH U.S. ARMY

Missile monitor, the first mobile electronic air defense missile fire direction system, is now being deployed to operational sites with the U.S. Army in Europe, officials of the Army and the Hughes Aircraft Co. announced today.

This completes deployment of the first missile monitor begun about a year ago with the AN/MSQ-18 battalion-level elements of the system, and will provide initial operational test information concerning on-site capabilities of the system.

Designed to operate on a 24-hour alert, the missile monitor system employs digital computer techniques for rapid and accurate information handling.

"The missile monitor system eliminates the old grease-pencil plotting and voice-telling methods to provide intelligence to air defense units. For the first time the field army has a transistorized digital control complex which permits the commanders at all echelons to observe and influence the air battle," Lt. Gen. John C. Oakes, the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, said.

Missile monitor can pass information many times faster than manual voice-telling systems, and with much greater accuracy and less delay.

Designated AN/MSG-4 by the Army, the missile monitor can detect, track, and store information on large numbers of airborne targets within a vast surveillance volume. Targets are automatically tracked by the digital computer while weapon-assignment information is flashed through the network to the missile batteries. There, Hawk or Nike missiles may be launched to destroy the attacking airplanes.

"The missile monitor is a field-tested system capable of being modified to keep pace with the rapidly changing requirements of military science. It not only effectively directs the fire of today's missile weapons to meet today's offensive threats, but is designed for easy modification to cope with future threats as well," C. Harper Brubaker, a Hughes vice president said.

The heart of missile monitor is a corps-level air-defense command post which provides a comprehensive and accurate picture of both friendly and hostile aircraft throughout the defended zone. The command post consists of Hughes-built electronic equipment mounted in standard Army trucks and vans.

The eye of missile monitor is Frescanar, a unique three-dimensional data radar developed by Hughes for the U.S. Army Signal Corps, which provides range, bearing, and altitude simultaneously on hundreds of airborne targets with only one antenna, receiver, and transmitter. Conventional radars require two or more complete systems to provide 3-D information on a limited number of airplanes.

Other trailer-mounted units at the command post include a radar equipment trailer which houses the transmitter and receiver of the Frescanar, a radar processing center, weapons monitoring center, and associated diesel-driven power supply trailers.

The radar data processing center houses the digital computer with its associated memory drum and six detector-tracker radar screen consoles. Targets are detected on the radar-video display, identified as friend or foe, and automatically tracked. The number of aircraft within a multiple-blip video return (raid-size estimate) is also estimated here.

The digital computer employs a track-while-scan technique to produce data on a large number of targets. The digital track data generated by the computer is stored in a Hughes-developed memory drum, then converted to analog form for display as track-marker symbols on the detector-tracker consoles. This digital data, including the target's range, bearing, height, and identity, is flashed to the weapons monitoring center by means of an automatic data link.

The weapons monitoring center contains four large-screen consoles to provide corps-level command personnel with a complete graphic picture of the ground-to-air battle in the zone of defense as well as the status of all Nike and Hawk missile batteries in the missile monitor network.

From the weapons monitoring center, the main line of electronic conversation leads to four or more remote battalion-level operations centrals mounted on 2½-ton trucks. There, battalion commanders observe the air battle on two large radar display screens.

Each operations central has electronic lines of communication connecting directly to four or more Nike or Hawk missile batteries via Hughes-built coder-decoder group equipment, also mounted on 2½-ton trucks. These units may be dispersed over a wide area as required.

Battalion commanders may stand by as missile firing orders are transmitted direct from the corps-level weapons monitoring center, or may assign missile batteries to specific targets as desired to meet a changing tactical situation.

The coder-decoder group is an unmanned unit which converts the digital target assignment and position data to analog form for use by currently operational missiles. Information can be sent from the weapons monitoring center to the missile battery in the millionth part of a second, eliminating the element of human error in the old voice-telling technique, and assuring rapid destruction of attacking airplanes.

Each operations central and missile battery has its own relatively short range radar which feeds information into the system. Thus, in an emergency, a fragmented system could continue to meet an aggressive threat effectively.

Lines of electronic communication are arranged so that elements of the system may communicate with each other. Information flowing from the air-defense command post through operations central to the battery includes track data on the assigned targets, and weapons assignments. The battery sends a constant flow of information back through operations central to air-defense command post on firing readiness reports, coordinates of the engaged target, and hostile airplane destruction results.

Jesus, the Perfect Man; a Perfect Tribute by the Late C. P. Mooney of the Memphis Commercial Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the Easter season upon us, this is a particularly fitting time for all of us to reflect over the life of the greatest man in the history of mankind.

One of the most beautiful and meaningful writings on the teaching of Christ and His impact on civilization was penned by C. P. Mooney of the Commercial Appeal (Memphis, Tenn.), just before Christmas in 1912. I have heard many tributes to C. P. Mooney by Boyce House, the author, who formerly worked with him.

The column, entitled "Jesus, the Perfect Man," has been reprinted and reread countless times since, usually around Christmas. But, I believe it is just as appropriate for study at Easter.

Recently I reread this timeless and extraordinarily powerful column in the Cotton Digest, a nationally circulated trade journal of the cotton industry, for last December. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column, "Jesus, the Perfect Man."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESUS, THE PERFECT MAN

There is no other character in history like that of Jesus.

As a preacher, as a doer of things, and as a philosopher, no man ever had the sweep and vision of Jesus.

A human analysis of the human actions of Jesus brings to view a rule of life that is amazing in its perfect detail.

The system of ethics Jesus taught during His earthy sojourn more than 2,000 years ago was true then, has been true in every century since and will be true forever.

Plato was a great thinker and learned in his age, but his teachings did not stand the test of time. In big things and in little things time and human experience have shown that he erred.

Marcus Aurelius touched the reflective mind of the world, but he was as cold and austere as brown marble.

The doctrine of Confucius gave a great nation moral and mental dry rot.

The teachings of Buddha resulted in mental and moral chaos that makes India derelict.

Mohammed offered a system of ethics which was adopted by millions of people. Now their children live in deserts where once there were cities, along dry rivers where once there was moisture, and in the shadows of gray, barren hills where once there was greenness.

Thomas Aquinas was a profound philosopher, but parts of his system have been abandoned.

Francis of Assissi was Christlike in his saintliness, but in some things he was childish.

Thomas Kempis' Imitation of Christ is a thing of rare beauty and sympathy, but it is, as its name indicates, only an imitation.

Sir Thomas More's Utopia is yet a dream that cannot be realized.

Lord Bacon writing on chemistry and medicine under the glasses of the man working in a 20th century laboratory is puerile.

The world's most learned doctors until a hundred and fifty years ago gave dragon's blood and the ground dried tails of lizards and shells of eggs for certain ailments. The great surgeons a hundred years ago bled a man if he was wounded.

Napoleon had the world at his feet for 4 years, and when he died the world was going on its way as if he had never lived.

Jesus taught little as to property because He knew there were things of more importance than property. He measured property and life, the body and soul, at their exact relative value. He taught much as to character, because character is of more importance than dollars.

Other men taught us to develop systems of government. Jesus taught so as to perfect the minds of men. Jesus looked to the soul, while other men dwelled on material things.

After the experience of more than 2,000 years no man can find a flaw in the governmental system outlined by Jesus.

Czar and kaiser, president and socialist, give to its complete merit their admiration.

No man today, no matter whether he follows the doctrine of Mills, Marx, or George as to property, can find a false principle in Jesus' theory of property.

In the duty of a man to his fellowmen no sociologist has ever approximated the perfection of the doctrine laid down by Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount.

Not all of the investigation of chemists, not all the discoveries of explorers, not all the experience of rulers, not all the historical facts that go to make up the sum of human knowledge on this day in 1912 are in contradiction to one word uttered or one principle laid down by Jesus.

The human experiences of more than 2,000 years show that Jesus never made a mistake. Jesus never uttered a doctrine that was true at that time and then became obsolete.

Jesus spoke the truth; He lived the truth and truth is eternal.

History has no record of any other man leading a perfect life or doing everything in logical order. Jesus is the only person whose every action and whose every utterance strike a true note in the heart and mind of every man born of woman. He never said a foolish thing, never did a foolish act, and never dissembled.

No poet, no dreamer, no philosopher loved humanity with the love that Jesus bore toward all men.

Who, then, was Jesus?

He could not have been merely a man, for there never was a man who had two consecutive thoughts absolute in truthful perfection.

Jesus might have been what Christendom proclaims Him to be—a divine being—or He could not have been what He was. No mind but an infinite mind could have left behind those things which Jesus gave to the world as a heritage.

Government Hit for Inaction on Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cotton Trade Journal of April 8, 1960:

COMER HITS U.S. INACTION REGARDING IMPORT FLOOD

(By Donald Comer, chairman of the executive committee, Avondale Mills)

The danger threatening us by Japan's cotton exports has been told over and over again by many leaders in our industry—Bob Jackson, Charles Cannon, Bob Stevens, Jim Chapman, Craig Smith, Floyd Jefferson, Leon Lowenstein, W. J. Erwin, Halbert Jones, W. F. Sullivan, Stanford Seabury, Ray Bell and, of course, many others, as well as many of our friends of the press and of the Congress.

The J. P. Stevens Co. recently took page newspaper ads to tell "The Influence of Uncontrolled Textile Imports on Our Economy," and ran this in 33 different papers.

All the facts should be put before every Member of Congress and before groups that these Congressmen represent and to the members of the legislatures of our several States, to the end that a commanding leadership will develop in the Congress that will not stop until the matter is fairly settled.

To quote from a recent meeting of GATT in Tokyo, "It was generally recognized that although exports of manufactured goods from the low-cost producing countries may in certain instances, create serious economic and social problems in the importing countries and it is essential to adopt liberal rather than restrictive policies to overcome those difficulties."

HEART OF PROBLEM

These two words, "liberal" and "restrictive" bring us to the heart of our problem. Let's review the matter: The present law governing our foreign trade was fathered by Secretary Hull in 1934.

It was interpreted by Mr. Hull as "nations swapping what each had in overabundance that the other needed with some three-way trading." This was called Hull's Reciprocal Trade Agreement.

When President Eisenhower asked for a renewal of this law he wrote Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts, that it would be administered without injury to a single American industry.

The Eisenhower claim was that we were protected by peril-point appeals to the Tariff Commission. In the past, more often than not, he has refused to accept their findings.

Recently, because of our continued complaint, he has asked the Tariff Commission to give our industry a hearing. His assistants have sold Japan our cotton at 8 cents a pound less than it costs us.

The fact that this cotton is to be manufactured into cloth by Japan at a labor cost one-tenth of ours, Senator THURMOND of South Carolina, with Senators EASTLAND, BYRD, RUSSELL, HOLLAND, MCCLELLAN, and STENNIS, asked that this hearing also include possible injury because of wage differential.

The President has just denied Senator THURMOND'S request and now we are asked to engage lawyers and to send our executive officers to Washington to prove that this situation will wreck our industry.

Arguing this injury because of the cotton differential is like being forced to go through an expensive hearing to prove that in boxing it is unfair to tie one contestant's hand behind his back. Their refusing even to allow us an argument about the wage differential is like arguing no injury in a boxing contest where both hands of one contestant are tied.

FAVORS FOREIGN TRADE

After all this waiting, the Tariff Commission began the hearing March 1. We feel, though, that our case is so obvious that in time we can win it. There are those of us, though, who feel that time is running out and we are afraid the ambulance will come before the doctor. Neither the original intention nor the President's promise has been kept.

We favor foreign trade on a reciprocal basis. We welcome original style, new ideas, new models—any improvements—but we are objecting, and with heaven's help, we will continue to resist the invasion of our market with goods, in imitation of ours, made with hours, ages and wages so far below ours.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS asked one of our committeemen how much longer we would be before our Congress asking for help—and I replied by asking him how much longer was the Congress, which continued to fix our wages, ages and standards (the highest in the world), going to sell our cotton to our competitors at 8 cents a pound cheaper than to us.

The administration charges American mills the parity price which they pay the farmers for our cotton. They sell this same cotton to Japan at 8 cents a pound less the world price—and this loss becomes a burden on all American taxpayers, including us.

Japan manufacturers our cotton, which she needs, with wages one-tenth of ours and the administration in Washington admits these imports, which we don't need, into our market. This is not reciprocal trade.

If Japan shipped us her tea and raw silk in payment for our raw cotton, that would be "reciprocal." As a matter of interest, Avondale maintains a highway rest station with a wading pool and a sand box, with an adjacent display and sales shop for our products.

We try to make this a convenient stopping point for the traveling public from the North and West to the South, and from here and yonder, and we advertise a cup of free Japanese tea to any friends who stop to see and to rest.

If Japan shipped her cotton goods to southeast Asia and took her pay in tin, rubber, etc., or shipped her goods to South America and took her pay in bauxite, nitrates, coffee, bananas, etc., and shipped those things to us, that would be "three-way trading."

You recall that Mr. Kogiro Abe, a Japanese spinner, asked "Why Mr. Comer is not willing to live and let live?" and I answered that we were willing to go a step farther and "live and help live," and had agreed to accept a quota of his goods—100 billion yards a year—not a yard of which we needed and which would shut down some of our machinery.

I asked Mr. Abe what Japan had done to our velveteen, tuna fish and hardwood plywood industries and his growing threat to our chinaware, textile and garment manufacturers, and so on and on. I have had no answer.

To my mind our case is very clear and the administration continues in its failure to carry out his promise. Senator SPARKMAN made these same charges in a Senate debate.

We are spending $40 billion annually against the threat of a possible invasion by soldiers, while our real threat is the increasing invasion of things right now.

The President promised us restrictive measures, but his assistants have chosen the

"liberal" procedure. This is why we find it necessary to ask that the whole thing be taken out of the hands of the administration and be put back into the hands of Congress.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Kearns, in a recent speech in North Carolina, indicated a policy of trading the life of one American industry because of his foreign imports in order that another American industry might live.

If my head is to be chopped off for the benefit of some foreign business, and if the claim is that it is for the general welfare, I want Congress to act and not the "Bureau Choppers" in the administration.

The Congress right now is debating the question of increasing our minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25 and a news item from the Associated Press has this comment: "The idea behind the law is that setting a floor under wages can assure workers that minimum income can protect employees from unfair competition from rival firms paying substandard wage rates."

Our American minimum wages and standards are fixed by our Government. The price of our cotton is fixed by our Government. These are the highest standards in the world. They help create a purchasing power that every foreign manufacturer looks at with hungry eyes.

I know of no farmer who provides a lush pasture for his cows who does not put a fence around it to protect it from encroachment (and may I add, let the farmer be sure that the fence is an American fence, for there is a lot of foreign wire coming in right now).

We resent the continuing effort of the administration to give grazing entrance permits to this, our pasture.

Our industrial wages, our subsidized farm income, are largely responsible for this purchasing power, and it is not the administration's right to trade it away except on a truly reciprocal basis.

Mr. Kearns, in his speech, mentioned other home troubles that plagued our industry, and Jim Chapman asked him how that justified another blow from him with his Asiatic imports. Mr. Kearns mentioned that there were some 2 billion underprivileged and underclad people in the world. Why not clothe these people with Asiatic goods, with our help if necessary?

We give our money to feed the hungry; why not clothe the naked, also? Japan should look for new customers and not try to crowd our already oversupplied market.

Senator KEATING, of New York, has introduced legislation to help correct this situation and is having support from Members of the Senate and the House.

I believe that Japan and our State Department should actively encourage visitors to Japan. Our tourist dollars could help bridge this trade gap.

I am hoping that what I am writing here will encourage our friends to do what is needed to protect an American industry—weaving, and garment making, employing over 2 million people, and which, profitwise, is 20th on the list of American industries, and, may I add, it is later than some Americans think.

Resolution on Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as our Nation attempts to defeat the powerful Communist campaign to rule the world, it is always welcome to learn of individuals and organizations who are voluntarily dedicating their services to combating this menace.

Through the years, a great many of our veterans and their organizations—comprised of members who have known firsthand the battles, heroism and sacrifices, in effect, the real meaning of a "hot war"—have also been in the forefront of efforts to strengthen our country during the cold war era.

Among other efforts, there has been a realistic attempt to inspire greater zeal, devotion to duty, willingness to sacrifice, awareness of the need for dedicating manpower and resources to preserving our way of life.

We recognize, of course, that in addition to dedication to the high principles, our citizens will need to translate their patriotism into realistic action programs that create a greater, stronger America.

There are, of course, many ways of inspiring our citizens to greater dedication to our way of life.

Recently, Trier-Puddy Post 75 of the American Legion, of Fond du Lac, Wis., adopted a resolution, originated by Victor T. Broome, proposing that the Nation during the period February 12 to February 22 observe Americanism Days in each year. The purpose would be to encourage the people of the Nation to rededicate themselves to our national ideals.

Reflective of the kind of grassroots patriots necesssary for preserving our freedom—finding its voice, as many times in the past, through the American Legion—I wish to bring this action to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution accompanied by a detailed, informative article from the Commonwealth Reporter, of Fond du Lac, Wis., printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is prevalent in the world today those who are openly and avowedly advocating the overthrow of all forms of government in favor of communism; and

Whereas ignorance of our Communist adversaries is our greatest weakness in our struggle against the Soviet conspiracy to overthrow our Government and way of life; and

Whereas the American Legion has, through its thousands of veteran members, been dedicated to the preservation of our form of government against all aggressors; and

Whereas the principles of the American way of life are personified in the exemplary lives of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln whose birthdays occur in the month of February; and

Whereas we believe the most effective method of combating the present threat to our way of life is by observing a period of rededication of ourselves as Americans to our democratic form of government as embodied in the patriotism exhibited by two of our greatest Presidents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the period commencing on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, and concluding with Washington's Birthday, February 22, of each year, be designated as "Americanism Days" by the Federal Government, to be observed annually by the Nation as a whole. That during such periods of rededication to Americanism, all organizations be urged to exert extraordinary efforts to apprise their members of the vitally serious nature of the Communist threat to our Nation of free people under God.

LEGION SEEKS NEW FIGHT ON SOVIET THEORY—POST RESOLUTION ALSO ASKS NATIONAL REDEDICATION TO AMERICAN IDEALS

Trier-Puddy Post 75 resolution originated by Victor T. Broome, 530 East Second Street, asking that the Nation annually rededicate itself to Americanism and the reappraisal of the threat of communism, was launched on its way through American Legion channels this week. Membership of the local post adopted the resolution Thursday night.

The period February 12–22 was selected because it falls between the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington.

The next steps for consideration of the resolution will be at the county council and sixth district levels. The goal is to have the resolution adopted at the American Legion's national convention in Miami, Fla., in August.

Broome's resolution contends that there is prevalent in the world today those who are openly and avowedly advocating the overthrow of all forms of government in favor of communism and that ignorance of the Nation's Communist adversaries is its greatest weakness in the struggle against the Soviet conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government and way of life.

"The American Legion has, through its thousands of veteran members, been dedicated to the preservation of our form of government against all aggressors and the principles of the American way of life are personified in the exemplary lives of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln whose birthdays occur in the month of February," the resolution continues. "We believe the most effective method of combating the present threat to our way of life is by observing a period of rededication of ourselves as Americans to our democratic form of government as embodied in the patriotism exhibited by two of our greatest Presidents."

The resolution then asked that it be resolved, "That the period commencing on Lincoln's birthday, February 12, and concluding with Washington's birthday, February 22, of each year, be designated as Americanism Days by the Federal Government to be observed annually by the Nation as a whole and that during such periods of rededication to Americanism, all organizations be urged to exert extraordinary efforts to apprise their members of the vitally serious nature of the Communist threat to our Nation of free people under God."

David M. Kuter, past commander and executive board member, was named to be contact representative to the advisory committee of Herman Nimmer, Winneconne, district commander.

In other action during the post meeting at the American Legion clubhouse, the membership decided again to offer for sale their cafeteria at Fairgrounds Park.

National Library Week Emphasizes the Importance of the Freedom To Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recent observance of National Library Week has afforded the opportunity to reaffirm the basic and indispensable contribution of literature to the growth and

vitality of our free society. In drawing attention to the historic link between freedom to read and the strength of democracy, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of April 3 has printed a most timely and significant statement sponsored by the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITHOUT FREEDOM TO READ, DEMOCRACY DIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following powerful statement in behalf of the freedom to read was sponsored by the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers' Council. Nothing we could say editorially could add a thing to this sharp attack on censorship and cogent defense of one of our foremost freedoms. The statement, written almost 7 years ago, is printed in observation of National Library Week.)

The freedom to read is essential to our democracy. It is under attack. Private groups and public authorities in various parts of the country are working to remove books from sale, to censor textbooks, to label "controversial" books, to distribute lists of "objectionable" books or authors, and to purge libraries.

These actions apparently rise from a view that our national tradition of free expression is no longer valid; that censorship and suppression are needed to avoid the subversion of politics and the corruption of morals. We, as citizens devoted to the use of books and as librarians and publishers responsible for disseminating them, wish to assert the public interest in the preservation of the freedom to read.

We are deeply concerned about these attempts at suppression. Most such attempts rest on a denial of the fundamental premise of democracy—that the ordinary citizen, by exercising his critical judgment, will accept the good and reject the bad. The censors, public and private, assume that they should determine what is good and what is bad for their fellow citizens.

We trust Americans to recognize propaganda and to reject obscenity. We do not believe they need the help of censors to assist them in this task. We do not believe they are prepared to sacrifice their heritage of a free press in order to be "protected" against what others think may be bad for them. We believe they still favor free enterprise in ideas and expression.

We are aware, of course, that books are not alone in being subjected to efforts at suppression. We are aware that these efforts are related to a larger pattern of pressures being brought against education, the press, films, radio, and television. The problem is not only one of actual censorship. The shadow of fear cast by these pressures leads, we suspect, to an even larger voluntary curtailment of expression by those who seek to avoid controversy.

Such pressure toward conformity is perhaps natural to a time of uneasy change and pervading fear. Especially when so many of our apprehensions are directed against an ideology, the expression of a dissident idea becomes a thing feared in itself, and we tend to move against it as against a hostile deed, with suppression.

And yet suppression is never more dangerous than in such a time of social tension. Freedom has given the United States the elasticity to endure strain. Freedom keeps open the path of novel and creative solutions, and enables change to come by choice. Every silencing of a heresy, every enforcement of an orthodoxy, diminishes the toughness and resilience of our society and leaves it the less able to deal with stress.

Now, as always in our history, books are among our greatest instruments of freedom. They are almost the only means for making generally available ideas or manners of expression that can initially command only a small audience. They are the natural medium for the new idea and the untried voice from which come the original contributions to social growth. They are essential to the extended discussion which serious thought requires, and to the accumulation of knowledge and ideas into organized collections.

We believe that free communication is essential to the preservation of a free society and a creative culture. We believe that these pressures toward conformity present the danger of limiting the range and variety of inquiry and expression on which our democracy and our culture depend. We believe that every American community must jealously guard the freedom to publish and to circulate, in order to preserve its own freedom to read. We believe that publishers and librarians have a profound responsibility to give validity to that freedom to read by making it possible for the readers to choose freely from a variety of offerings.

The freedom to read is guaranteed by the Constitution. Those with faith in freemen will stand firm on these constitutional guarantees of essential rights and will exercise the responsibilities that accompany these rights.

1. It is in the public interest for publishers and librarians to make available the widest diversity of views and expressions, including those which are unorthodox or unpopular with the majority.

Creative thought is by definition new, and what is new is different. The bearer of every new thought is a rebel until his idea is refined and tested. Totalitarian systems attempt to maintain themselves in power by the ruthless suppression of any concept which challenges the established orthodoxy.

2. Publishers and librarians do not need to endorse every idea or presentation contained in the books they make available. It would conflict with the public interest for them to establish their own political, moral or esthetic views as the sole standard for determining what books should be published or circulated.

Publishers and librarians serve the educational process by helping to make available knowledge and ideas required for the growth of the mind and the increase of learning. They do not foster education by imposing as mentors the patterns of their own thought. The people should have the freedom to read and consider a broader range of ideas than those that may be held by any single librarian or publisher or government or church. It is wrong that what one man can read should be confined to what another thinks proper.

3. It is contrary to the public interest for publishers or librarians to determine the acceptability of a book solely on the basis of the personal history or political affiliations of the author.

A book should be judged as a book. No art or literature can flourish if it is to be measured by the political views or private lives of its creators. No society of free men can flourish which draws up lists of writers to whom it will not listen, whatever they may have to say.

4. The present laws dealing with obscenity should be vigorously enforced. Beyond that, there is no place in our society for extralegal efforts to coerce the taste of others, to confine adults to the reading matter deemed suitable for adolescents, or to inhibit the efforts of writers to achieve artistic expression.

To some, much of modern literature is shocking. But is not much of life itself shocking? We cut off literature at the source if we prevent serious artists from dealing with the stuff of life. Parents and teachers have a responsibility to prepare the young to meet the diversity of experiences in life to which they will be exposed as they have a responsibility to help them learn to think critically for themselves.

These are affirmative responsibilities, not to be discharged simply by preventing them from reading works for which they are not yet prepared. In these matters taste differs, and taste cannot be legislated; nor can machinery be devised which will suit the demands of one group without limiting the freedom of others. We deplore the catering to the immature, the retarded or the maladjusted taste. But those concerned with freedom have the responsibility of seeing to it that each individual book or publication, whatever its contents, price or method of distribution, is dealt with in accordance with due process of law.

5. It is not in the public interest to force a reader to accept with any book the prejudgment of a label characterizing the book or author as subversive or dangerous.

The ideal of labeling presupposes the existence of individuals or groups with wisdom to determine by authority what is good or bad for the citizen. It presupposes that each individual must be directed in making up his mind about the ideas he examines. But Americans do not need others to do their thinking for them.

6. It is the responsibility of publishers and librarians, as guardians of the people's freedom to read, to contest encroachments upon that freedom by individuals or groups seeking to impose their own standards or tastes upon the community at large.

It is inevitable in the give and take of the democratic process that the political, the moral, or the esthetic concepts of an individual or group will occasionally collide with those of another individual or group.

In a free society each individual is free to determine for himself what he wishes to read, and each group is free to determine what it will recommend to its freely associated members. But no group has the right to take the law into its own hands, and to impose its own concept of politics or morality upon other members of a democratic society. Freedom is no freedom if it is accorded only to the accepted and the inoffensive.

7. It is the responsibility of publishers and librarians to give full meaning to the freedom to read by providing books that enrich the quality of thought and expression. By the exercise of this affirmative responsibility, bookmen can demonstrate that the answer to a bad book is a good one, the answer to a bad idea is a good one.

We state these propositions neither lightly nor as easy generalizations. We here stake out a lofty claim for the value of books. We do so because we believe that they are good, possessed of enormous variety and usefulness, worthy of cherishing and keeping free. We realize that the application of these propositions may mean the dissemination of ideas and manners of expression that are repugnant to many persons.

We do not state these propositions in the comfortable belief that what people read is unimportant. We believe rather that what people read is deeply important; that ideas can be dangerous; but that the suppression of ideas is fatal to a democratic society. Freedom itself is a dangerous way of life, but it is ours.

Secretary Herter's Stand on Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an editorial published in the Chicago American of April 5, 1960, regarding Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's stand relative to the continuation of disarmament talks and the German problem is both appropriate and timely.

The editorial points out the wisdom of a firm adherence to basic western principles as we approach the summit conference.

I believe the Chicago American editorial is informative and instructive, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FIRM, CALM HERTER

In view of the Russians' refusal to consider the West's disarmament plan at Geneva, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's suggestion that they offer a new proposal to keep the negotiations moving is entirely reasonable.

It isn't likely to get a reasonable answer, though. Valerian Zorin, the Russian delegate, probably will only reiterate his demand that the Western nations comply absolutely with the Communist program, which calls for total world disarmament in 4 years—with no provisions for insuring that everybody really will disarm.

Yesterday the disarmament conference entered its fourth week without any advance toward a compromise between the West's demands for a census of forces, inspections, and international armed supervision, and the Russians' proposal that the West take their word for everything.

It was that failure to progress that Herter had in mind when he addressed the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago, observing that while the Geneva Conference on nuclear tests has come near reaching an agreement that could be a "historic turning point" in the quest for arms control, the disarmament meeting itself had come to a standstill.

This, as Herter pointed out, is only one of the deadlocks dividing the East and West as next month's summit conference approaches. Khrushchev is still insisting that the West must settle the West Berlin dispute on his terms—which would surrender the people of West Berlin to Communist enslavement—or he will make a separate peace with Communist East Germany.

Herter's assurance that the West will continue to insist that the whole future of Germany be settled—and settled by decision of the peoples of West and East Germany together, in a popular vote—was cheering evidence that the United States is not softening in response to British Prime Minister Macmillan's arguments for more "flexibility" in negotiating with the Russians. It seems clear that the United States is approaching the summit with a resolute dedication to its principles.

As Herter remarked, it is almost a year since he succeeded the late John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. He has fitted smoothly into this tremendously difficult job.

Aside from this country's struggle with the Communist bloc in Europe, there are also seething tensions in Asia, South America, and Africa. None of them has eased much anywhere, and each of them must have the constant and alert attention of the Secretary of State.

To keep up with such demands, a man must have, in addition to understanding and intelligence, an objective outlook and a reasonable degree of imperturbability. Herter's performance makes it clear that he has these qualities.

Proposed Repeal of the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Abdication of Rights," published on March 3, in the Hardin County (Ky.) Enterprise.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABDICATION OF RIGHTS

Two resolutions, now pending before the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives would, if passed, strike a powerful blow at the rights of this Nation and its citizens. One is Senator HUMPHREY'S Senate Resolution 94, and its House Joint Resolution 558 was introduced on January 19 by Congressman HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.

These resolutions provide that the Connally amendment to the statute of the International Court of Justice be repealed. That amendment reserved to the United States the right to make its own decision as to whether or not a subject of litigation lies within its own domestic jurisdiction.

The dangerous and radical resolutions now pending before both Houses of the Congress would "grant the consent of the United States to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to determine whether or not disputes before that Court involve matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

Just how crazy can some of our lawmakers get? These resolutions, if passed, would confer upon a foreign body the power to determine its judicial jurisdiction with respect to this Nation. This is a power that has not been granted to any court in the United States, either Federal or State. These courts determine their jurisdiction only insofar as is provided by constitutional and statutory law.

Even so, within the past 30 years the United States has seen its highest court, the Supreme Court, mix sociological and political concepts with its judicial decisions. This shows how dangerous it would be to give the World Court the power to designate its own jurisdiction.

In a strong protest against passage of the resolutions, made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mrs. Wilson King Barnes, chairman of the National Defense Committee of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, had this to say:

"The Supreme Court, composed of jurists trained in the same legal tradition, limited by the written Constitution to the determination of judicial matters, and applying a definitive body of constitutional and municipal law, has extended its jurisdiction into political and sociological areas. It is reasonable to believe that the International Court of Justice with no definitive body of law, no prior tradition of judicial restraint and with judges trained in different legal systems, and without agreement among themselves as to either the principles of law to be applied or the methods of applying the law, would decide cases upon a political and ideological rather than upon a strictly judicial basis."

So, in brief, if this hodgepodge court has the power to say that it will take jurisdiction over a matter that concerns the rights of the citizens of the United States, and them alone, our liberties could easily be curtailed or abolished, our system of economy be altered at will, by a foreign court. Are we going to buy a mess of pottage like this? We hope not, and we hope that at least a few people will write their Congressman and Senators about it.

Stuart McGregor, Editor of the Texas Almanac for 35 Years, Honored in Journalism Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Stuart M. McGregor is the first living person to be elected to the Journalism Hall of Fame at the University of Texas. He earned the honor.

In 1857, the Galveston News, ancestor of the Dallas News, brought out the first annual Texas Almanac, a compendium of information about Texas, its history, geography, people, economics, industry, education, religion, and, in fact, every facet of Texas life.

The Texas Almanac was published annually from 1857 to 1873, sporadically from then until 1914, when it seemed to lapse.

By the drive, leadership, vision, and energy of Stuart McGregor, publication was resumed in 1925. It has been published annually or biennially ever since. Stuart McGregor has been its editor-in-chief for those 35 years. I have kept a copy of the Texas Almanac on my desk the last 33 of those 35 years. I learned to love the Texas Almanac as a boy, when my father purchased copies of the 1911, 1912, and 1914 Almanacs, during the years of intermittent publication.

Under Stuart McGregor's editorship, the Texas Almanac has expanded from a small octavo of 432 pages in 1925 to a full sized octavo volume of 704 pages in 1959. The quality of content and typographical excellence has improved even more rapidly than the size of the volume.

Not only is the Texas Almanac the best single volume source of information about Texas and all facts of its life, it is also accurate to say that one does not have the proper sources of information about Texas if he fails to keep a copy of the Texas Almanac at hand.

Mr. Stuart McGregor has discharged his editorship responsibilities ably, fairly, and with a high degree of or-

ganized intellectual discrimination. All the 9½ million people of Texas are in his debt, as well as all others needing information about that great commonwealth.

In honoring Stuart McGregor, along with Samuel Bangs, Texas' first printer, the University of Texas' Journalism Hall of Fame has reflected credit on itself.

Stuart McGregor, quiet, modest, unassuming, seldom seen in public or in public print—his name does not even appear on the title page, foreword, preface or in the Texas Almanac, as its editor—has received in his own lifetime an honor justly earned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today an article from the Dallas News of April 3, 1960, entitled "Texas U. Honors Stuart McGregor."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS U. HONORS STUART MCGREGOR

AUSTIN, TEX.—Stuart M. McGregor, "Mr. Texas Almanac," Saturday received plaudits at the University of Texas, the first living member of its journalism hall of fame.

Also a Dallas Morning News editorial writer, McGregor has edited the Texas Almanac since 1925. He is the first journalism graduate of the university here, receiving a master's degree in 1915 after earning a bachelor of arts degree a year earlier.

The journalism department ceremony highlighted a 2-day roundup of ex-students at the University of Texas.

Samuel Bangs, a pioneer Texas printer and newsman who died more than 100 years ago, also was named to the journalism hall of fame. Selections were announced by Paul J. Thompson, director emeritus of the journalism department, and Dr. Joe B. Frantz, historian and journalism graduate, at a meeting of ex-students.

The Texas Almanac was revived in 1925, after a 9-year lapse, at McGregor's insistence. Professor Thompson described the fact book, published by the Dallas Morning News, as of great value to journalists.

Dr. H. Bailey Carroll, director of the Texas Historical Association, termed the Almanac "the finest statistical reflection of Texas and obviously the work of a man who knows how to present facts."

McGregor has been self-effacing in editing the highly regarded book. Once he asked a country editor some questions about his town and county.

The local editor handed McGregor a copy of the Texas Almanac.

"That's the best information I can give you," he said. "It's all in there."

McGregor was born at Coleman in 1892 and worked his way through the State university. He was a Navy flier in World War I, and later a public-relations man for the old Texas Chamber of Commerce, before joining the Dallas Morning News in 1923.

The names of Stuart Malcolm McGregor and Samuel Bangs will be inscribed on plaques in the journalism building, and a scrapbook containing pictures and articles concerning their careers will be on display.

Samuel Bangs came to Texas in 1817 and published newspapers in Corpus Christi, Galveston, and Houston. He died in Kentucky sometime during the early 1850's.

Awards sponsored by two Dallas foundations also were announced Saturday at the University of Texas.

Dr. Philip Levine, associate professor of classical languages, was given a $1,000 award by Alfred L. Bromberg, Miss Mina Bromberg, and Mrs. Maurice Joseph, ex-students from Dallas.

Scholarships from the Clark Foundation were announced for 25 outstanding freshman students, designated as "junior fellows." Dr. Willis M. Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, spoke at the honors day program where the awards were made.

Junior fellows winners included three from Dallas—Elizabeth Ann Hargrove, 304 South Brighton; James Horace Justice, 1738 Crowberry; and Jeanine Anne Watson, 14008 Preston.

Twenty-five are chosen annually from among outstanding freshmen. Besides scholarships, the group receives special library privileges and has special faculty advisers.

Proposed International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Alfred Frankenstein in the magazine section, This World, of the San Francisco Chronicle of April 10 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Frankenstein writes of the proposed International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii. In his article he gives graphic observations of Hawaii as the ideal place for such a center.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEPRINT FOR A CULTURAL CENTER—IN NEED OF A BLESSING

(By Alfred Frankenstein)

Something new is stirring 2,000 miles to the west of San Francisco, where the University of Hawaii is founding an international Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange. So far, this center is in the blueprint stage, but it has a director—Murray Turnbull, former head of the university's art department—it has a letterhead all its own, and it has the blessing of the government of the State. What it needs now is a few strong friends in Congress, for this is no parochial affair.

The center would provide the means of cultural and technical interchange between all the peoples of the free world, with special emphasis on the United States and the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The center would be articulated into a series of specific agencies, including an International College, where students and scholars from all the world would study ideas from all the world; an International Training Facility, making use of Hawaii's government agencies, business houses, and other institutions to provide technical instruction in various fields; an Institute of American Studies for foreign and American students; an Institute of Advanced Studies which, among other things, would stage international conferences for specialists in public health, education, public administration, and other areas; a translation bureau; and a bureau for the organization and management of study-tour whereby Americans may go to Asian countries and Asians to the United States.

The University of Hawaii argues for the proposal in the following terms:

"The concept is simple: that there be established a center whereby students, technical experts, and scholars from all areas can meet for the exchange of information and the development of better understanding. Hawaii can make a contribution in functioning as intermediary. Her role in East-West relations is inherent in the geography and history of the islands. In recent years, the political-social structure and economy of the islands have received international attention as an example of growth for the underdeveloped areas of the world.

"The University of Hawaii, aware of its unique situation, has initiated such major devices for the exchange of ideas on world problems as the East-West Philosophers' Conference, the Conference on Race Relations in World Perspective, the annual Summer Institute on Asia, and the oversea operations program. To bridge language barriers, the university offers courses in the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, and Thai languages as well as French, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish. The island community in addition has been host to Asian Fulbright and Smith-Mundt grantees for six summers and to thousands of Asian trainees under the U.S. International Cooperation Program."

To all of this, I can add only one thing. Two years ago it was my privilege to teach during the summer session at the University of Hawaii where I had a student assistant named Francis who came from the Marshall Islands. One night Francis participated in a Marshall Island war dance which his grandfather danced for real, and the next night he sang Poulenc and Palestrina with the University of Hawaii choir before it set off on a tour of Japan.

Things like that were always happening at the University of Hawaii while I was there. As the university of a territory, it was actually the university of the entire Pacific island world. As the university of a State, its influence can and should be correspondingly expanded.

Resolutions by Central Cooperatives, Inc., of Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout our history, the cooperative movement has made a constructive contribution to improving the economic status of both producers and consumers in our economy.

We recognize, of course, that questions have arisen on a number of aspects of the co-op movement, including size, method of taxation, competition with other businesses, and other challenges.

There is, of course, a real need to find realistic, equitable solutions to these questions.

Within their proper roles, however, I believe that our co-ops will continue to play a highly significant role in our economic life.

Recently, I was pleased to receive from Donald Lehtinen, manager of Central

Cooperatives, Inc., of Superior, Wis., a series of resolutions adopted at their 43d annual meeting.

Through these resolutions, are reflected the voice of more than 75,000 families represented at the annual conference.

Notably, the resolutions pertain not only to issues confronting co-ops, but also a wide variety of other problems confronting our whole Nation.

Reflecting the thinking of these individuals and families on a great number of local and national issues of concern, not only to them, but to the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have several of the resolutions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING, CENTRAL COOPERATIVES, INC., MARCH 28–29, 1960

RESOLUTION 3—COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas cooperatives have for years been handicapped by unfair attacks upon our tax liabilities; be it

Resolved by this 43d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., That all member cooperatives and their individual members pledge themselves to continue to work against any unfair co-op tax legislation that may be introduced in State legislatures or the National Congress.

RESOLUTION 4—YOUTH PROGRAM

Whereas the teenagers of today will lead our co-ops tomorrow; and

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc. has established a college scholarship program to encourage the interest of these teenagers in cooperatives and in the higher education so necessary today; be it therefore

Resolved, That this scholarship program be continued and expanded as funds permit, and that member cooperatives give it their full support.

RESOLUTION 5—CO-OPS ARE ON THE CONSUMER SIDE

Whereas there has been much scandal in the past year concerning various trade practices hurting the consumer; and

Whereas cooperatives have always taken such things as honest weights and measures; sincere, capable buying; freedom from exaggerated list prices; observance of pure food laws, etc. for granted.

We pledge ourselves to continue such honest practices, and we declare that we are unequivocally on the consumers' side, definitely out to fulfill the consumers' desires for quality, fair price, pleasant and courteous service.

We further commend efforts other than our own to properly inform the consumer, and to represent him in the State legislatures and Congress, by groups including consumers testing organizations, information councils, the new consumer associations being formed in several States.

RESOLUTION 6—THE FORAND BILL

Whereas there is a lack of medical and hospital care provided for the aging through existing agencies of insurance;

Whereas life expectancy and longevity is rapidly increasing each year and it is generally agreed that the problem of providing medical care for people on social security is an ever increasing one;

Whereas there is no apparent hope of progress without national action; be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this 43d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., go on record reaffirming our support of H.R. 4700, known as the Forand bill, representing to us either Federal action, or forcing suitable action by such existing agencies of insurance.

RESOLUTION 8—CONSOLIDATION OF SMALL COOPERATIVES

Whereas the modern technique of doing business is changing at an ever increasing rate, based on large volume and fast turnover; and

Whereas distances that used to be a major factor in isolating communities have been overcome by faster methods of transportation and better roads; and

Whereas some of our very smallest cooperatives are by now in operating difficulties and must soon take drastic action to prevent eventual serious loss; be it therefore

Resolved, That this 43d annual meeting commend our cooperatives to study the possibilities of consolidations to offset this trend.

RESOLUTION 9—MINNESOTA CROSS-STATE HIGHWAY

Whereas the Duluth-Superior harbor has become an important seaport; and

Whereas transportation by trucking has become one of the most practical methods for hauling farm, timber, and allied produce; and

Whereas the present East-West truck routes in northern Minnesota are in dire need of reconstruction; and

Whereas a new route proposed by the Cross-State Highway Association passes through many lake and resort areas and is the most convenient route for the public seeking enjoyment and recreation, besides serving as a new shorter truck route; be it therefore

Resolved, That the commissioner of highways of the State of Minnesota be asked to recommend this route to the Legislature of the State of Minnesota and the Congress of the United States so that it will be added to either the State or the Federal highway system; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the appropriate members of the Minnesota Legislature and the Congress of the United States.

Address by William G. Carr at the White House Conference on Children and Youth

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, delivered on March 30, 1960, at the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ADDRESS, WILLIAM G. CARR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Childhood, we like to think, is gay and simple, amusing and amazing, an altogether carefree subject. Yet, strangely enough, when adults congregate to discuss this most delightful of all topics, our customary attitude is tense and cautious, our brows furl, our lips curl (with the effort to think deeply), our thoughts turn to secretly guilty foreboding, and our sentences become responsively convoluted. And when, as on an occasion like this, we join the concept of child with the concept of White House the two together, symbols of the continuity of our country and of our humanity, send us into perfect paroxysms of polysyllables, of which these opening sentences of mine offer warning examples. We make childhood one more problem to be solved rather than an experience to be treasured.

Conferences about children do encounter issues of tremendous complexity. If you doubt that, please consider the theme which Miss Frederick and I have been asked to discuss. I quote: "The Future of Children and Youth—1960: Adapting To Change and Innovations, the Effect on Them of Science, Technology, Population Pressures, and World Events." That is what I would call an assignment. However, I must admit that the speakers may gain from such a subject a great advantage; namely, that one can hardly say anything whatever that will be completely irrelevant to the assigned topic. However, one can always try.

It is with some astonishment that I find myself participating this week in my fourth White House House Conference on Children and Youth. Little did I think when I went to Mr. Hoover's Conference in 1930, that I would survive to witness an unbroken series of four of these decennial spectaculars. In retrospect, it seems to me that each successive meeting has set a new record for the profundity of the principles uttered, for the eloquence of the sentiments expressed, for the solemnity of the vows pledged, and for the number of pages of documents produced.

A simple and candid statement about our children is a rarity in these conferences. When such a statement is uttered, it clings tightly to the memory. I can still remember, for instance, Mr. Hoover launching the 1930 Conference on the stage at Constitution Hall, and saying of our children: "We live a life of apprehension as to what their opinion may be of us; a life of defense against their terrifying energy. We put them to bed with a lingering of devotion and a sense of relief." But such delightful expressions of idealism and human interest are rare. The painful truth is that almost all of what we say here will be forgotten long before we reach home.

I have a theory as to why these great nationwide efforts are so limited in practical effect. But before I tell you what this theory is, let me say that I do not doubt that some useful results have ensued from these conferences; results that would not have occurred without the conferences, or at least not so soon or so completely. Rather, my concern is that the sacrificial efforts of so many people, of such abounding enthusiasms, profound skill, and indestructible goodwill, have not produced results more fully proportionate to the investment.

Thus for instance, I found on looking up the records that the 1930 conference was preceded by 16 months of preparatory study, engaged in by no less than 1,200 experts organized in 167 committees. Their printed reports fill more than a 3-foot shelf in our libraries.

The structure and documentation for other conferences have been on a similarly lavish scale. The preparatory activity for the 1950 conference extended over 4 years. There were over 1,000 county committees. Six months before the conference opened, 100,000 citizens were working on White House Conference projects to get ready for the big discussion. There were 35 working groups, 5 sections, and 31 panels. These were assisted at the international level by 292 representatives from 41 countries, as well as spokesmen for the United Nations and 22 other international bodies.

When we consider such enormous investments of time and money, wisdom, and devotion, surely we do no wrong to ask earnestly how the actual results in the lives of boys and girls may be more prompt, more lasting, more profound, and more widespread.

I think there are two reasons why results are not greater than they have been. The first reason is their enormous scope. The early conferences concentrated attention on some one area. Thus, the first (1910) conference dealt with dependent children, the 1920 conference dealt with welfare services, the 1930 conference, somewhat broader, dealt with health and protection. Coming nearer to the present, however, the conferences have become so comprehensive that nothing is excluded that has any relevance, however, remote, to the well-being of children and young people. The 1940 conference theme, for instance, dealt with children in a democracy. The 1950 conference gave up trying to find a central theme and merely called itself the midcentury conference. As nearly as I can tell from the preliminary literature, the conference in which we are now engaged, having found no terse, specific theme, is called merely the golden anniversary conference.

Our book of conference charts, of course, does have a subtitle, "Children in a Changing World," but even that is not what I would call a very narrow topic. We may assume, perhaps, that the 1970 conference will deal with children in a changing solar system or perhaps in a changing universe.

There are, of course, some advantages in a comprehensive theme. In any case, a single topic, with clean-cut edges, is probably no longer a practical objective for a conference held under the high auspices of the Chief Executive of the Nation. I merely point out that, unless we are very careful, a very broad theme exacts a penalty in loss of tangible results. Let me illustrate the range of topics which a conference on children and youth must face and unravel, by referring merely and only partially to one topic: the schools.

Insofar as we know, children born today have the same learning ability as those born 50 years ago, or 5,000 years ago. There are, of course, differences among the children of any generation. But we have no reason to suppose that, as a group, children today are either more stupid or more clever than we were when we were very young; or our parents, or any other generation back to the beginning of time.

However, although the children have not changed, an enormous change has occurred in the educational task. For example, the last two centuries have witnessed the rise and extension of a form of government, representative democracy, which places upon each citizen responsibilities for great and difficult social and political decisions.

In the economic realm, too, the educational task has become greater. The increase in the demand for technical training is well known. Almost every job now requires training which the comparable worker, even a generation ago, did not dream existed.

But the catalog of increased educational requirements is not closed by reference to political and vocational responsibilities. Every phase of life has become more demanding. We call these changing dimensions of human experience "the explosion of knowledge." This expansion will not continue to increase at the same rate as it has in the past. On the contrary, we may expect a constantly accelerated acceleration.

Thus while the raw materials of education, the child's nervous system and its capacities for adaptation, are not essentially different from what they were in the past, the educational job is almost infinitely more difficult.

The pressures on the schools to accomplish much broader ends than ever before, with essentially the same raw material, have been further increased by the discovery that schools make excellent channels for presenting ideas which various groups in the population think important. Such groups are not content merely to help elect school boards. Hundreds of organized groups press directly upon the schools to promote their respective programs. They organize contests, drives, collections, exhibits, special days, special weeks, and anniversaries that run all year long. They would like the public schools to give more attention (just to cite a few examples) to little league baseball, first aid, mental hygiene, speech correction, Russian in the primary grades, military preparedness, international peace, modern music, world history, local history, Canada, South America, the Arabs and the Israeli, Christopher Columbus and Lief Ericson, Robert E. Lee and Woodrow Wilson, nutrition, care of the teeth, free enterprise, the United Nations, labor relations, cancer prevention, the pony express, human relationships, atomic energy, the use of firearms, the Constitution, tobacco, temperance, kindness to animals, the control of inflation, the use of the typewriter, moral values, physical fitness, civil defense, religious literacy, thrift, law observance consumer education, dramatics, mathematics, physics, ceramics, phonics, narcotics and alcoholics.

To meet this circumstance of unchanging raw material with new and complicated specifications for the finished product, the schools, with the support of society, have reacted in the following ways:

First, they have enrolled for more children and youth.

Second, they have extended the duration of formal education by beginning at an earlier age and by postponing the age for leaving school.

A third response has been to improve the effectiveness of teaching. We have better books, better teaching equipment, better audiovisual aids, and, most important, more highly skilled teachers.

We now casually refer to this ongoing improvement of tools and techniques as quality education.

A fourth kind of educational adaptation is an effort to return to the homes and other institutions some of the educational functions which lately have been assigned to the schools.

Finally, and especially since Sputnik I, a mode of adaptation has been proposed which consists essentially of putting more pressure on the children in school. We hear talk of a get-tough policy in education, of a longer school day, 12-month schools, more homework, and less time for the arts and crafts. We hear talk of more rigorous discipline and the shadow of the hickory stick and the dunce's cap are plainly visible in the background. This movement is supported by references, often quite inaccurate, to the supposed superiority of Russian or European schools. As with most reform movements in education, there is something to be said in favor of this position. Yet, I venture to hope that this conference will not conclude that because unlimited indulgence is bad for children, absolute tyranny would be better. If the security of the United States requires that we get tough in our discipline, let's begin with the adults. I'd be willing to see compulsory homework in the first grade the day after business, industry, and government abolish the second coffee break.

I hope I have said enough about schools to illustrate the first limiting factor on the results of these conferences. That limiting factor is the expanding nature of the problems and the data in the field. There is not much we can do to control that factor.

The second limiting factor, however, is one that we could control if enough of us had the nerve to do it.

I do not know whether or not we shall; I only say that we could. White House conferences (and many other conferences) are less productive than they might be because most of us shrink from speaking out on those types of controversial questions on which action has to be taken. As long as we can keep our controversy in the realm of philosophy where no immediate action is likely or possible, we can expound our different views like ladies and gentlemen, and we can have plenty of fun without the necessity of anybody being hurt by seeing his ideas repudiated. But the penalty for this sort of aloofness from certain practical matters affecting children and youth is precisely that dilution of the effectiveness of the conference to which I have already referred. Here again, I make bold to illustrate the point from an area which I know best, although I have no doubt that it could be illustrated just as well, if I had the knowledge and the insight to do so, in many other fields.

Everybody knows that we need better education at once. Everybody knows more money is necessary in order to get better education. The evidence is conclusive that to provide funds on the scale required involves money from the National Government. It has become routine in this capital city for almost everyone who discusses the schools to declare that we should spend about twice as much on them as we do now. This statement used to call forth thunderous waves of applause. It doesn't cause much applause any more because we have learned that talk is cheap and that talk of doubling expenditures for education without facing the question of how, when, and where, is double talk in a double sense of the phrase.

The question of Federal support for education has been lurking around White House Conferences for 30 years. The 1930 White House Conference said that equalization of opportunity should be sought in all schools by all possible means. Whether "all possible means" included money was conveniently left ambiguous. It avoided a lot of discussion, I have no doubt. A similar ambiguity at this Conference will have a similar effect. The only trouble is, indecision and evasive language can make little actual difference in the kind of schools our children have and our country needs.

President Hoover, perhaps not satisfied with his White House Conference as a source of advice, appointed a National Advisory Committee on Education at about the same time. This committee produced three large volumes of studies and reported to the President that the American people are justified in using their Federal tax system to give financial support to education in the States.

But the 1930 Conference delegates, 3,000 strong, or should I say 3,000 weak, came here and went home. They neither said nor did anything clearcut about this issue, and Congress followed suit.

So we came to the White House Conference in 1940. As a kind of preparation for that conference, President Roosevelt appointed an Advisory Committee on Education. This Advisory Committee, substantially like its predecessor, reported that there are national responsibilities for education which only the Federal Government could meet. The White House Conference report of 1940, following up the Advisory Committee report, said that there must be action by the Federal Government to reduce educational inequalities within and among the States. The report avoided the approval of any actual legislation that would have acomplished this result. It was Federal action that we wanted, but we did not say exactly what kind of action because that might have stirred up controversy, and that would have lowered the feeling of unity of the Conference.

So we came to the White House Conference of 1950. The proceedings of the Con-

ference include a resolution that Federal funds be provided for educational services in tax-supported public schools without Federal control. But this was only one of 67 other resolutions, together with 8 very general resolutions, on how to follow up the Conference, a further statement of 8 points upon which it was believed there was consensus of opinion, and an eloquent pledge to children which promised the children of America exactly 27 different things, including faith in their right to seek the truth.

So now it is 1960, 10 years later, and probably later than we think. And now the questions once more are these: First, shall we state boldly what the majority of this Conference believes? And, second, shall we bluntly endeavor to get the Congress to act accordingly?

When we get pushed into an intellectual corner on a point like this, some of us try to escape by saying that after all money isn't everything; that after all some of the best schools we ever knew were not expensive; that Federal dictation in education would be very bad; that we really ought to get more results for the same amount of money; and that the States and localities should try harder. We can say these things to ourselves and to others and we can feel good about it for a few minutes, but we know perfectly well that they have no relevance to the issue at hand. The American school system needs to be quickly stepped up in effectiveness. There is no practical way to do this which does not cost money. There is no way to get more money on the scale required without Federal action. We cannot buy the education that America needs in the bargain basement. We cannot maintain a level of educational expenditure, which was inadequate even for the quiet past, if education is to help us face and surmount the problems of the future.

But this course of reasoning and its consequences in action is an extraordinarily difficult mental exercise for most of us. As a result, many of us take out our enthusiasm at this and other Conferences by giving applause to the speakers who say what we hope will happen. It seems a little beneath our dignity, a little like acting as though we really meant it, for us to walk up the hill to the Capitol of the United States where the question of school finance is being debated this very minute, and tell our elected Representatives what we think about the pending legislation.

This blinking at the stark realities of the situation, this hesitancy to take those steps which are open to every American citizen to secure action by his Government to assist him in meeting these problems, this is the second reason why, in my opinion, White House Conferences have produced far less results than are possible and reasonable in relation to the enormous investment in good will and money that we make in them.

Children in this year of the Golden Anniversary Conference need many things. I hope they get what they need in health, in protection, in education. I remind you in closing of the adage of Epictetus:

"The law has decided that only freemen shall be educated, but the gods have decided that only educated men shall be free."

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1890, the Latin American Republics and the United States adopted a resolution by which the first attempt at continuing cooperation between the nations of the Americas was launched.

Today marks the 70th anniversary of that memorable occasion when the inter-American system was born.

Since 1890 many changes have taken place. The name of the Pan American Union has been changed to that of the Organization of American States. With a change in name there was also a change in policies, attitudes and programs between the nations forming this novel experiment in international relations. Mutual understanding and cooperation increased.

No longer is the inter-American system simply a clearinghouse for economic and commercial information. The measures taken by the member states since World War II to strengthen the bonds of cooperation are numerous.

It is gratifying that on the 70th anniversary of this unique institution—the Organization of American States—one of the most important projects for inter-American cooperation has been officially established. I refer to the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank. Undoubtedly economic cooperation in the inter-American system is in the forefront of our relations with our neighbors to the South.

It is impossible to view with indifference the increasing economic problems confronting the Latin American people today. Consequently, more effective cooperation of all the inter-American system in the economic field is needed today. The creation of the Inter-American Development Bank should be a great stimulus to those forces working to bring about greater prosperity and well-being to all of us in the Western Hemisphere.

Without a doubt the inter-American system has advanced a long way since 1890. Its record is one of continuous progress and positive achievements. It is a record that will also show our united determination for a happier and a better America.

Showdown on Kinzua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, another voice has been added once again to the chorus which demands that the Kinzua Dam project involving an appropriation of approximately $120 million be given a new evaluation by the Congress. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of April 11, 1960:

SHOWDOWN ON KINZUA

The Seneca Indians have won some influential allies in their last-ditch attempt to have a thorough study of the Kinzua Dam project. Representatives PILLION and OSTERTAG have been impressed by the arguments for an alternative flood-control project in the Conewango Valley. And so, apparently, have Representative GOODELL and New York's two Senators in asking the Army Engineers to clarify the issues.

The charges that have been made by the engineering consultant for the Indians are so gravely disturbing as to call for some frank answers. The stakes involving the public interest, as the News said 2 years ago, are such as to justify a temporary freeze on the Kinzua funds pending a prompt airing of the claims and counterclaims in an utterly confusing and technical debate.

What is most disturbing is the contention of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and author of the Conewango-Cattaraugus flood-control plan, that his specific proposal never received careful study.

Whether this is so, we certainly don't know; but at least there was enough doubt in the minds of House Members last year to demand a new study of alternatives—a stipulation that subsequently was dropped in conference with the Senate. Surely it is not too late to pin down the facts and find out who is right about an alternative that allegedly would produce more flood-control and steady water benefits at less cost and in shorter time, and without necessitating the removal of the Senecas from their ancestral homes. Competent engineers who have no partisan interest tell us that there is enough potential merit in the Conewango proposal to give it a real study before committing $125 million or so to a giant dam.

Rehabilitation of Cheyenne River Sioux Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Big Change at Cheyenne River," which appears in the March issue of NWB, a magazine published by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

This article tells the amazing and heartwarming success story of the tribal rehabilitation program, which has been developed and operated by the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe on their reservation located in north central South Dakota. It is hard to believe that such progress could have been attained in the brief span of 5 years; but, as a firsthand observer of this program, I can attest to the fact that the social and economic rehabilitation of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe is moving forward by leaps and bounds. This progress and accomplishment has been no mere inexplicable occurrence of fate—the success of this program has resulted from the persistence, hard work and desire of the Cheyenne River Sioux members under the intelligent and energetic leadership of their tribal chairman, "Tony" Rivers, and his predecessor in office, Frank Ducheneaux.

I congratulate the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. for its publicity of these noteworthy accomplishments, and I know that this fine article is deeply ap-

preciated by "Tony" Rivers and the members of the Cheyenne River Tribe, who are proving that "rehab" can work. I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives will take the time to read this excellent article, for it very accurately depicts the intense desire of the Sioux people to become active full-share members of 20th century free enterprise America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG CHANGE AT CHEYENNE RIVER

It is a desolate and rugged land, dotted with strange sounding places like Rattle Snake Butte, Willow Creek Camp, Fine Weather Draw, and Arrow Head. Stretching westward from the Missouri River in north central South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation is an awesomely primitive potpourri of butte-covered and often fenceless grassland, towns that look like horse opera movie sets.

The stranger is startled by log cabins chinked with mud, animal skins nailed to doors, scrub oaks twisted and dwarfed by the arid wind of the prairie. And yet there is a monstrous beauty about it all.

This is the land of the Sioux—more often than not, a horrendous collection of ignorance, prejudice, poverty, and the not-too-white lies of the white man.

Almost centered in this 2,300 square mile reservation is the town of Eagle Butte (population 800), new home for the U.S. Government's Cheyenne River Indian Agency. Moved 55 miles when the Missouri began backing up from Oahe Dam to the south, the new agency and tribal quarters have turned dirt-streeted Eagle Butte into a booming builder's camp. The town's population, more than doubled in the last 4 years, has gradually grown accustomed to the sprawling office, school and housing projects that have poured nearly $8 million into the area. Included: the tribe's own telephone company, an ambitious $260,000 (thus far) project that links a half dozen Indian towns, ties into NWB and rancher-owned facilities.

Eventually the Oahe-dammed Missouri will back up for over 100 miles, cause widespread flooding of lowland cattle watering and shelter areas. This soon-to-come loss has brought the Cheyenne Tribe $10 million in Government compensation. Problem: what does an Indian tribe of 5,000 (two-thirds of them on the reservation) do with $10 million?

The question can best be answered by a small, 40-year-old part-Indian named Anthony "Tony" Rivers. As chairman of the Cheyenne Tribal Council (15 representatives and a full time governing body of 3), Rivers is beating the drum for a long-range rehabilitation program. "Rehab," as the Indians call it, already has the makings of a genuine social and economic uprising.

Basic aim of soft-spoken, educated Rivers is to give his tribe a chance to live like 20th century Americans. This includes free enterprise—the opportunity to go into business. Not an easy task, Chairman Rivers has found that the Indian himself is often his own biggest problem.

"We are sometimes too busy working against one another."

There has, too, been good reason for distrust of the white man. Most Indians can tell of special discriminatory prices, personal and public humiliation. And there are some, like Tony, who can recall a sometimes brutal past.

Once lashed from head to foot because he would not confess that a dime he had was stolen (his mother gave it to him), he took the beating rather than lie. He also remembers watching a school chum bullwhipped by his non-Indian teacher. The boy died a few days later.

"These things happened as recently as the twenties," recalls Rivers. "And the cattlemen gave us almost nothing for grazing rights on our land."

Mild mannered and surprisingly philosophical about the past, Rivers asks only that the Indian now get "what is rightfully his." Like most of his people, he has grown up with a sense of racial inferiority, still looks on his non-Indian neighbors as something better than himself—"Not an easy thing to overcome," he adds.

Born in a log cabin of a Sioux mother and partly Indian father (Grandfather Rivet was a Frenchman; the name was later altered to "Rivers"), Tony grew up on the prairie, daily rode a horse 5 miles to the Moreau River, boated across and then hiked another mile to school. In 1940, after high school and 2 years of business college accounting, he joined the Army, fought in north Africa and Italy, was injured (noncombat) and sent home. Honorably discharged as a sergeant, he married an attractive girl from Mississippi named Ruth.

In 1945, Tony Rivers went to work as an apprentice accountant with the Navy Department in Washington. Scheduled for promotion to supervisor, he quit the Government job, and with only a saddle and refund from his income tax, the Rivers went back to the reservation. They received 50 head of cattle from the tribe, borrowed enough to lease nearly 6,000 acres 3 miles from his father's ranch.

"I sincerely hated the place at first," recalls Ruth. "Now I wouldn't trade this life for anything."

Later, after a year and a half as office manager within the tribe's rehabilitation program, Tony decided to run for tribal chairman—top Indian-elected post on the reservation.

Along with six other candidates he began combing back hill country. He drove thousands of miles in his jeep, talked to any that would listen—and some that wouldn't. "He was never home," remembers his wife.

Tony won the election by less than 100 votes.

The job of tribal chairman pays $340 a month, is usually a daylong series of meetings, telephone calls, complaints, and personal visits. It is a thankless job, but Rivers has turned down several $600-a-month positions to stay on. Tony, Ruth, and their 12-year-old daughter, Linda Lou, have now moved to Eagle Butte, but still get out to their ranch on weekends.

Since his election, Tony has obtained a long-delayed $300 per capita payment (over 5,000 tribe members collected) from the $10 million tribal fund—a heated battle Chairman Rivers waged all the way to Washington and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Tony's mother is also a member of the tribal council, has represented the Four Bear District for the past 3 years. An intelligent woman who speaks well, she is, too, a member of the rehabilitation committee.

Initiated before Tony's election, Rehab has successfully helped the Indian go into business. Over 150 are now ranching, getting their start from the tribe's loan of 100 cattle, cash (up to $10,000) and 160 acres of land (additional land is leased from the tribe and private individuals). Failures in the cattle program have run less than 15 percent and several of these were voluntary repossessions because of illness.

Other Rehab-sponsored projects include a gas station, supermarket, recreation hall, theater, and dairy. The tribe has its own trailer court and laundromat.

Three years ago only one tribe-member was attending college. Today over 50 are studying at colleges and universities across the land, their expenses paid by grants from the tribe.

The Rehab program is a giant step for the Indian, has enabled many to actually own something for the first time.

Admittedly there are weaknesses: Some Indians signed up just to get the money. But even this has often worked favorably. As one rancher told Tony, "I was only after the money at first. Now I'm going to change * * * for the first time, I've got something to work for."

Incentives are important, but Chairman Rivers knows that "education is the foundation of success. Our people do not have it. That is why schools are the most important part of Rehab." For years many of the Indian children have come in from the hills to attend agency boarding schools in the country. Last year a new $1,637,000 consolidated school opened in Eagle Butte (830 students, about two-thirds Indians).

Not everyone has taken to Rehab, however. The new $210,000 tribal housing units for the aged (65 and over) have a 30-couple capacity, are less than two-thirds filled. Offering attractive, modern facilities, as well as excellent medical care, the homes cost the Indian nothing. Recently, an 85-year-old Sioux was coaxed in from his shack in the hills, taken on a tour of his prospective home. He flipped light switches, turned on the automatic stove, looked at the modern plumbing. "Too easy," he grunted. "I wouldn't get any exercise here."

And with that he headed back for the hills.

Telephone service on the reservation was once Government owned and operated. Now owned by the tribe, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Telephone Co. has refused cheap Government loans (2 percent interest), gone ahead with its own privately financed dial conversion and rebuilding program.

Headed by Issac Halfred, and with Nathan Littlewounded as No. 2 man, the telephone company has had its difficult days. Main problem: experienced help during the complex rebuilding program. Private contractors have done most of the work, replaced every foot of in-town overhead wire and cable. Eventually service will be offered to rural areas.

Originally against the idea of the tribe owning its own telephones, Rivers has changed his mind. "It's going to pay off big * * * and we don't have the restrictions that a Government-sponsored system would require."

He says, too, that one of his people's biggest hopes lies in attracting industry to the area. Seldom an easy job, the task is even more formidable in the rugged grasslands of the reservation.

Industry-scout Rivers is ambitious about these programs, too much so for some (he's been threatened, offered bribes). But if he seems to be in a hurry, it is only because those who are behind must run to catch up.

The Cheyenne River Sioux have a lot of running ahead of them.

The Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great newspapers of our country, the Buffalo Evening News, on March 22, 1960, rendered the following editorial with

reference to the Forand bill and the general problem of our aged citizens. Although I cannot agree with several of the conclusions in the editorial, I have such great respect for the editorial policy of the Buffalo Evening News that I believe it would be helpful for all of our Members to have the opportunity to see this editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE FORAND BILL

For countless older people, living on small fixed incomes or pensions, the rising cost of hospital-medical care presents an increasingly cruel and worrisome dilemma. Just at the time in their lives when they need such care most, and when the cost of providing it for them is multiplied, they can least afford it.

What to do about this dilemma is the subject of a blazing controversy in Congress over a bill known as the Forand bill. Sponsored by Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, the bill is undergoing hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. Very simply, it would provide free (that is, tax-paid) health insurance for everyone eligible for social security old-age pensions. To finance it, an additional payroll tax would be borne by every employer and employee.

The Forand bill has been vociferously supported by the AFL–CIO and all the usual labor-liberal political action groups. And it is roundly denounced as an entering wedge for socialized medicine by the American Medical Association. The Eisenhower administration has opposed the bill while conceding that the problem it aims at does exist. Health-Welfare-Education Secretary Flemming is scheduled to spell out the administration view and offer the committee an alternative approach tomorrow. Vice President NIXON is said to have pushed hard within the administration for support of a modified version of the Forand bill.

We hope the administration will come up with something solid and imaginative. For while the Forand bill does, in our opinion, need some modifying, we think it would be a bad mistake for its critics—doctors, private insurers or anyone else—to underestimate the seriousness of the problem it deals with, or the anxiety which millions of older people now experience for lack of access to adequate health protection at moderate cost.

The basic idea of using social security machinery in one way or another to extend health insurance coverage to old-age pensioners not only makes sense, but it has an aura of political inevitability. The whole history of social security in this last quarter century, after all, has been one of continuous mushrooming growth, often with too little heed paid to the cost factor. This latter objection has been raised by critics of the Forand bill, who claim that giving full health coverage to everyone eligible for an old-age pension would cost far more than the bill admits.

Quite apart from the actuarial soundness or unsoundness of the Forand bill, however, our main objection to it as it stands is that it would create a new and unnecessary Federal insurance bureaucracy. Instead of just underwriting the abnormally high cost of covering the over-65 age group in the existing plans—Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and the like—the Forand bill would create a needlessly competing system. In that respect, it is wide open to the charge of being an entering wedge for socialized medicine.

Far better, it seems to us, would be a Federal approach which aimed simply at charging the social security system the difference between the cost of providing hospital-medical care for those under 65 and the 2½ times greater cost of covering those over 65. This great difference in the use of medical care facilities by the older group is, after all, the crux of the problem. There are various ways in which that cost differential could be absorbed by society. One, for example, would be to require that all group plans offer coverage at a uniform rate regardless of age—and then bill the social security fund for whatever difference their experience tables showed between the cost of caring for those over 65 and under 65.

While the Forand bill needs substantial modifying, however, it has the virtue at least of going right to the heart of what is admittedly a very real and pressing social problem. In fact, it may well turn out to be the most insistent social security problem of the sixties. And it is the kind of problem which—for obvious political as well as sound social reasons—simply is not going to take no action for an answer.

When Money Comes High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic magazine of April 11, 1960:

WHEN MONEY COMES HIGH

It seems only a day or two ago that President Eisenhower and Secretary Anderson were nagging Congress to raise the ceiling on interest rates on long-term Treasury bonds. Congress balked but the story seems to have a happy ending for the administration after all. Interest rates in general now seem to be turning downward. Commercial bank borrowings from the Federal Reserve System have diminished; bond prices have been rising and bond yields falling; yields on Treasury bills, the shortest term of Treasury securities, have plummeted; and there are even rumors that the Treasury contemplates the issuance of 5- to 10-year bonds at rates well below the famous 4¼-percent legal ceiling.

How pleasant it would be if we could simply put a period to a confused episode whose rights and wrongs few people ever thoroughly grasped. But the effects of the high interest rates which the monetary policy of this administration has promoted linger on long after current rates begin to fall. In the perspective of the monetary managers, interest-rate variations may appear short-run only, easily reversed with each shift in the economic winds. In the lives of those who borrow when interest rates are high, the results may endure for 20 years. Take the home buyer's situation as illustration. If he took out a $12,000 FHA mortgage in 1952, his payments of interest and principal over the 20 years of the mortgage's life would have totaled $20,556. If he had waited until 1957 to move into the suburbs, the interest rate which faced him would have risen to 5 percent and his total payments would have ascended to $22,140, or an additional $1,620 in interest charges. If, less luckily still, he waited until 1960, the startling interest rate which then would have confronted him came to 5¾ percent plus a one-half percent insurance charge. His total obligation would have mounted to $23,760—a difference of $3,204 between the 1952 and the 1960 situations. What was true of the home buyer was also true of other private borrowers, generally in lesser degree, as they committed themselves to installment purchases of automobiles and consumer appliances, or borrowed from small loan companies. Public borrowers encountered many of the same difficulties. States and municipalities which endeavor to raise funds for schools and other public purposes, discovered that higher interest charges drastically elevated costs and was an important reason why voters rejected many projected bond issues.

It is plain, then, that interest-rate policy as pursued by the Eisenhower administration suffered from at least three major defects. In the first place, its short-run policies led to long-run effects on the lives of many people. In the second place, the burden of these high rates fell very substantially upon those with small or moderate incomes, for individuals in these groups by and large must borrow to purchase and are least able to postpone their decisions. It is accurate to say that high interest rates promote a transfer of income from those with relatively little to those with relatively much. Finally, existing disproportions between public and private spending are aggraviated by the higher costs of bond issues. When interest rates are high, fewer schools are built, fewer clinics opened, fewer slums cleared.

None of this should be taken to mean that interest-rate policy should never be used. But at a minimum it implies that it should be used more selectively and that at many economic junctures the fairer way to counteract recession or inflation is to employ fiscal policy—the deliberate variation of taxes and public outlays.

The Veteran and His Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's March 1960 issue of Higher Education, there appears an article written by the Honorable Bradford Morse, Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration entitled "The Veteran and His Education."

This article, Mr. President, contains an excellent review of our programs, both new and old, for the education of veterans, including an assessment of their contribution to the Nation's manpower resources and an excellent report on the performance of veterans in academic work.

I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VETERAN AND HIS EDUCATION

(By Bradford Morse)

Since 1945 the armed services have discharged 20 million servicemen. Nearly 11 million of these veterans have received educational benefits under the veterans' education and rehabilitation laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Out of

this group one of every three veterans entered college or university. In 1947 one of every two college students was a veteran, and three out of every four men students were veterans. We have still to evaluate the pervasive effects of this program on the general level of education, the Nation's skilled manpower resources, our national security, our productivity and the gross national product.

THE NEW PROGRAMS

Before we survey accomplishments and relationships, it may be useful to review the basic legislative provisions for veterans' rehabilitation and education programs.[1] They are embodied in the following:

Public Law 16, 78th Congress, now codified as chapter 31, title 38, United States Code provided vocational rehabilitation benefits for disabled veterans of World War II who needed such training in order to become employable.

Public Law 346, 78th Congress, provided education and training to veterans of World War II. Maximum duration of benefits was based on the length of the veteran's service but was not to exceed 48 months. Public Law 346 immediately was nicknamed the "GI bill."

Public Law 894, 81st Congress, also codified as chapter 31, title 38, United States Code, extended the vocational rehabilitation benefits of Public Law 16 to disabled veterans of the Korean conflict.

Public Law 550, 82d Congress, now codified as chapter 33, title 38, United States Code, provides education and training to veterans of the Korean conflict. Duration of maximum benefits is determined by time in service but may not exceed 36 months.

The current vocational rehabilitation program is a lineal descendant of World War I rehabilitation activities. Although it is enriched with the contributions of notable advances in applied psychology, essentially it has presented problems which have been encountered before. This was not the case with the GI bill. Over 16 million servicemen were in uniform during World War II, constituting practically a whole generation of Americans. At the war's end the return of this large group to civilian life presented a challenge such as the Nation had never before faced. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act cushioned the adjustment of millions of men from military to civil life. It provided for unemployment and self-employment allowances, loan guaranty benefits, and education and training. The educational benefits were based on the philosophy that men whose lives had been interrupted by military service were entitled to return to or begin their education or training.

Only a confident country like ours could have contained the tidal wave of veterans returning to formal education. Only in a system like ours was it possible to regard the flood as promise rather than as threat. The positive response of our colleges and universities to the need for expanding and adapting their facilities and programs to accommodate the large number of veterans is well known. Probably there is not a reader of these paragraphs who cannot contribute out of his own experience at his own institution stories and incidents, first of reluctance and dismay as the classrooms bulged and then of hope, achievement, humor, understanding, and dedication.

If Operation Education gave college housing authorities sleepless nights, it also electrified the social science discussion, for these men had lived close to death and had been everywhere and seen everything. While fraternity row lost some of its glamor, the college classroom and seminar increasingly became places to learn and work and achieve. The familiar sight became, not the freshman pledgee complete with beanie, but the veteran student at the window of his trailer digging into his books. Even to one outside of university life, it seems clear that we have still to assess the revolution of manners as well as the changed educational practices which resulted from this educational breakthrough.

The table shows that of the nearly 11 million veterans who entered training, 3½ million attended college or university. Colleges and universities contributed to the vocational rehabilitation and training of many veterans in ways not accounted for in the statistical table. Guidance centers based at the universities provided counseling service for veterans who pursued other than college training as well as for those who enrolled in college. Veterans pursuing apprenticeship or other on-the-job training were aided through use of school facilities such as speech correction and reading clinics. Agricultural extension teachers provided the academic training for some of the institutional onfarm trainees, and extension divisions conducted correspondence courses as related training for many veterans in the group of on-the-job trainees and apprentices.

Types of training under the various laws

[In thousands]

Type of training	Total [1]	Vocational rehabilitation		Education and training	
		Public Law 16, World War II	Public Law 894, Korea	Public Law 346, World War II	Public Law 550, Korea
Total	10,455	614	62	7,800	2,302
Institutions of higher learning	3,435	153	22	2,200	1,166
Schools below college level	4,364	149	26	3,500	824
Apprentice and other on-the-job	1,810	236	11	1,400	219
Institutional on-farm	846	76	3	700	93

[1] Totals are less than the sum of figures for each program, since an estimated 3 percent of the veterans pursued under more than 1 law.

Of particular interest to institutions of higher learning may be the fact that while less than one-third of the World War II veterans who entered training enrolled in institutions of higher learning, one-half of the Korea veterans who took advantage of educational benefits enrolled in colleges and universities.

APPROVAL OF COURSES

The traditional relationship between the Federal Government and the States in education is reflected in the safeguards erected in the veterans' education laws. Approval of institutions and facilities which offered education and training was clearly established as a function of the various States. However, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was authorized to approve institutions when a State did not exercise its approval function. He was also required to formulate regulations governing payments to schools and veteran enrollees.

In the majority of States the Governors designated the State department of education as the approval agency. A few Governors delegated authority to special boards and commissions.

Problems arose immediately. The country was still at war. Many State departments of education were understaffed. As originally promulgated, the law established no criteria to guide the States in their approval actions and provided no Federal funds for reimbursing States for the expenses of carrying out their approval responsibility. At the very time of greatest need for careful inspection and approval of facilities, the States were least able to perform their function.

It was during this period that many abuses developed. Opportunists opened fly-by-night schools. Some employers took advantage of the veteran to obtain cheap labor while offering little in the way of training.

Problems also arose in the field of higher education. The law authorized the institution to fix rates of tuition on a fair and reasonable basis if it had no established tuition or if its rate was inadequate. But what was a fair and reasonable rate when the school had to double its faculty and its facilities? For State institutions, when a fair and reasonable rate was agreed upon there was often State law to contend with. Some State legal authorities held that the State could not receive tuition in excess of the customary fees, on behalf of veterans who were residents of the State. Also, veterans objected to having schools reimbursed in excess of customary fees because the original GI bill provided that the amount paid in their behalf would be charged against any bonus or adjusted compensation authorized in the future. There were problems on how to pay colleges for conducting special courses designed to help veterans adjust to or accelerate their programs, on how to pay for short, intensive courses, and on what rates to pay for part-time training.

The difficulties faced by the Veterans' Administration, the State approving agencies, and the schools, were presented to the Congress. The law was amended immediately to authorize funds for the approving agencies and to reimburse schools for keeping records that would help control the program. Other amendments spelled out criteria for approval of schools and on-the-job training facilities and authorized the Veterans' Administration to discontinue payment to a veteran whenever it found that the requirements of the law were not being met. Aided by the new legislation and the cooperation of the great majority of schools, employers, and the veterans themselves, the State approving agencies and the Veterans' Administration were able to eliminate most of the abuses and solve all major problems that had threatened the success of the GI training program.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION'S MANPOWER RESOURCES

Has the program helped meet the Nation's needs for trained manpower? While there is no complete answer to this question, probably as good an answer as any is contained in the report of the President's Commission

[1] In addition to benefits for veterans, the VA is responsible for providing educational assistance to war orphans under Public Law 634, 84th Cong., "The War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956." This law, now codified as ch. 35, title 38, U.S. Code, provides for the education of children of those who died as a result of service in World Wars I, II, or the Korean conflict.

on Veterans' Pensions, published in September 1956:

"The serious depletion of trained personnel resulting from World War II has been largely offset by the incentives created by the GI bill of rights. We have produced hundreds of thousands of technicians, doctors, lawyers, engineers, craftsmen, farmers and business workers. These trained men and women represent a great national asset * * *.

"The veterans' educational program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense, if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise."

As noted elsewhere in this article, training has been provided in a great variety of fields to 3½ million veterans. A number of critical fields, however, deserve highlighting: In engineering nearly a half million veterans have received training; in physical and natural sciences, 134,000; in teacher education programs, 371,000; in medical and related sciences, 209,000—77,000 in professional medical courses. Without the men trained in veterans' programs, shortages in these fields would be much more severe than they are.

Of the total number of veterans who entered training, 676,000 pursued courses of vocational rehabilitation. Many of these disabled veterans were seriously handicapped. VA rehabilitation efforts with this group have not only resulted in incalculable benefits to the individuals but provided a striking demonstration of the potential inherent in this hitherto largely untapped manpower resource.

VETERANS' PERFORMANCE IN EDUCATION

The past hides our unwarranted fears. We have forgotten our concern about the return of the veterans to the classroom and study hall—older and removed in time and experience from the routine and discipline of study, many disabled, some bitter. We were fearful not only about the veteran's influence on the traditional college atmosphere but also about his possible inability to adjust to the requirements of academic life. Actually he seemed disadvantaged in a number of ways. His education had been interrupted for from 2 to 5 years, and he might have been poorly prepared for college work. For instance, he might have left high school in his senior year before graduation, or he might have secured high school graduate status on the basis of various equivalency tests.

The question of what actually happened is best answered by university people themselves.

Writing in the Educational Record for October 1950, Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, noted that veterans entered college with lower admission scores or returned to the college with poorer preservice college records than did comparable nonveterans. Nevertheless, veterans as a group maintained a slight but consistent superiority in academic performance over comparable nonveterans.

In School and Society for March 22, 1947, Edgar A. Taylor, Jr., reported that studies of achievement in freshman English courses at the University of Southern California in 1945–46 showed far smaller percentage of failures for the veteran students than for nonveterans.

Data from the University of Wisconsin showed the grade-point average for 4,201 veterans to be 1.66 as compared with 1.57 for 1,114 nonveteran students. The grade-point average for 1,021 married veterans was 1.80 as compared with 1.62 for single veteran students (Riemer in "Marriage and Family Living," February 1949).

A study of 2,020 veteran and 5,887 nonveteran undergraduate students at Ohio State University showed that the median point-hour ratio earned by veterans was 0.17 higher than that of nonveteran students (Journal of College and University Registrars, January 1947).

Comparison of 857 veterans with 846 nonveteran students at the University of Michigan—1944–46—revealed no significant differences when all academic levels were considered (Tibbets, Clark, and Hunter, School and Society, May 10, 1947).

A comparative study of grades obtained by veteran and nonveteran students of comparable ability in 10 colleges led the Educational Testing Service investigators to conclude that veterans tended to achieve higher grades than nonveterans of equal ability but that the magnitude of the difference was small. (Psychological Monograph No. 347, Educational Testing Service, 1952.)

A comparison of grades of veteran and nonveteran students at UCLA during spring and fall semesters 1946 showed that performance was appreciably higher for veteran than for nonveteran students in both semesters for all groups of students except for science majors in the fall semester. (Atkinson in the Journal of Educational Research, December 1949.)

An article in the July 16, 1946, issue of Life, "GI's at Harvard. They are the Best Students in the Colleges' History," is more impressionistic, but perhaps it is equally telling:

"The window gazers and the hibernators have vanished" says one professor. "This crowd never takes its eyes off you" says another. A third says, "You've got to be awfully careful. These kids have been everywhere; they have stored up an enormous amount of information." A fourth finds, "Sure, there are plenty of radicals but there's not much ideology. These men don't want to tear everything down; they want to make the existing system work better." And Provost Buck, who has been on the faculty for 20 years, has decided, "There is a strong strain of idealism in these young men. They want to do a good job."

Little more need be said. The story of veterans' accomplishments in school is, after all, recorded in the experience of personnel in higher education. It is clear that veterans did as well as or better than nonveterans.

IN PERSPECTIVE

The effects of these vast programs on numerous other facets of our social, economic, and cultural life remain for thoughtful consideration and assessment. At this time we lack the data for evaluation. Yet it stands to reason that this multibillion-dollar program affecting millions of persons must have had profound effects on us.

A central tenet in our way of life is that an informed citizenry is an essential for democratic government. Education is an obvious means to this end. In our country, moreover, we can begin to look toward man's fulfillment of needs that are particularly human, considerably beyond the need to satisfy hunger and to be protected from the elements. The awareness of cultural and esthetic values must be increasing as a result of the program.

Educational technique and perhaps also basic educational philosophy have been affected in many specific ways. Although experimentation in admission practice was underway before the veteran influx, it was shown that under the press of need, useful changes could be made to the enrichment rather than the distadvantage of formal education. In many ways the veteran students foreshadowed the great press of students now knocking on university doors. Perhaps we can be more optimistic about our ability to provide higher education to this new population as a result of the experience with veterans. The effect on our economy, in terms of manpower skills and competence, increase in earning power, greater tax returns, and increase in gross national product may be all but inestimable, but it is there.

On the whole, we have dealt with the veteran of our wars, in rehabilitation and education, as in other benefit programs, in such a manner as to enrich him in many critical ways. The Nation is richer for it.

Man and Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, since the days of the introduction of automated flight, prophets have been visualizing the end of man's usefulness in the handling of aircraft. Particularly true has this been since the rapid development of guided missiles. But today, as we reevaluate the place of man in the space picture, it is reasonable to assume that the Air Force pilot of this age will carry the big stick of deterrence into the arenas of space.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., vice commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, has written an excellent article on the subject of man and space, which appears in the April issue of Air Force/Space Digest. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SOARING SIXTIES: MAN IS ON HIS WAY UP

(By Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., USAF, vice commander, Air Force Ballistic Missile Division)

Since man first appeared on this planet he has capitalized progressively on his God-given advantages—physical dexterity, rational intellect, and the exercise of free will—to extend his horizons and broaden his capabilities. He has ventured into one frontier after another, and has conquered obstacle after obstacle. Immensely adaptable, he has used the forces of nature to his own benefit. Yet the wider his knowledge has become, the greater have been the challenges.

At this point in time, man is confronting his greatest challenge—the challenge of the vertical frontier. This decade already is being heralded as the "soaring sixties." Man is on his way up.

In the emphasis that has been placed on technology, it is easy to lose sight of a fact that should be apparent. It is simply this: Man does have a place in space. He has a role to fulfill in the distant reaches beyond our atmosphere just as surely as he has pioneered in the exploration and exploitation of the land, the sea, and the air. Our ultimate objective in this sunset side of the 20th century is not man in space, but men in space. As Lt. Gen. Bernard Schriever has said:

"Despite the talk of pushbutton technology, whether in industry or the military, it is the man who counts, and not the button. You just can't build creative ability into a machine. You can't design a circuit to take the place of courage. Above all, you

can't enclose dedication to freedom in a magic black box."

As long as man and machine have toiled together, we have sought continually to get the most out of their relationship. In reaching upward, in attempting to rise above terrestrial limitations, we have pushed the machine virtually to the limit. A jet aircraft, for example, will accommodate man at altitudes up to 70,000 feet. But beyond that the operation of today's jet engines, as we know them, is marginal.

Yet while progressing from the Jenny to the jet, we have also gone from Kitty Hawk to Canaveral. And suddenly we have at our technical fingertips new machines—machines which carry their own atmosphere with them. Now we look once more to man, to train him to fit the capabilities of these machines.

We are doing a great deal to bridge the thin air between earth and space. It is a tribute to man's resourcefulness that he has learned to sample artificially the unknowns of new frontiers, without serious risk to his own well-being. Machines are expendable. No tears are shed over tubes and transistors.

If, in the past, we had decided to channel our resources—without regard for costs—toward the development of spacecraft (and by that I mean advanced man-carrying vehicles) we could eventually have done aerodynamically what we are more rapidly achieving through ballistic missile and satellite programs. Our sights are set on our goals. If we can attain them by quicker, more effective methods, then there is little justification for following the slower, more traditional patterns.

Let me illustrate. In the evolution of aircraft we have gradually achieved ever greater range, continually higher altitudes, increasingly faster speeds. We have perfected jet power, and we cracked the sound barrier.

But two major breakthroughs, occurring in recent years, suggested a reorientation of our efforts. We harnessed the power of the atom, and we aroused ourselves to the practical advantages of rocket engines. And because a potential enemy was turning great strides in the direction in which these developments pointed, it suddenly became not only expedient, but virtually essential, that we move in the same direction. As a result we have penetrated the gravity barrier. We have proved the feasibility of reentry; and we shall soon demonstrate that man, too, can pierce the heat barrier and survive. In addition, a fourth obstacle—the radiation barrier—is now recognized as a serious problem.

The facilities, weapons, and equipment we have put together in our mammoth ballistic missile program do indeed provide us with a base for space. It is a broad base, serving both as a deterrent and as a solid foundation for raising us step by step toward our goals in space. Studies being conducted now, at the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine and at other research centers, are aimed toward acclimating man to the peculiarities of space.

The men now being selected as the Air Force test pilots of the future are pioneers just as surely as Langley and Lindbergh and Mitchell and Doolittle were pioneers in their day. The fact that these illustrious names belong to our century makes me confident that we shall see—in my lifetime—man as firmly established in the medium of space as he is now in the medium of air.

Man tends to be pessimistic regarding things he knows little about. When the airplane was new, intelligent people conceded it might someday be practical for man to fly, but surely not more than a few miles and certainly not with any weight greater than a thousand pounds.

In 1943, when the first American jet aircraft took wing, few, if any, realized its true significance. That jet brought dramatic changes. New, broader characteristics of speed, of altitude, of endurance, of pilot techniques—all dictated fresh concepts and, consequently, new tactics. These breakthroughs required exploring, understanding, and learning.

Once accepted, however, jets came quickly into their own. Their dynamic impact as a deterrent force and as an offensive instrument emerged out of the transitory thinking that marked the conversion from hot to cold war. Modifications in both technologies and tactics have led to jet bombers of intercontinental ranges, and these have flowered commercially into airliners of similar speeds, ranges, and carrying capacities.

Still another graphic example was the breakthrough achieved in nuclear energy. The atomic bomb was developed during World War II and finally employed as a means of resolving decisively the war with Japan. It was used initially in its most primitive fashion and peaceful applications which control of the atom would yield had not yet been given the consideration they were later to receive. Throughout history many has suffered from a shortage of power, and suddenly he was faced with an awe-inspiring source of new power. In a short 15 years the fantastic energy derived from the atom has been used to fashion a new base for deterrent strength. It has been put to use in powerplants and in medicine. It has made possible submarines of great endurance. And the expansive commercial applications of nuclear energy still lie ahead. We never dreamed when we tackled the enigma of the atom that one of our problems was going to be an excess of power—a problem requiring discrimination and subtle employment in the exploitation of this new-found source.

Our thinking at this tender point in the aerospace age may be just as naive as these examples. Yet here we are, in 1960, with another newly developed technology at our command. We have built and demonstrated workable ballistic missile weapon systems. Even the experts who made up the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee in 1954—in their most optimistic moments—believed that an operational ICBM could not be produced in less than 6 years. Our Atlas, launched by a Strategic Air Command crew just 5 years and 2 months from the time the accelerated development effort began, not only exceeded this expectation, but it has attained performance, accuracy, and reliability standards far better than originally specified.

This is an era ripe for progress. It is ready now, not by accident but by intent. The lessons of the recent past should make it crystal clear that unparalleled opportunities are ours for the taking.

Now, why should man go into space—and how will he benefit himself and his country once he is there?

Man is already taking a big part in the overture to space. The trip begins at the beginning—on the ground. The boosters, the space vehicles, the instruments they carry—all germinate in the minds of men. Men of many talents must create, develop, build, test, operate, and maintain them.

Already space has had a tremendous impact on long-accepted doctrines of military strategy. The potentials of robot military vehicles have been illustrated vividly in the Discoverer series, and future uses are clearly predictable. Past accompilshments and visible prospects are equally stimulating.

The ballistic missile and strategic space systems we are building today are intricate. But this does not mean that we are piling complexity upon complexity. Rather, in the interests of reliability and economy, we are continually seeking simplification. Our coming Minuteman ICBM, for instance, will be much easier—and cheaper—to build, maintain, and operate than the liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan.

The remarkable fact emerging from our current developments is not the conquest of challenging technologies alone. More significant is the fact that people accustomed to traditional patterns of development have been able to accept and react to drastic departures in technologies, methods, and procedures. We have been faced with an intense challenge to our learning processes—the necessity to expand hurriedly but productively into new sciences and new career fields.

Short years ago electronic brains were the province of a few. Today the use of giant computers is becoming common, and people who may not necessarily comprehend their complexities are proficient in this operation. A pilot not familiar with the cockpit of a B–52—or a 707—may be dismayed by the array of dials and instruments that surround him. Yet he soon discovers that these devices make his job easier, simpler, and safer.

I cannot imagine the Air Force operating without planes, or various forms of manned vehicles, at any time in the foreseeable future. I believe that the Air Force will come to depend upon a broad, flexible, well-balanced "mix" of aircraft, ballistic missiles, satellite systems, and man-carrying spacecraft. And we should not be so shortsighted that we fail to recognize both the vistas of opportunity and the extension of responsibilities which this mix entails.

We are expanding the regions in which man can become militarily and commercially proficient. To succeed we must plan for advanced manned systems—systems which will enable us to perform in space the kinds of missions we have been conducting at the lower altitudes. This calls for versatile forces, both aloft and at ground level, which are capable of fulfilling a growing variety of exacting duties.

Those who think that the aircraft needs defending have pointed to certain operational requirements which can now be satisfied only by conventional manned vehicles. For example, aircraft can be launched when an attack appears imminent, and recalled if that attack fails to materialize. Aircraft, en route, can divert from one target to another. They can strike multiple targets and perform combined tasks on a single sortie. They have the ability to search out, locate, and attack targets of uncertain location. And aircraft are not expendable on a single mission.

Yet here is an important fact not generally recognized: In looking realistically to the future, we are laying technically practical plans to incorporate into the Nation's force structure manned or unmanned space systems which can accomplish, or improve on, every one of these capabilities traditionally related to aircraft.

Through recoverable boosters and nonexpendable spacecraft, we will be able to inject man—safely and economically—into our space programs. Man's dexterity and judgment applied to these far-ranging systems will broaden this scope, reduce their costs, and enhance their practicality. In the true mastery of spaceflight, the personal capabilities of man will replace complex and expensive equipment.

The rational ability which man can bring into play will be far better than the most intricate devices ever conceived. Man is still the best all-purpose computer servo-system known. His brain is equal to 10 billion electron tubes. He is unsurpassed in evaluating, reasoning, interpreting and reacting to complex situations.

Man's performance in space will complement and protect man's progress on earth. The crews of our Strategic Air Command fly long hours over great distances in the interest of national security. As human boundaries have receded, human responsi-

bilities have increased. It is reasonable to assume that the Air Force pilot of the space age will carry the big stick of deterrence into the arenas of space.

Above the atmosphere, too, man can widen his knowledge and extend his abilities in the fields of communications, intelligence, navigation, and meteorology. He can perform in superior fashion the functions of reconnaissance and early warning soon to be carried out by our Samos and Midas satellite systems. He can raise his scientific and engineering capabilities to new heights, maintaining and utilizing the growing number of artificial satellites which will be joining the space-traffic pattern. He can look into the universe unhindered by the atmosphere.

As our ascent in the vertical dimension lengthens, characteristics change. But the pilot remains the essential link between aspiration and achievement.

Like our curent earth satellite programs, any manned space system should begin, and end, in the lower atmosphere. We have determined that the best vehicle to carry man into space will be one which he can control and maneuver and land. The earliest such craft will undoubtedly be similar to the skip-glide kind of vehicle now envisioned in the Air Force Dynasoar program.

In the latter years of this century, the people who will support these manned space-flights will probably be performing many of the same kinds of tasks now being done in support of aircraft and satellite systems.

Near Sunnyvale, Calif., the Air Force satellite test center is already in operation. It is the Nation's first organization set up exclusively to satisfy the launch, tracking, acquisition, and recovery requirements of a satellite program. A nerve center for an electronic network that extends around the would and into space itself, the center is linked to instrumentation squadrons in Hawaii, to tracking stations in California and Alaska, and to a launch squadron at Vandenberg AFB.

Already marked for expansion, this satellite test center will take on increasing responsibilities in the months ahead. The staffs of NCO's who keep electronic fingers on the pulses of these systems will grow significantly as the systems increase in number and in complexity.

Similarly, men who service and maintain our fighters, bombers, and cargo planes will be matched by men technically trained to the demanding job of readying space vehicles for flight—work which requires the ultimate in quality and attention to detail. Others will be needed for ground support, control, and communications.

Already we can acquire, during a single pass of an instrumented satellite, enough scientific and performance data to keep processors and evaluators busy for weeks. More and more, skilled computers will be needed to extract vital information from the infinite mysteries of the universe.

Tracking, control, and communication with orbiting vehicles will demand manpower and brainpower in hitherto unmatched quantities. During research and development, these are functions accomplished primarily by civilian technicians; but with operational systems, these jobs will belong to the men—and women—who wear Air Force blue.

Never let it be said that the flying Air Force is a dying Air Force. Nothing could be further from the truth. Man will go into space. The work which the Air Force does today and in the years just ahead will strengthen our national security and enhance the progress of our civilization. And men will be shaping, building, operating, and administering the aerospace force which is emerging today as our strong lifeline to peace.

Man has ranged the length and breadth of the land. He has descended to the depths of the sea; climbed to the heights of Everest. He has raised himself to the limits of the atmosphere. Man has been the instigator and the benefactor of every breakthrough against technical, social, and geographic frontiers. He will not stop short of the last great frontier.

Dental Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to receive from Dr. J. M. Donovan, editor, Wisconsin State Dental Society, a resolution proposing increased appropriations for dental research.

All of us recognize the significant role the dental profession plays in our community helping to maintain and improve the health of our people.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Dental Society, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution forwarded by Dr. Donovan, accompanied by a letter from Dr. A. E. Kopp, president of the society, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE DENTAL SOCIETY,
Neenah, Wis., April 7, 1960.

To: Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Request for increasing appropriation for dental research.

Reason: We as members of the dental profession feel that due to our expanding population and to the limited number of dentists being trained, it is necessary to expand our facilities for research in dental health. We wish to ask your support for legislation to further this purpose and to increase the present appriation.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

J. M. DONOVAN, D.D.S.

WISCONSIN STATE DENTAL SOCIETY,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 30, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I understand that Federal budget items for support of research and training in our dental and medical schools are presently being reviewed. It has been urged that $5 million be added to the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1961 for the National Institue of Dental Research. On behalf of the membership of the Wisconsin State Dental Society I wish to voice our approval of this increase.

It is contemplated that $3 million of this increase would be allocated to the dental schools for training dental students in the use of auxiliary personnel, particularly chairside assistants. This procedure would be a worthwhile investment to substantially improve the dental health of our growing population in the future. It would be one way of helping to solve the dental manpower situation.

I most earnestly trust that you will give this increase your most earnest consideration, and that you will arrive at the opinion it should be approved.

Sincerely yours,

WISCONSIN STATE DENTAL SOCIETY,
A. E. KOPP, D.D.S., *President.*

"We Must Do Everything in Our Power To Make America Grow," Says Michael F. Widman, Jr., Assistant to the President, United Mine Workers of America, in an Important Public Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of our colleagues to these cogent sentences spoken Tuesday by an assistant to the president of the United Mine Workers of America:

We must do everything in our power to make America grow. Extending our thoughts to a broader field, the old struggle between capital and labor is, or should be, as dead as the proverbial dodo bird. There is no reason for it here. Besides, cooperation has much sweeter fruits than discord. A richer America is a better America, for capital, labor, and that great and often indistinguishable mass—the general public.

So declared Michael F. Widman, Jr., director of the Research and Marketing Department of the United Mine Workers of America, in an address to the Division of Gas and Fuel Chemistry of the American Chemical Society at Cleveland, Ohio, April 12, 1960.

Mr. President, those remarks by Mr. Widman represent further manifestation of the spirit which permeates the National Coal Policy Conference—an organization of producers and workers of the coal industry, the coal-hauling railroads, and equipment manufacturers allied with the coal industry.

I underscore, too, Mr. Widman's pertinent remarks concerning the necessity for more research and the essentiality of a national fuels study. We have measures pending in committees which I earnestly hope will be cleared for action by this body at an early date to further the research and fuels policy study.

Mr. Widman's address is replete with hope, challenge, and forthrightness. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MICHAEL F. WIDMAN, JR., DIRECTOR, RESEARCH AND MARKETING DEPARTMENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, TO THE DIVISION OF GAS AND FUEL CHEMISTRY, AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 12, 1960

Gentlemen, it is with some hesitation that I venture to address you this afternoon.

After all, I come before this assemblage as a layman, a novice speaking to experts in the field. But I feel that we have a great deal in common, you and I. The times have welded unbreakable bonds around us. These bonds impose upon us, indeed upon all Americans, the gravest responsibility since the foundation of our Republic.

Consider for a moment the era in which we live. Obviously, it is a dangerous time. The realities of the cold war are constantly before us. The ominous threat of atomic extinction looms not too distantly in the background. It is a challenging period. The Nation has grown tremendously, but with this growth has come problems of seemingly insoluable proportions. The responsibilitis of the United States, not only to our own people, but also to the rest of the free world, demand from every citizen maximum effort. In return for this effort, I say to you today, the future of this Nation is brighter now than at any other time in our history.

To you has been given a special responsibility. For in order to grow we must invent, we must improvise, we must find new and better ways to solve age-old problems.

Look about you. The world is literally straining at its bonds. Nations are arising from areas which, a short time ago, were little more than jungles. Scientists all over the world are being taxed to the utmost to wring from mother earth the resources necessary to sustain and nurture this growth. Already the eyes and hopes of men have transcended the earth and are dwelling on the distant stars and planets. Who can say what the future will bring? Hundreds of years of progress have been compressed into the last 50 years. Each day brings further progress, with more problems and greater potential for the satisfaction of human wants.

But there are also in the world two conflicting ideologies. Each school of thought is in a period of dynamic and sustained growth. Each seeks to mold the world in its own shape. There is a war being fought for the hearts and minds of people, a war in which the only alternatives are freedom or slavery.

NEW TYPE OF CONFLICT

You are in the forefront in this war. For this is a new type of conflict. It is being fought in the factories, on the farms, and in the marketplace. It is an economic war—different, but no less deadly.

To win we must produce. Just as in every other war, production of the sinews of battle determines who will emerge victorious and who will fall.

The weapons of this new warfare are different. Oh, to be sure, we still have tanks, artillery, airplanes, and the like. But the mutual threat of destruction by the atom and hydrogen bombs have forced us into different channels.

Our principle reliance for national survival is on our ability as a nation to produce an ever increasing standard of life for those who live in our economy, or who benefit directly from it. This is what we must do to win. Mobilization of every resource at our command must be mustered to meet the contingencies imposed upon us by the war. America has an unparalleled record during past conflicts. We know that we must rise again to meet the challenge of the enemy.

Here again you and I have something in common. For you have helped to provide the many products which have brought America to her present status. We, in the labor movement, have constantly struggled to give to those who produce the goods and services of our opulence a share in the prosperity of the Nation.

But, as I have stated, the job has really only begun. We must not look backward. Leave looking backward to history. Rather, we must strive to meet our future, its problems, its rewards, and its setbacks.

We have a job, you and I. We must do everything in our power to make America grow. Extending my thoughts to a broader field, the old struggle between capital and labor is, or should be, as dead as the proverbial dodo bird. There is no room for it here. Besides, cooperation has much sweeter fruits than discord. A richer America is a better America, for capital, labor, and that great and often indistinguishable mass—the general public.

GROWTH ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL

Growth, then, is essential to survival. Aside from its strategic connotations, growth is desirable of itself. In fact, each age has tried to expand, to enjoy a little more of the material benefits of the earth.

Each succeeding age in our history has been characterized by inventions which shaped the destiny of that era. There were the cotton gin, the steamboat, the railroad, the automobile, and many others too numerous to mention. This age, however, is far more complicated. Scientists have literally unloosed a Pandora's box upon mankind. There are a host of inventions in production, in distribution, and in consumption. More are coming in an almost frightening array. No one invention can be singled out as more prominent than several others. The sum total has meant an almost unbelievable standard of life for us all.

However, our competitors have not been asleep. Their scientists and engineers have also reached, as it were, for the stars, in both the literal and figurative sense. But in so doing, they have neglected the material welfare of the people. They have sacrificed human rights for economic progress. The challenge before you then, is to further economic progress by promoting human progress.

These two ends, although many times considered incompatible, are really complimentary. For a few minutes consider the steps taken by the coal industry to further its own economic progress and the welfare of its employees at the same time. The strides made in coal are worthy of imitation. For in coal's emergence are combined all the elements of a successful formula for national growth.

Ten years ago bituminous coal had reached a low ebb. Production had fallen, labor strife was widespread, markets were feeling the eroding effects of gas and oil. Obviously, the life of the industry depended upon a revolution. To effect this revolution, both labor and management pledged their unceasing efforts.

During the following period coal has lost two of its major markets. This loss in one case is all but complete. In the other outlet, coal faces a most serious decline in demand. We refer, of course, to the railroad and the domestic space heating fields.

The old steam engine is well on its way to becoming a quaint museum piece. The diesel is now the mainstay of every major railroad in the United States. With the disappearance of the steam locomotive a market of over 100 million tons has been lost.

Most new homes in the United States are now being heated with either oil or natural gas. This process is a natural result of our rising standard of living. Coal has become associated with bygone eras of drudgery and toil. In fact, to suggest to many homeowners and housewives today that they dirty their hands with coal is closely akin to being a subversive. So despite the rapid strides made by coal in designing and manufacturing modern stokers, oil and gas continue to replace coal in the basement.

No amount of argument seems to be able to stem the tide. Coal equipment may be automatic. It may be clean and convenient. It may be the least expensive of all the fuels. It may be dependable under any and all conditions. While, assuredly, it is all of these things, yet we have witnessed a headlong flight from this fuel in new home construction and a great amount of conversion in existing homes.

COAL INDUSTRY LEADS IN PRODUCTIVE EFFICIENCY

Coal faced these problems. It had to. From them coal found the incentive it needed to modernize its productive facilities. Today the coal industry stands alone at the head of all industry in productive efficiency.

This productive record of coal is no less than an industrial revolution. The average miner in America today produces almost 12 tons per day. Compare this to the record of about 1 ton for a European miner and you can visualize the record of our industry. American coal can undersell German coal in Germany. In fact, many European nations have tariffs or other trade restricting devices on American coal to protect their domestic coal industries. This is indeed different, in an age when America is supposedly faced with the challenge of foreign competition.

The coal miner benefited by the mechanization of the mines. The miner today is the highest paid industrial worker in the world. He has a welfare and retirement fund which provides for his medical needs, his retirement, and for many other services which he and his dependents may require from time to time. All of this is included in the price of coal. And, yet, the f.o.b. mine price of coal has actually declined during the past 10 years. Amazing, incredible, but it is true.

All of this has been accomplished by research finding new and better ways to do things. But the United Mine Workers of America has always maintained that the new and better ways must include more benefits for the men who work for a living. So, we did not fight mechanization. We welcomed it. Through it we envision a new and better life for our members and the Nation.

However, our industry is just beginning. Research has found ways to produce coal cheaply. Now research must find ways to use coal in more and more ways. This is the job that is in store for coal. I hope that some of you will be a part of the program to expand coal usage through research. Believe me when I tell you that your career will be most satisfying. One thing I can promise—it will never be dull.

Three years ago the United Mine Workers of America established a research and marketing department. The purpose of the department was to aid the coal industry in its search for new markets. It was the feeling of our organization that, while coal had been farsighted in production, it had failed to keep apace in the utilization of its product. In the 3 years since the founding of the department, it has made some startling progress which should help our economy in its program to grow and prosper.

UMWA ESTABLISHES UNIQUE DEPARTMENT

The idea of a marketing department in a labor organization is, in itself, an innovation. The fact that the industry has allowed a union to engage in activities, once considered to be exclusively management's domain, is a tribute to the changed attitude of the former protagonists in coal. The formation of the research and marketing department could only be possible after the two sides had reached a plateau of cordial labor relations. The industry has not had a major strike in 10 years. During this period an understanding has been reached wherein each side accepted its responsibility to promote the good of the industry and the men who work in it. Within this framework was born the idea that together more could be accomplished than separately. We may still

have our family feuds, but to the outside world there is no distinction between capital and labor in coal.

In the intervening period the United Mine Workers of America has done much to assist the coal industry in its constant battle to maintain its competitive position. In the course of this we have definitely come to the conclusion that coal is the fuel of the future. Furthermore, with some basic research, coal can easily become the foundation stone for the progress I envisioned at the beginning of this address.

It probably would be interesting to you for me to illustrate how we have somewhat reversed the tables upon our former competitive tormentors. In the domestic space heating field, for example, coal is on the way back. Not only are we coming back, but we intend to compete with gas and oil on their own terms, comfort and convenience. How do we intend to do this? We say this to you prospective homebuilders. If you want the cheapest and most convenient of the fossil fuels consider coal. However, if you want the ultramodern, the very best, why then "coal by wire", or electricity, is for you.

What has happened essentially is that coal has become the principle fuel used for the generation of electricity. Today, for example, coal generates about 55 percent of the total in the United States, including hydro. The utilities consume over one-third of our total production each year, amounting to about 160 million tons. Experts predict that by 1975 this total will jump to about 475 million tons, or more than our existing present production.

The implications for the home heating market are clear. An average residential user today consumes about 3,500 kilowatt hours or 1½ tons of coal equivalent. If that same household lives "all-electric", including electric heating and cooling, his usage could easily jump to 22,000 kilowatt hours, or 11 tons of coal equivalent. It is of little consequence to us if the coal is burned in the basement, or under the utility boiler. Either way coal serves the American public and in so doing prospers.

Naturally, our department has encouraged any inventors who come to us with ideas. We believe that the best way to progress is to judge every idea objectively, no matter how idiotic it may sound on the surface. There may not be merit in any except one, but we dream of that one. Some of these ideas may surprise you. But, we think that a great many of them have future potential of staggering dimensions.

WILL COAL AGAIN POWER LOCOMOTIVES?

An engineer has patented a coal-fired diesel engine. Actually, a small diesel was recently run on a mixture of coal and oil at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Currently tests are being considered at the Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Needless to say, successful conclusion of these tests will not only put us back on the railroads, it could also revolutionize the internal combustion field. The growth of an industry and the progress of a nation may well be accomplished through research.

There is currently under consideration in Congress a bill to provide money for coal research. A similar bill, which passed both Houses last year, was vetoed by the President. This year we look forward to a more successful culmination to our efforts to find new uses for coal. Certainly the Nation will benefit, the industry will grow, and the mineworker will be in a much better position.

There are literally hundreds of potential uses for coal. What we want is for the American people to have the full use of the product with which nature has so lavishly endowed our Nation. There are over a thousand years of coal reserves. To you, the scientists, goes the task of utilizing it.

There is one final word which I believe should be said here. Every nation should make maximum use of their natural resources. We, as a nation, have not done this. Even today, in our energy fuels, we are wasting valuable and irreplaceable products by indiscriminate use. I refer to the practices of dumping natural gas under utility boilers and the wholesale importation of residual oil. Each of these practices is bad from a conservation standpoint. Natural gas is in short supply. To use such a premium fuel under a boiler, when there are so many substitutes with many hundreds of years reserve, is a waste of the most base sort. The use of residual fuel oil, if continued at its present pace, will go a long way toward crippling the domestic coal and petroleum industries. The President has seen the harm this has caused and has placed a ban, though hardly adequate, on the wholesale importation of foreign oil.

NATIONAL FUELS STUDY IS NEEDED

We would suggest that in light of these developments, the Congress conduct a national fuels study to consider the proper use of all of our fuels. Such a course of action would go a long way toward assuring our Nation the energy it needs for long-term growth.

To promote a national fuels policy and all other activities for the good of coal, the coal operators, the coal-carrying railroads, the coal equipment manufacturers, the coal-burning electric utilities, and the United Mine Workers of America have formed the National Coal Policy Conference. This group is another tribute to the new era of cooperation in coal. Its activities have already done much to promote coal's welfare by acting as a forum where all parties may meet and discuss problems. The idea for the conference emanated from Mr. John L. Lewis, who suggested that coal needed one voice. Coal now speaks with that one voice.

The coal industry has made progress through innovation and a willingness to try something new. We have done it in many ways and will continue to do it. For in expanding our horizons, we will provide for a better life for ourselves and the world. It is truly an age of plenty for those who progress by providing better things for themselves and the Nation.

Dissemination and Application of Information on Environmental Cancer Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Dr. Wilhelm C. Hueper before the Science Writers' Seminar in Louisville, Ky., on March 30, 1960. Dr. Hueper is Chief of the Environmental Cancer Section of the National Cancer Institute:

DISSEMINATION AND APPLICATION OF INFORMATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL CANCER HAZARDS

(By W. C. Hueper)

Present efforts toward a control of cancer are heavily loaded with salvage measures against cancers in being. Doubtlessly, to cure cancer victims is more exciting, more tangible, more glamorous, and more immediately rewarding than prevention even if failures of cancer therapy are still frequent. Prevention of cancers from being formed by eliminating or containing cancer-producing agents is obviously less spectacular and less attractive. However, primary cancer prevention is definitely more humane and can be made not infrequently even with the limited existing knowledge of cancer causes much more effective than cancer cures.

Since a considerable amount of reliable information is available on chemical and physical carcinogens being constituents of our natural and artificial and mainly industrial environment and on their distribution in the human environment, a sound factual foundation exists for instituting a practicable and economically feasible cancer-control program by applying preventive measures. Exposure to environmental carcinogens is not limited to a few small population groups, but is present to varying degrees for the population at large. Preventive cancer control therefore should be everybody's concern for purely selfish reasons.

A principal step in launching such a program consists of a comprehensive educational campaign by disseminating through all means of communication the available facts on environmental cancer hazards not only to a few specially interested parties but especially to the general public which will furnish the cancer victims. The general public must be alerted to the health hazards which are associated with the development of modern industrialism. Mankind has to be made aware of the introduction of new manmade disease-producing agents which have become superimposed on the natural environmental pathogenic spectrum. Preventive medicine properly applied against these new industry-related health hazards can become as effective as it has been in the past against communicable diseases.

It is gratifying to know that Dr. A. Lanza recently expressed in a foreword to a monograph on industrial carcinogens by Dr. Eckardt similar sentiments when he stated that "Knowledge—made as widely available as possible—is still the major weapon in this attack." There can be little doubt that a part of the confusion and controversy which surrounds the present public and legislative discussion concerning control measures of cancer hazards associated with additives and contaminants of food, cosmetics, and drugs are the result of highly defective or totally lacking recording of experiences made on man with carcinogenic substances produced, processed, and used in industry, which are reaching through the medium of industrial waste products and consumer goods in a usually mitigated form the general population. It may therefore be appropriate to list some of the sins and omissions of the past so that we may benefit from them in the future.

The American dye and rubber industries have been manufacturing and using in preceding decades carcinogenically highly potent aromatic amines, i.e., naphthylamines, benzidines, and 4-aminodiphenyl, which were employed in the production of dyes including food and cosmetic dyes and of rubber antioxidants. These chemicals were made in millions of pounds and can elicit cancers of the bladder upon contact to microgram quantities. Except of a brief report on the occurrence of some bladder cancer among 4-aminodiphenyl producers published a few years ago, the American literature contains no information on the occurrence and number of such cancers and the type of workers involved for the last 25 years. Quite complete and thorough studies on this subject, on the other hand, were published during recent years from English industrial investigators.

Not only is the scope of the aromatic cancer hazard for workers, users, and consumers of these chemicals and the products made with such carcinogens an unknown quantity,

but the medical director of one of these chemical companies has gone out of his way also to block the presentation of such evidence before an International Cancer Congress in 1929 by threatening me with legal prosecution of divulging company's secrets. In 1948 he declared in a letter to the Public Health Service that my publications revealed communistic leanings and that for this reason I would never be allowed to enter any plant of his company. Somehow he was not successful in his attempted character and professional assassination. Occupational bladder cancer among several hundred dyeworkers is on record in files of chemical companies. Representatives of the dye industry refused at two occasions to divulge the number of bladder cancers which had occurred among the employees of their companies.

Coal tar cancer of the skin and of the lung is, as far as American workmen are concerned, an almost nonexisting occupational disease. The unpleasant fact is that their occurrence has merely not been reported. After I had some years ago an opportunity to study the cancer records of workers employed in a coal tar distillery I followed this experience by visiting one of their customers. However, as a matter of precaution I stopped first at the State Health Department to consult there the official cancer records kept regarding the occurrence of skin cancers among workers of this large papermill. Its management first denied the existence of a cancer hazard and conceded it only when I confronted them with the official evidence of their State Health Department. Similar observations were subsequently made in another papermill located in another State. Some 15 manufacturers and processors of coal tar banded together some 10 years ago to sponsor experimental studies on cancer hazards. These investigations for which I devised the plans and which were executed by a private research organization have been carried out during the past decade. Nothing has ever been published about the results obtained in studies on man and animals.

A similar situation prevails in connection with published records on carcinogenic properties of products of the petroleum industry. Although the occurrence of skin cancer among paraffin pressers of American oil refineries belongs to the oldest observations on occupational cancers, there elapsed 30 years between 1930 and 1960 before the continued existence of such cancers was again placed on record. Nevertheless, one must appreciate the relative broadmindedness of this particular company, because it is the only one during the last decades which has seen fit to make some of its clinical and experimental observations on oil cancers public property. In recent litigations on cancers of the skin from contact with cutting oil the confession was made by the chief investigator of prolonged and extensive experimental studies on various products of the petroleum industry sponsored by the American Petroleum Institute that none of the results concerning carcinogenic properties of such materials made during the last 12 years have been published and have therefore been made available to the medical profession at large for analysis and application.

Experiences of similar nature are available for other industrial carcinogens, such as asbestos, arsenic, chromates, nickel, isopropyl oil, and others. Some of the recently published statistical investigations on lung cancer among asbestos workers and railroad employees are of peculiarly colored quality and contain most dubious statistical data.

There remains the question whether governmental agencies facing similar problems are immune against such manipulations. Apparently they are not, according to my own experiences during the past 12 years. When in 1948 I advocated a thorough survey of our uranium miners in the Rocky Mountains for evidence of lung cancer hazards, a high medical official of AEC declared such an undertaking as nonsense and tried to block it, although unsuccessfully. When in 1951 I had been invited by the Colorado State Medical Society to address its annual meeting in Denver on cancer hazards in Colorado and had included in my communication a description of the circumstancs accounting for the highly excessive lung cancer incidence among radioactive ore miners in Saxony and Bohemia observed and published since 1879, I was requested to omit these references as being "not in the public interest" and not sufficiently confirmed and applicable. The delivery of my paper was made dependent on complying with this demand. Since I refused to be made a scientific liar by omission, I canceled my talk as being censored. I have been told that someone in AEC asked then that I should be dismissed for using allegedly "bad judgment." Since about that time Dr. Sebrell, former Director of NIH had objected to my appearance as a private citizen for giving testimony before the Delaney Committee in matters of cancer hazards from food additives, my punishment consisted of having my promotion to a higher grade rescinded and of being removed from all further fieldwork on occupational cancer, i.e. I was forbidden to contact State health departments and industry. This arbitrary order almost killed, also, my experimental work on environmental cancer hazards, although it was quite effective in obliterating almost the entire epidemiologic work on occupational cancer hazards at the National Cancer Institute since 1952.

My most recent experience on this line came from the Food Protection Board of the National Research Council. After I had been instrumental as a member of an ad hoc committee to establish the scope and nature of cancer hazards from food additives, I was excluded from becoming a member of the permanent committee because of objections raised against me by some members of the Board. After exchanging some personal correspondence with the chairman of the committee on this point, one member of the Board, Dr. King, executive director of the Nutrition Foundation, addressed a letter to Mr. Larrick, Commissioner of FDA in which he bitterly complained about my activities in declaring irresponsibly in papers and speeches that carcinogens were getting into our food supply, that I had criticized allegedly competent scientists and members of the National Academy of Sciences on that account. He seemed to consider them apparently as some sort of unfallible and untouchable scientific holy cows. Finally he suggested that his denunciation might be submitted to Mr. Folsom, at that time Secretary of the Department, apparently in the hope that my further services might be dispensed with by the USPHS. Well, a copy of his letter drifted down through channels and seems to rest peacefully now in some file cabinet.

This is the record of some types of present-day efforts to disseminate information on environmental cancer hazards and to support cancer prevention.

Through such a distortion of occupational cancer epidemiology, the seriousness of this problem for modern industry is conveniently minimized. Attention is thereby, moreover, diverted from investigating and assessing properly the role that industrial and industry related carcinogens play in the present-day cancer panorama.

Farm Legislation Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Virginia congressional delegation met yesterday with approximately 200 farmers from our State, the occasion being planned by the Virginia Farmers Union.

The president of this organization, which has the welfare of the Nation's and Virginia's farmers uppermost in mind, presented an excellent statement at this meeting. It deserves the attention of the entire House.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this statement on the need for farm legislation:

STATEMENT BY JOHN B. VANCE, PRESIDENT, VIRGINIA FARMERS UNION AT A MEETING OF STATE FARM LEADERS WITH THE VIRGINIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 13, 1960

Gentlemen, although I am privileged to be personally acquainted with most of you gentlemen here this afternoon, perhaps the first thing I should do is to identify myself.

I am John B. Vance; I am president of the Virginia Farmers Union, which as I am sure you know is one of Virginia's two major farm organizations covering more than two-thirds of the geographical area of our State with a membership of approximately 20,000 farm people. I have been asked to act as first spokesman for the group.

On behalf of the group assembled here this afternoon, may I express our most sincere appreciation to you gentlemen for granting us a few minutes of your time. We fully appreciate the important positions you occupy in our Government and the tremendous responsibilities you must carry. Certainly it is not our wish to add to your burdens but instead we want to be as helpful as possible in assisting to resolve some of the very serious problems with which we farm people are confronted today.

Also, may I say that Virginia is justifiably proud of its representation in the Congress of the United States. We feel that in you gentlemen we have a congressional delegation second to none in this entire country.

Gentlemen, the group you see assembled here this afternoon are real farmers. In fact I think they are the cream of Virginia agriculture. These people are not part-time farmers. They are not city farmers. They are not hobby farmers. Nor are they people who farm the farmer. These people are honest to goodness dirt farmers who attempt to make their living from the land they till. There are little farmers in this group. There are big farmers here. There are Farmers Union members here. There are members of other farm organizations here, and yes, there are people here who are members of no farm organization. Almost every type of agriculture in our State is represented—tobacco, peanuts, fruit, vegetables, small grain, corn, cotton, dairy, hogs, beef cattle, poultry, and others. I bring these facts out because I think it important for you gentlemen to know that you have seated before you one of the most representative cross sections of Virginia farm leadershhip I have ever seen together in one group in my entire life.

May I also say that we welcome among our group a delegation of fine outstanding farmers from the great State of North Carolina. These gentlemen learned of our visit with you here this afternoon and expressed a desire to participate. Obviously we are delighted to have them with us.

Gentlemen, we have made this trip to Washington to see you because, very frankly, we are deeply concerned with what we see happening to the family farmer and to the rural areas and towns of Virginia. We are concerned and grieved when we see our neighbors selling out and leaving the farm; when we see the country stores being closed for lack of patronage and when we see the country churches vacant because there is no one left to attend services. Let me hasten to add that I am not attempting to be dramatic. I am simply trying to portray for you a trend which if not arrested and reversed is going to destroy the family farmer just as surely as night follows day. Let me also point out that Virginia's traditional conservatism is nurtured among its rural people. Most of you here today will attest to the correctness of that statement. Do you not see that as our rural population is depleted, as the ranks of the farmer is thinned, the greater the danger not only to the economic welfare of the farmer but to the very roots of our free democratic society which was born and nurtured in our beloved Commonwealth.

Each of us know that the existing farm program is not working. It is not working satisfactorily for farmers. It is not working satisfactorily for Government and it is not working satisfactorily for the taxpayers. Except for the tobacco program, which you in Congress had to pass twice before you got it enacted, none of the other parts of the farm program with which we in Virginia are concerned is working at all adequately.

Let me make it crystal clear that we did not come up here to Washington to be critical of anyone, not even Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson who will undoubtedly go down in our history books as the worst Secretary of Agriculture this country has ever known. The time for criticism is past. The time for constructive action is here.

As I have stated the present farm price support programs built around the theory that the way to reduce surpluses, increase farm income, reduce cost to the Government and hold down consumer costs is a proven failure. No one can deny this. Actually the opposite has happened. The lower farm price supports have been reduced, the more farmers have had to produce. They had no other choice, the more surpluses have been created and the higher the cost to the taxpayers.

I am not going to bore you gentlemen with a lot of statistics. All of us know that net farm income is down 40 percent since 1952. We know that the parity ratio is down to 77 percent and that the farmer's share of the consumer dollar has dropped from 47 cents in 1952 to only 37 cents today. We know that 3.5 million farm people have left the farm since 1952 due primarily to economic pressure. We know that farm debt has jumped from $14 billion in 1952 to $20.8 billion today.

On the other side of the page we also know that Commodity Credit Corporation losses today are 15 times more than in 1952. We know that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has added about 20,000 new employees since 1952 and we also know that total expenditures from USDA in 1952 was $1,242 million as compared with $7,341 million in 1959. These are cold, hard facts and figures I have picked up from official publications of the Department of Agriculture, the Presidents Council of Economic Advisers and the Budget Bureau.

But above all, gentlemen, we know that while the prices of the commodities we have to sell have been dropping lower and lower, the cost of the items we have to buy have been rising higher and higher. I know that you gentlemen in Congress have a pretty good idea how much the cost of operations on the farm have gone up. Several of you own farms yourself and know this. But just for the record, let me say, every last thing that farmers have to buy has gone up in price—everything from the cost of medical attention to the price of plowshares.

It simply stands to reason, gentlemen, that this trend cannot be allowed to continue if we are to prevent economic disaster to the family farmer. Farmers have just about taken all the economic shock treatment they can stand. About this, make no mistake. If you should doubt my word, then I invite you to talk with any farmer here today. Or better still the first time you are back home in your district take a tour of some of your farm areas and see what they have to say.

It takes considerably more money to produce a crop of peanuts than it did 8 years ago. And there was very little profit in peanut production for the dirt farmer even 10 years ago; he was lucky to make enough to cover his cash operating expenses and have enough left to pay taxes, debt repayment and a relatively modest standard of living.

The situation has worsened almost every year since 1954. Every year the support level has dropped and unless Congress acts to improve the situation the end is not yet in sight.

While we do not grow much corn in Virginia in comparison to Iowa, the disastrous effects of the present corn programs is going to bring disaster to Virginia hog and cattle growers as surely as night follows day. As you know all controls were removed from corn and the price support level was dropped. What happened? The acreage and production went up. The same as would happen if acreage controls were taken off peanuts and tobacco.

Corn production was record high in 1959. I'm told that a record production is expected again in 1960. At first this will just cause a rapid buildup of corn in CCC inventory, but inevitably this will also mean a great buildup in the supplies of corn which will certainly be fed to hogs in the major areas of corn production. And this can only mean heavy downward pressure on hog and cattle prices; and this will affect us here in Virignia just as surely as it will affect the hog and cattle farmer in Iowa.

Gentlemen, as sincerely and firmly as I can say it—we do not see any sense in a farm program that continues to build up Federal Treasury expenditures while reducing farm income to a lower and lower level. Really, this is a ridiculous situation.

Well, you might ask, Why try to do something about this now? We know that Congress has tried, only to be met by repeated vetoes. Why make an effort now, wait until next year and we almost surely will have a new and better Secretary of Agriculture?

Gentlemen, that might be all right for some of us who are fortunate enough to have a little more comfortable margin of financial resources than the average farmer. Those of us that are left have been hanging on for 7 years. Now, possibly some of us could hang on for another year or so. But gentlemen, there are many farmers—up to a hundred or more in every county in Virginia—that can hang on no longer if something is not done this year. Some of the rest of us will be on the skids within a few years if something in the way of an improved farm program is not gotten underway as soon as possible.

To the best of our ability we have been studying and discussing the situation among ourselves. We do not presume to pose as agricultural economists or experts. Sometimes we are inclined to think we have too many of this sort anyway. Perhaps farmers would be far better off if they started "thinking for themselves"—as the cigarette commercial goes—instead of sitting passively by and letting someone else do it for them.

We hope you will be able to bring about enactment of the Poage farm income bill before you adjourn. As it stands this bill will not be an immediate solution to our income problems but at least it will give our peanut producers, our hog producers, our manufacturing milk and cream producers, our egg and broiler and turkey producers an opportunity to start this year to develop a program for each of their commodities that can be placed into effect by the beginning of the next production and marketing year, after the producer developed program is approved by Congress.

It seems to us that the Poage farm income bill is the best chance we've got for legislation that will be of long-term help to the Virginia farmer. And we need to get the bill enacted at this session so that work in setting up the programs can get underway this year for consideration next year. If we wait still another year it will be 1963 before we can start operating under adequate long-range farm programs. If we wait this long a lot of farmers who are here today will not be around.

As badly as we need to get started on setting up a good long-range program, we also need to get enacted some kind of immediate emergency legislation so that many of our present farmers can stay on their places long enough to still be there when the improved long-term program goes into effect.

As a minimum this year, as late in the season as it already is, we need to set up some kind of emergency economic disaster credit program so that farmers who cannot obtain loans from regular sources can have funds available to finance this year's crop. Many good Virginia farmers are having real difficulty this year finding a place where they can even borrow money; it is not just a matter of interest rates, it is actually a scarcity of money to be had at any rate of interest. If you can find an acceptable way of doing it we need to work out someway to improve 1960 farm income from the low level now forecast.

And certainly if we start now we have enough time to enact a bill that can extend an emergency credit program and set up a 1-year stopgap income improvement program for the 1961 crop year.

Finally, gentlemen, let me make one point crystal clear. We as farm people are not asking to be given anything. We do not want something for nothing. All we are asking is that Congress formulate and adopt legislation which will extend to us the opportunity to make a decent living for our families comparable to that of nonfarmers.

We are strong believers in the strictest kind of economy in Government. We did not ask for nor do we approve of the so-called soil bank program. We urge you to delete the $500 million requested in the administration's current budget request. Any program which pays anyone for doing nothing is both economically and morally wrong. This program has resulted in the waste of billions of dollars of taxpayer's money and is having the effect of drying up the rural community.

We believe that farm programs similar to that we now have for tobacco should, with necessary adaptations, be made available to the producers of all commodities. This program has worked satisfactorily. It has cost

the Government nothing. The producers are satisfied as evidenced by their better than 90 percent approval for the past 25 years and above all it lets the producers decide for themselves whether or not they want the program.

Living in an administered economy and with the rapid advancement in agricultural technological know-how, farmers have no choice but to restrict production to what the market will absorb at a livable price. This can only be accomplished through rigid production control programs, administered by the farmers themselves, coupled with realistic and workable price supports. This should be the basic philosophy around which future farm programs are built. Any program to be workable and acceptable must in our opinion provide the following: (1) Realistic and strict production control so as to hold production in line with market demands, thereby reducing cost to the taxpayers, (2) price supports only on those commodities where growers in a democratically conducted referendum have chosen to restrict their production to what the market will absorb, (3) no price supports whatever should be made available on any commodity where growers have refused to restrict production, (4) administration of all farm programs by the farmers themselves through democratically elected farmer committees. These are only what we consider the basic essentials of a sound farm program.

In closing our statement, gentlemen, let me say that we believe that once and for all Congress should decide on a basic farm policy. That policy should be clear cut. It should either be based on (1) the preservation of the family farmer or (2) the conversion from family farming to corporate farming such as we are witnessing with the trend toward vertical integration. Then once and for all we farm people would know where we stand.

If we are to go the family farmer route, keep the family farmer on the land and preserve our rural society, then improved legislation is a must at the earliest possible date.

If we are to go the other route, then no action is required. All we need to do is to continue in the direction we have been going these past 7 years.

On behalf of the group assembled here this afternoon, may I again express our most sincere gratitude for your indulgence and patience.

Don M. Leary, Sr., a Dedicated Employee of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 2,300,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government. Today, I will speak briefly about one Federal employee from that great number.

Although I often hear disparaging remarks about the average Federal employee, from my personal experience I find them, in most instances, undeserved. During my 17 years as a Member of Congress, I have had occasion to make many requests for governmental services from many Federal employees. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years, I have listened to and read a great amount of testimony from legislative representatives of Federal employee groups.

I am convinced our Federal employees represent the most efficient, the most loyal, and dedicated group of employees in the world. I would challenge any great private industry to match the capabilities and the high standard of character possessed by our Federal employees.

In February 1943, as a freshman Congressman in Washington, I moved my family to a house in nearby Alexandria, Va. We soon became acquainted with our next door neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Don M. Leary, Sr., and their son and daughter. Mr. Leary had been employed by the Federal Government some 8 years at that time. In the summer of 1945 he started working at the National Airport as an operating engineer in the air-conditioning and heating department. He was dedicated to his family and his job. For the past 15 years he has worked at the airport and he has become the superintendent of his department.

Hours of work meant nothing to Don Leary. I know he was on call day and night for emergencies of different kinds at the airport.

Don began the week of April 4, 1960, like all the previous weeks for 25 years, with a heavy schedule of work. He had reached the age of 69 in March of this year, but he worked with the vigor of a man of 40. His hours of work were long each day of that week. On Friday, April 8, Don worked his full day; went home for dinner and then returned to the airport where he worked until midnight.

On Saturday, April 9, he left for work at the usual hour of 8 a.m. and worked until 1:30 p.m. At about 1:30 p.m. Don crawled into a large new air conditioning duct to inspect the work of his men. One of the younger men asked to be allowed to crawl into the pipe to do the inspection job for him, but Don wanted to be sure everything was perfectly done and insisted on doing the job personally.

We do not know what happened exactly. His men heard him call to them—then silence. Don Leary's devotion to his work ended at that moment. His crew lifted him from the air duct. He was unconscious and almost immediately his heart beat no more. Later, the doctor's autopsy revealed his sudden death was caused by an acute coronary attack.

Don Leary could have retired with a pension 4 years ago, but he chose a different course. He loved his work and respected his responsibility for the safety and comfort of the millions who rush through the crowded corridors of our great national airport each year.

When Don Leary's labors ceased he had an accumulated sick leave of more than a thousand hours. He was entitled to take those hours off with full pay on the many days when he did not feel so well, but he never did. A person who does not understand love of one's work, nor dedication to the job which needs to be done, might say that Don was foolish. They might say Don should have used those hours for rest, a rest to which he was entitled.

His family will receive no compensation for his more than a thousand hours of sick leave. They are lost forever to Don and his family. However, they represent only a small part of that extra loyalty which one Federal employee gave to his employer, his family, and to the best ideals to which most of our Federal employees subscribe.

Don Leary was a quiet man with the dignity that comes from goodness. He bore no high-sounding title, but his life of love for his family and his dedication to his work gave him a high measure of respect and love from hundreds of fellow workers and friends who grieve because he walks no more among us.

In the sadness of his passing, like all those who were privileged to know him, I feel a deep sense of pride in knowing he considered me a friend.

There are many Federal employees who possess the same type of loyalty and devotion to their work. Whether they knew Don Leary or not, they can be proud their fellow employee, Don M. Leary, Sr., lived the life he lived and set the example he set for all of us to follow.

Bigger and Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at this cherry blossom time here in Washington I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to another cherry blossom display in the district which I am proud to represent, in Newark, N.J. I like cherry blossoms wherever they are, and I certainly do not want to minimize the beauty of the cherry blossoms which grace the tidal basin, but I have heard it said that our blossoms in Newark are even bigger and better.

There can be no dispute, at least, that we in Newark have a great many more. Sometime next week over 2,000 trees will burst forth in full, luxurious bloom in Branch Brook Park, only a stone's throw from my home. The newspapers report that over 100,000 people visited the display in just one afternoon last April.

One of our patriotic Newarkites, Herman Davis, pointed with pardonable pride to our fine display in an advertisement in a Washington newspaper. Mr. Davis invited all District residents to come to Newark to see for themselves.

The rest of us in Newark will certainly underscore Mr. Davis' suggestion. All cherry blossom lovers will be most welcome in Branch Brook Park and we guarantee them a sight of unforgettable magnificence. As a matter of fact, if visitors will let me know in advance, I will be glad to escort them to the scene personally.

The following editorial recently appeared in the Newark Evening News:

MORE AND BETTER

A New Jersey voice sounds a discordant note in Washington's Cherry Blossom Festival. Herman Davis, a public-spirited citizen of Newark, has paid for an advertisement in a Washington newspaper inviting residents of the capital to come to Newark if it's cherry blossoms they want to see.

Mr. Davis, a city employee, has seen Washington's trees and he insists they are surpassed by those in Newark's Branch Brook Park, in number, variety, and beauty.

He has a good case. Branch Brook has 2,200 trees, as compared with Washington's 750, and many agree that they make a more dramatic display. They were given to Essex County by the late Mrs. Felix Fuld and grow more luxuriant every year and every year attract increasing numbers of visitors.

The cherry trees are the glory of a park that is one of Newark's—and Essex County's priceless assets. It exists, a green and gracious expanse of lawns, trees, shrubs, playfields, footpaths and winding roads, because of the foresight of the early park commissioners who created it from swampy wasteland.

The Branch Brook Park cherry trees should be blooming in a week or so, and we second Mr. Davis' invitation to District residents. If any of them come they will understand why Branch Brook was visited by more than 100,000 on a single afternoon last April.

One Way To Get Area Development Program Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have been pleading with the Congress to act upon measures I have introduced in the House to assist surplus labor areas. I have requested that some sort of a start be made in getting this program underway. Depressed area legislation is urgently needed and I hope the leadership of the House will schedule early action on a bill that can become law.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, and call its contents to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Tribune-Democrat, Apr. 6, 1960]

ONE WAY TO GET AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM STARTED

Seven House Republicans, including Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of this district, Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, and Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pittsburgh, have asked the House Banking Committee to release the Eisenhower administration's area development bill.

There are numerous bills in Congress to aid depressed areas. One, passed by the Senate nearly a year ago, called for $389.5 million to start this long-delayed program. It was revised down to $251 million by the House Banking Committee, and has been awaiting action by the Rules Committee since the middle of last May. The third is the administration bill, which calls for $57 million.

With respect to industrial development alone, the bills are not so far apart—$100 million in the Senate bill, $75 million in the House revision, and $50 million in the administration bill. The Senate bill would, however, provide $100 million for loans to distressed rural areas, the House revision $75 million, the administration bill nothing. Both Senate and House bills would also provide grants and loans for public facilities, which are not covered in the administration bill.

Also, the Senate and House bill would finance not only land and buildings, but equipment and machinery, up to 65 percent of the cost; whereas the administration bill would provide only 35 percent of the cost, and would exclude equipment and machinery on the grounds that industry could finance these itself, on liberal terms.

These are the basic disagreements which caused President Eisenhower to pocket-veto a bill passed in the closing hours of the 85th Congress, in the summer of 1958. And it is almost certain they will cause him to veto such a bill if it is passed at this session. Therefore, the seven Republicans say, the administration bill should be passed by the House, and an attempt should be made to produce a bill in Senate-House conference committee which the administration will accept.

Had this approach been used earlier, a start could have been made on Federal aid for depressed districts as long as 5 years ago, and much experience could have been obtained by now on which to base its expansion. This type of legislation has been before Congress since 1955.

If the Democratic-controlled Congress persists in passing another bill certain to be vetoed, it will be clear that it is looking for a political issue, rather than legislation to make a start toward area development. In two previous Congresses—the 84th and 85th—bills introduced at the beginning of the 1st session were held up until the closing days of the 2d, a year and a half later. The same thing is happening in the 86th Congress.

This legislation is both experimental and highly controversial. In a minority report last year, three Democrats and three Republicans on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee noted that it cost from $10,000 to $15,000 in plant and machinery to create one job; and instead of the proposed $389.5 million it would require from $3.9 to $5 billion—of which the Government would furnish 65 percent—to provide jobs for the estimated 390,000 unemployed in depressed areas alone.

Other questions were raised: For example, the areas to be helped would be determined on the basis of 6 percent or more unemployed over a period of years, so that cities with a larger volume but a lower percentage of unemployed would be excluded. The minority group said this would put the Federal Government in the position of influencing the location of industry without adequate safeguards to existing developed areas. An antipirating amendment proposed by a Connecticut senator was defeated on the ground that it would cause southern Senators to oppose the bill in the belief that it would finance businesses in staying where they are and not creating new employment opportunities in the South.

Another northern Senator said the classic pattern of area aid, such as that in the Pennsylvania State government, had been to acquire land and buildings but not machinery. Machinery can become obsolescent long before the term of the loan. Senator JAVITS, of New York, said the inclusion of machinery and equipment would cause legitimate suspicion of an attempt to raid the industrial States.

No one could be more interested in aid to areas of chronic unemployment than this newspaper. We have pointed out before, however, that this aid program could have begun on a moderate scale years ago, had some of the controversial questions been compromised.

We sincerely hope—though we do not expect—that Congress will produce a bill this year which provides at least a moderate start, instead of passing a bill certain to be vetoed. The problem of chronic unemployment exists in many places, and needs to be corrected.

The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority is showing the way by lending up to 30 percent of building, land, and improvement costs. Republican Senate Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN said, a year ago, that the administration bill was "geared to what happened in Pennsylvania and elsewhere at the State level."

Nixon's Open-City Approach Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the March 31 edition of the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., contained a very worthwhile column by Prof. Edmund Zawacki.

Professor Zawacki recently spoke in my hometown of Marshfield, Wis., and supported Vice President NIXON's open-city proposal. I have had many letters from people attending this meeting commending Professor Zawacki on his speech.

The column which appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal—the official State paper—is as follows:

ADENAUER HAS OWN SUMMIT AGENDA IDEAS—BY URGING "OPEN SKY" ACCEPTANCE, HE LENDS WEST HAND, THROWS REDS OFF

(By Edmund Zawacki)

On March 26, out of a clear sky, as it were, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer challenged Khrushchev to accept President Eisenhower's "open sky" proposal made 5 years ago at summit conference I.

What is the German chancellor driving at?

With summit conference II scheduled to begin on May 15, revival of the "open sky" idea at this time must have some purpose. But the "open sky" in its original formulation by President Eisenhower had nothing to do with Germany. Has Adenauer discovered something new?

It is characteristic of the German chancellor that his thinking is pretty much limited to pursuit of German national interest, and he has spoken now, too, with German interest dominant. He does not want the morally delicate problem of East German boundaries to be taken up at summit conference II. Khrushchev does.

Given the history of World War II, Adenauer knows that diplomatic defense of German territorial claims in the east against Poland and the U.S.S.R. would be morally embarrassing to the West and, therefore, weak. The allies' interest in German affairs has for some time been focused exclusively on their own important rights in West Berlin, and they have avoided taking a final position on the smouldering boundary dispute between Germany and Poland.

Khrushchev knows all this, too, as is evident from his blunt behavior in France with De Gaulle. The moral force of justice is clearly on the Slavic side of the eastern German boundary dispute, and Khrushchev will be quick to take advantage of this fact at the summit. He will try to put the German problem high on the agenda.

Adenauer's best hope is to crowd out the German question, if he can, by raising a

tremendous issue, one not only urgent but central to world peace. His challenge to Khrushchev is shrewd, and deserves Western support.

The prime feature of Ike's "open sky" idea in 1955 was not, as is commonly supposed, the exchange of unlimited aerial photography, but the prior swap by the United States and the U.S.S.R. of complete blueprints of all military installations, including bases. The "open sky" was to be not mere legalized espionage (prevention of surprise attack), but total moral disarmament by the two top military powers. The photography was only intended as a verification and cross check of the blueprints.

Since Khrushchev in his U.N. speech last August made the spectacular proposal for "Total universal disarmament in 4 years," it is really not Adenauer but Khrushchev himself who, indirectly and perhaps unwittingly, has done most to put the open sky idea massively on the summit agenda. Our side evidently has been aware of this for some time. After all, it is impossible to disarm totally without first knowing what the total armaments are, which calls inexorably for a prior swap of complete military blueprints, i.e., total moral disarmament—the 1955 open sky idea.

In the final analysis, it was Vice President NIXON'S two ideologically explosive speeches inside the Soviet Union last July, broadcast by radio and printed in Izvestia, that forced Khrushchev's hand and precipitated his spectacular but morally defensive "total disarmament in 4 years" proposal in August. Khrushchev was trying to regain the initiative in the war of ideas.

Mr. NIXON'S ideologically explosive reference to the open sky over the Moscow radio is worth careful scrutiny today, especially by those commentators who never understood the big American open sky idea in the first place:

"To me," said the Vice President to the Russian people, "the concept of coexistence is completely inadequate and negative. Coexistence implies that the world must be divided into two hostile camps with a wall of hate and fear between.

"What we need today is not two worlds but one world where different peoples choose the economic and political systems that they want, but where there is free communication among all the peoples living on this earth.

"Let us expand the concept of open skies. What the world also needs are open cities, open minds, and open hearts."

Big ideas do not dry up and blow away. They gestate in men's minds until their time ripens.

The Vice President's timing turns out to have been right. It is clearly in the interest not only of the American people but of the Russian people (for that matter, of the whole world) that an expanded concept—"open skies, open cities, open minds, open hearts"—should dominate the discussions at summit conference II. Concrete means of implementing it are known. In this direction lies a realistic self-enforcing peace for the hydrogen age.

The German problem is peanuts by comparison.

Let George Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Trailways magazine for March–April 1960, carried a noteworthy editorial entitled, "Let George Do It?" I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trailways magazine, March–April 1960]

LET GEORGE DO IT?

In a small New Jersey community not long ago, an election was held for positions on the school board. Only 7½ percent of all the people registered and eligible to vote actually went to the polls. The other 92½ percent were apparently content to have the issue decided for them.

The significance of these figures lies in the fact that they constitute a trend that threatens every one of us. The trend is voter apathy.

It's obvious that democracy will not work in America if people don't care enough to make it work. If too many of us behave like that 92½ percent and sit back to "let George do it," the crucial decisions of our time will be made only by the small groups willing to organize and speak out. Their decisions may not always reflect the true will of the people.

So far in this century we have fought three wars—and expended a great deal of effort—to defend a system of government that urges every man to speak out on issues that concern him. Yet, paradoxically, we seem to spend only a small fraction of this effort in exercising the very right we defended so strongly.

Our record as a nation bears close examination. For a recent major election in Austria, 95 percent of the people turned out to vote; for a similar contest in Italy it was 93.8 percent; in France 89 percent, and in Turkey 87.7 percent. Yet in our own 1956 presidential election, nearly 40 percent of those registered and eligible to vote just didn't bother.

The temptation to "let George do it" is a dangerous one indeed. It is a symbol perhaps of a society where decisions are being made by increasingly complex machines, a society so big and bulky that individuals more often than not are tempted to feel that one vote here or there will count for nothing in the final tabulation.

The fact is that participation by all the people is the lifeblood of democracy. Let one man neglect his obligation and an artery will somewhere be severed; let a thousand men forget and the jugular vein of our democratic system will suddenly be exposed.

Nineteen hundred and sixty is an election year—an opportunity for all of us to express our individual opinions on the relative merits of candidates and issues. Let's not let George do it for us.

The Lion Magazine Strikes a Blow Against the Smut Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, another forceful voice comes to the front in the campaign against those who are perpetrating the vicious and evil racket of obscene mailings upon the American public, and particularly upon the youth of our land.

I refer to the April 1960 issue of the Lion, the official monthly publication of Lions International.

Mr. John Read Karel, senior editor of this fine magazine, has put his powerful pen to work against the smut racketeers through a striking editorial report on what the terrible traffic in pornography and obscene materials is doing to the moral structure of our citizens, and specifically to those who are living in the golden age of youth.

Mr. President I ask permission to have Mr. Karel's outstanding editorial printed in the RECORD, for I believe it contains a message of such importance that it should be read by every Member of Congress, as well as every mother and father in our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lion magazine, April 1960]

THE LION MAGAZINE STRIKES A BLOW AGAINST THE SMUT RACKET

(By John Read Karel)

As the father of three school-age boys whom I am attempting to bring up with clean minds in clean bodies, I would like to talk with my readers for a few minutes about a serious moral problem facing all parents of children today. It is a vicious challenge to decency which you and I can no longer ignore.

I am talking about the problem of pornography—the steadily increasing sale and distribution of filthy, smutty materials to our boys and girls. I am talking about the steadily increasing horde of perverts, hoodlums and smut merchants who have discovered that the dirtying-up of kids' minds is a profitable business. Not somebody else's kids, but yours and mine.

Maybe you don't know what I'm talking about, but the Postmaster General of the United States does. "The increase in pornography being sent through the mails," he says, "is comparable to the narcotics traffic in its damage to our youth." He estimates that a million youngsters a year are receiving mail solicitations from the smut merchants; mail that offers dirty books and pamphlets, phonograph records, movies, and photographs, colored slides, cartoon books and a hundred other things that you, as adults, would be ashamed to be caught looking at.

The Kefauver committee investigating juvenile delinquency knows what I am talking about. "Almost every conceivable device that can be used to pander to the base, illicit and immoral tendencies of human beings has been utilized and merchandised by licentious and conscienceless individuals who play upon normal and abnormal passions for profits."

Who is peddling this filth? The Chicago jobber who made $144,000 a year selling smut to local retailers, the New York pornographer who owns several bookstores frequented by kids and took in over $1,500,000 last year from the traffic, the Los Angeles mail-order peddler of dirty pictures and films who did a $3,000 business per day. Now maybe you know why the hoodlums, the vice gangs, the dope peddlers, and sex perverts have latched onto this beautiful racket of selling dirty, vicious, suggestive junk to your children—and why their take amounted to at least half a billion dollars in the United States last year.

They can't get at my kids, you say? Don't sit there dreaming. Let your boy order a cheap mail-order model plane, or bargain stamps for his collection. Let your daughter innocently send away for a doll dress or a cheap purse and bang, they're on a filth list and the next mail brings a pricelist of per-

verted popular cartoons or books on what happened to Tina, the beautiful sophomore, in the deserted warehouse. These aren't decent mail-order merchants who advertise in reputable papers and magazines; they are the fly-by-night smut merchants whose ads appear in the cruddy publications sold at the corner newsstand, under the counter, to kids. Do your youngsters tell you they get this unspeakable filth? Nope, they are ashamed—but normally curious—so they hide it under the clothes in the dresser drawer until mother finds it and gets sick to her stomach. Last year the Post Office Department received more than 45,000 letters from parents complaining about obscene mail received by their children; the only way, incidentally, under our postal laws that these purveyors of smut can be investigated.

The mails aren't the only weapon of the perverted fast-buck boys. The newsstand operator who is forced to take filth books along with the good ones; the candy-store owner without a conscience; the back-alley passion peddler; the student moron who writes the phone number of his pornography boss on the washroom wall; the itinerant photographer who works small towns to get school kids to pose for his rotten art; all these, and many more, are contributing to this deliberate assault upon the decency of our children. Maybe the father and mother who leave "Lady Chatterley's Lover" and the naked sweetheart of the month lying around the living room, or play suggestive records on the hi-fi while the kids are still awake, are unconscious agents of the scummy bums who would pervert their own daughters for a fast and slimy dollar.

I can't stand in the doorway of my home and slug those filth merchants who want to sell my boys the idea that all women are tramps and all love is lust, because they don't dare come up my driveway. They work from the sewers and the dingy loft mail-rooms, the brothels and their pornographic studios, smearing their filth on the minds of our children.

I hope you dads and mothers will join me in helping the forces of decency—already at work—to wipe them out. In next month's Lion I'll have somebody who knows the answer tell us how to do it.

Government by the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 5, of this year, Mr. William C. Stolk, president of the American Can Co., addressed the Association of Reserve City Bankers, at Phoenix, Ariz. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

(An address by William C. Stolk, president, American Can Co., before the Association of Reserve City Bankers, Phoenix, Ariz., April 5, 1960)

Ninety-seven years ago, on a bleak November day, Abraham Lincoln closed what he called his "little speech," the immortal Gettysburg Address, with these words: "That Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." Thus he charted the course for future generations of Americans to rededicate themselves to this concept. Today we can find solutions to the many serious problems confronting our Nation by restudying Lincoln's call for steadfast adherence to the democratic principles on which our Nation was founded. We cannot achieve government "by the people" unless the people themselves take an active interest in government and are sufficiently well informed to be able to demand good government from their elected representatives. A broader, deeper, and more fundamental approach to an informed citizenry is imperative and, in my opinion, the key to solving most of our national difficulties. This is the basis for the American Can Co.'s public affairs program.

To crystallize our thinking, let us examine one of the major problems confronting our country. International competition. I refer to this subject inasmuch as the company I represent is not directly affected by competition from overseas; this gives me an opportunity to look objectively at the problem and its possible solutions. It is significant that examination of this question cuts across our most pressing national problems. I am sure you are aware of most of them.

Prior to World War II, we Americans had developed uniqueness through the management philosophy of striving for constructive change through planned obsolescence. This philosophy made possible higher standards of living through higher wage rates without correspondingly increasing unit costs. We have long been accustomed to battle the old with new and better facilities. We deliberately quickened obsolescence through research and development. For three quarters of a century of rapid American economic growth, our European friends looked with scorn upon our practice of tearing down facilities which had not yet worn out.

Although this part of our management philosophy was never fully understood by others and, therefore, not accepted, the obsolescent plants were effectively removed by our bombers during World War II. With the advent of the Marshall plan, American generosity undertook the task of helping to rebuild the economies of our future competitors. We supplied them with the most advanced production facilities and also gave freely of our knowledge and techniques.

In the decade of the 1960's, our country is confronted with strong high-quality low-cost competition from the European Common Market, from the countries associated in the outer seven, and probably from a new Latin American common market. We are now receiving increased imports in many product lines from Japan, and this, too, will be augmented as other Asiatic peoples become industrialized. In time, mass markets abroad will consume the products they manufacture, but before this takes place, the American people will be faced with the problem of competition from this added output. The American market is obviously the most attractive one for others to develop, so unless we can improve our own productive efficiency now, we will be in real trouble before the consumption abroad rises to a point where their domestic requirements will absorb these added goods and services.

As this competition grows—and it surely will—unemployment will become a major problem in this country.

Any failure to recognize that this problem is already upon us, that it will grow rapidly in seriousness, and any failure to start now to take basic and constructive steps toward solving it, will have the gravest kind of implications for the future of our system.

No Member of Congress, who wants to remain in Congress, can face a steadily rising volume of unemployment and refuse to deal with it. If the proper groundwork has been laid, if basic studies of the prospective developments have been completed, if an adequate educational job has been done, Congress will be able to deal with the problem calmly and wisely.

If, on the other hand, we fail to face up to this problem, if business executives follow the historical pattern—and wait for the crisis to arrive before starting to do something about it—the losses will be terrific.

Under these circumstances Congress will have no alternative—which has been so often true in the past—than to legislate unscientifically, in a highly emotionally charged atmosphere.

Pressures for action will grow and take many forms. Sponsors for the abolition of the Trade Agreement Act, who are already active, will increase their efforts. Suggestions for import quotas will develop rapidly. Bills for aid to depressed areas will gather support. Demands for newer and bigger Government spending programs, to sustain employment and purchasing power, will mushroom. Proposals to provide further artificial stimulation for the declining domestic economy will be pulled out and dusted off, and new ones will be dreamed up.

These palliatives would perhaps offer some temporary relief. However, they are, generally speaking, no more practical, nor realistic, than will be the proposals—which will certainly come—to cut wage rates.

The only practical and realistic solution—in my opinion—will be to remove legislative handicaps to business initiative. I am referring to those handicaps which were designed over the years to meet individual major domestic problems and crises, as they arose. Some undoubtedly served a good purpose in the world in which we then lived, but have no place in today's world, or in the world of tomorrow.

I also want to make it very clear that we have no desire to turn back the hands of the clock and thus open up our system to abuses which prevailed in the past.

If American industry is unfettered and its energies are directed at product and market development, it can hold its own in any field. Simple arithmetic proves that American industry must be more effective to overcome the prevailing wage level in other countries, which is fantastically low and is only a small percentage as related to our own. In addition, our statutory law requires the payment of overtime. Furthermore, we grant our workers fringe benefits and absorb countless other additional costs which are imposed by Government. Unless each hour of labor here is more productive than abroad, how can we hold our markets? It is too often forgotten that labor costs in their broad context represent 70 percent of our national income. Hence, this expense must result in high output of goods and services. No one should misunderstand my purpose. I am advocating conditions that will support a high standard of living for American workers.

In addition to the large advantage in lower labor costs, other nations have the added edge of not being subject to laws and regulations which inflate our costs of production, nor do they have the heavy tax burden we carry as a result of financing the major portion of the free world's defense.

When domestic competitors vie with each other for the home market, they are all operating under the same ground rules. Now they are threatened by strong competitors from other lands, made stronger by the advantages we have given them and continue to give them. In other words, unless we come to our senses, we deserve to be put out of business. The time has come for more enlightened self-interest and less unbridled altruism.

I have great faith in America and Americans and I am firmly convinced that our ingenuity, our high standards of quality, our talents for developing and manufacturing products at high speed can compete successfully with the wage difference.

I believe the American business manager's basic competitive position in international trade is the same one we use every day here at home: "Let's compete; let's see who can produce the most of the best at highest efficiency and lowest cost; and let's see who can supply consumers in America, or anywhere else, with what they want at lowest possible prices under the influence of a risk-for-profit private enterprise economy."

Some people believe the answer is higher protective tariffs. I do not share this view. Could you have imagined a few years ago that labor unions would some day cry for tariff protection? At least three American unions are now demanding that Congress put up tariff bars on imports, and they want to negotiate contracts prohibiting American employers from handling foreign goods. These unions do not suggest, however, that they or their members try out such realistic actions as reducing inflationary pressures by holding the line on labor costs, or by reducing unit costs through higher efficiency and productivity.

This leads us into another critical area of business-manager responsibility for an all-American problem. The problem I speak of is labor union power.

To start with ourselves, management should reexamine the source of union power. When I have talked to business friends about their concept of union power, and what to do about it, I find they usually concentrate their attention on the power unions have, under Federal law, to bargain for workers in an entire industry or company and, consequently, are able to strike that entire industry or company. This attitude results from the truth that Federal law does grant union monopoly power at the collective bargaining table, and that our labor laws support the principle of monopoly. Hence, they are in conflict with our antitrust laws, which are based on the principle of competition. The suggestion therefore is frequently made that the remedy is to apply the antitrust laws to unions as well as companies. While the basic objectives of fostering competition is a worthy one, we have seen the destructive impact of the inhibitions and shackles which the interpretation and the maladministration of such laws impose on the constructive opportunity for American business to operate in the best interest of the entire economy. I could find only negative solace in watching the Federal Government try to apply those particular curbs and penalties to unions. Frankly, I can't see how the Government could use the current antitrust laws to deter and penalize union leaders in their monopoly use of power.

Many business managers would like to see a Federal law prohibiting industrywide or companywide collective bargaining. I hold a minority viewpoint on this. I think it would not be workable, enforcible, nor practical—and I do not believe that by itself it would effectively reduce union monpoly of bargaining or striking power. Without seeking to make policy either for my own company, or any other, as to the proper scope of collective bargaining under any particular set of circumstances, I would certainly oppose any effort to assign to the Federal Government the added power to judge the size and shape of either a union's or a company approach to the bargaining table.

A great many businessmen would be elated to see a law outlawing the union shop—preferably by Federal edict, but failing that, through State so-called right-to-work laws. Arguments on both sides of this controversy are charged with high passion. But the emotional appeals on both sides ignore one essential fact, which is that for more than 20 years Federal law and collective bargaining has given a recognized union absolute power to bargain collectively for every employee in the bargaining unit, whether he is a union member or not. The same law prevents the nonmember, as an individual, from delegating someone else to bargain for him. Nor can he do the job himself. The fact that he is not a member and cannot attend union meetings just means that he doesn't have an active voice or vote in the way the union acts for him.

I believe that people in a free society who find that certain of their interests have been delegated to someone else for collective handling should make it their personal duty to keep posted on what their representatives are doing and to let them know whether they agree or disagree. This goes for the town meeting, the State legislature, Congress, the White House—and also the union hall.

My disenchantment with the popular proposals we hear for curbing union power is that they seek to limit labor union monopoly power only by Government regulation of the technical processes of collective bargaining. Union monopoly power in bargaining is a danger secondary, in my opinion, to the union leader monopoly power of control over men, achieved independently of law and not susceptible to control by law. This power results essentially from union leader control over the thinking and actions of men. Should we seek to curb this type of power by Federal law or regulation, we would, at at the same time, be encouraging government to take charge of all human relationships on the job, at the union hall, everywhere.

Union leader power over men exists because union members have delegated that power to their leaders—either deliberately, accidentally, cynically, or even by default. We should also remember that a union official, like any other politician, has to run for office and keep on running to stay in office. This being so, the only people who can influence and, in the long run, reward or punish him are his own constituents—our employees, who, as his union members, delegated their individual power in the first instance. On this premise, we must rely on enlightened and well-informed union members to influence thheir own leaders to seek sound solutions to the problems which confront all of us. Take, for example, the so-called work rules or local practices clauses in labor agreements. Some of them dangerously restrict management opportunity to improve production efficiency; this was the major issue in the last steel negotiations. It was also critical in our own company's recent steelworker union negotiations—not to recapture, but to retain basic management responsibility for efficient, productive operations. Let me emphasize that the American Can Co. did not relinquish nor share that responsibility; we are still managing our own business.

While on the subject of our labor negotiations, let me be specific about contract settlement costs. Soon after the steel industry settled its strike, public statements by steel industry and Government officials announced that the new contract would cost the steel industry 40 to 41 cents an hour for a 20-month contract.

Some of the same spokesmen went on to say that if the steel industry had accepted union demands to meet the terms of the earlier can industry settlement, this would have cost the steel industry 52 cents an hour.

To try to compute the cost of any one industry's union contract, as applied to the operating conditions of another industry, is a purely arbitrary and selective exercise of mathematical theory. The steel industry says it settled for 40 or 41 cents—and I have no reason nor basis to challenge these figures. Nor do I have any practical reason or factual basis for trying to estimate the possible cost of the steel industry settlement if it were to be applied to the can industry.

I do know, of course, what our own can industry negotiations are going to cost the can industry. We are going to pay an average 34 cents an hour for our 3-year contract. This is substantially less than the 41 cents that the steel industry estimates for its own settlement cost, and is not even close to the higher speculative estimates you may have read about in the papers.

Let us turn now to the second area of disadvantage in our cost sheets; government laws and regulations—which do not apply to our foreign competitors.

In the absence of a constructive program based on careful study and appraisal of the facts, any legislation which would accompany substantial increase in unemployment would jet propel us along the road toward more government in business. What I am urging is the alternative to a crisis type solution. It is a reappraisal of public policies, laws, and regulations which inflate our costs of production and which involve such things as:

Huge personal and corporate income taxes which restrict accumulation of capital needed to accelerate the growth of our economy; unrealistic tax depreciation policies; government fiscal and monetary policies which put an upward pressure on prices, thus increasing the differential between U.S. and foreign costs; unnecessary foreign aid programs; lack of adequate laws, policies, and supports designed to promote U.S. exports; laws and regulations which set arbitrary restraints on efficiency of big units; and uneconomic farm policies.

I believe that we in American business should not wait for changes to be proposed by others, but should ourselves actively explore on a long-range study-in-depth basis, some of these areas. Only then will we be able to recommend policy and legislative changes that will remove costly procedures that hamper effective competition. It is this approach to the problem of meeting foreign competition and expanding our exports that seems to offer the most promise.

I, therefore, suggest that thoughtful and intelligent men and women in all segments of our national life—government, business, finance, labor unions, agriculture, and in our colleges and universities—should develop a scientifically constructive approach to the problem of increasing international competition, and explore how government policy, laws, and regulations can be modernized to meet this great threat.

Such an approach should be completely nonpartisan. It should be undertaken by a group such as yours, and be so constituted that its work could proceed regardless of the outcome of the next election. This work should be financed by private grants, utilizing existing voluntary agencies wherever possible. I do not suggest that you gentlemen carry the entire financial burden, as I cannot imagine any industry or business who, understanding the problem, would be unwilling to support such an undertaking. In my book it is a must.

In talking about elements of cost other than labor, we naturally are led to that body of men and women in Congress who are responsible for our country's laws and regulations, and who I like to think of as the board of directors of these United States. These are the people to whom we must communicate our ideas, our hopes and recommendations. Based on our experience in contacting legislative Members of both parties, we are convinced that they are honest, dedicated individuals. We have found no group of people who are more overworked, or more harassed by bewildering and complex problems. Few of us would

leave our chosen work to take up the burdens which Congressmen assume when they are elected. How many of us are sufficiently well informed to express opinions on every conceivable issue ranging from labor relations, foreign relations, national defense, the problems of health, education, and welfare, taxes, money and banking, agriculture, minerals, public lands, to the rigged television programs or payola in radio? These are only a few of the subjects that come before Congress; yet, we elect our neighbors to represent us in Washington and request them to record their positions on hundreds of such issues during each session. They cannot say "I am sorry, this is not my specialty"—and, furthermore, they must be prepared to defend their voting records when they come up for reelection.

At the end of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, 10,676 measures had been introduced in the House, and 3,161 in the Senate; 383 new public and 236 new private laws had been enacted. In addition, the Senate confirmed 43,567 presidential nominations. I cite these data as they show that the burden on a conscientious legislator is staggering. I know of no one in our orgainzation, or, as a matter of fact, in any organization who is fully qualified in all of these fields. If such a person could be found, we would have difficulty in paying him a salary attractive enough to warrant his complete devotion to our corporate needs. Yet, we expect a Congressman or Senator on an annual salary of $22,500 to discharge his many tasks while maintaining a residence in Washington and also in his home district.

Finally, our costs are also affected by the policies of management. We who have that responsibility must make sure that our company is run efficiently, that we have a lean, hard-hitting organization, and that we have replaced the complacency and smugness of the years immediately after World War II and Korea with the realism that only the strong can survive.

The working people in this country, who influence the labor costs in our balance sheet, need and, in our experience, welcome impartial information to help them obtain enlightened union leadership. Similarly, experience has taught us that our Representatives in Congress recognize fully that they can do a better job of serving as our country's board of directors with facts and advice from their constituents.

To cope with the need for information and communications with people who are so vital to our future welfare, we in American Can Co., decided to embark on a full scale public affairs program designed to do certain things. This program has two objectives. One is to provide facts and information which will help individual citizens—particularly our employees—to formulate personal judgments as to what constitutes good government—good in the long-range interest of themselves, their families, their company, and their country.

The second is to stimulate, encourage, and help citizens—again primarily our employees—to work for good government. We urge them to work for their independently formulated concepts of good government, through the political party of their choice.

As we see it, working for good government involves doing four separate but related things:

1. Obtaining a correct understanding of major issues facing the Government and the probable impacts of alternative courses of Government action.

2. Standing up and expressing our convictions, regardless of occupation or profession—or position in an organizational structure—and thus give other citizens the benefits of our individual points of view.

3. Working actively through the party of our individual choice to induce the best possible people to compete for and get elected to public office.

4. Helping to supply elected officials with the information they require in order to make sound legislative decisions.

I can promise you this program of employee education will work—because after 4 years' experience in our company it is showing tangible results. We know, from the response we are getting, that our people understand what we are talking about, and they intend to make use of what we are saying. Our response has come from local union officers as well as rank-and-file employees. In many plants they have asked our management this question: "What can we, as local union officers and as employees, help do to keep our plant alive, competitive and prosperous?"

I am also very enthusiastic about the number of people in our company who have taken a keen interest in their community politics. We have trained 80 members of our management group to lead discussions in the art of practical politics. Approximately 100 courses, comprising groups of 15 to 20 individuals, are now underway in our company. By July 1 of this year we expect that practically all of the 5,000 people in our management group will have completed this course, which consists of six 2-hour sessions.

We are thoroughly convinced that there is much to be gained by our efforts to give the people the facts. Thomas Jefferson wrote the prospectus for our public affairs program when he said: "I know of no safe depository for the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion through education."

The Responsibility of America and the Needs of the United Nations in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Responsibility of America and the Needs of the United Nations in the Atomic Age," delivered on February 25, 1960, at the University of North Carolina, by the Honorable Frank P. Graham, formerly a Member of the U.S. Senate, and now a United Nations mediator.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF AMERICA AND THE NEEDS OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Speech by Frank P. Graham, United Nations mediator, at U.N. mock assembly, University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill, February 25, 1960)

In the world of atomic power we must all learn to live together in equal freedom, mutual respect, and productive cooperation or die together in universal annihilation. We must see ourselves in the vertical perspective of the evolutionary processes of the long past and in the horizontal perspective of the revolutionary forces sweeping across the earth today. Deep in the subconscious nature of man is the primitive inheritance of hundreds of millions of years as animals, hundreds of thousands of years as savages, and scores of thousands of years as barbarians. Only in recent thousands of years has there been a deepening of the consciousness of the fatherhood of one God and the brotherhood of all people.

Just as man with his capacity for good and evil, with his physical descent and his spiritual ascent, needs high religion and the development of the humane spirit for the sublimation of the savage deep in the nature of man and for the fulfillment of his higher nature so the national states with their capacities for good and evil need the United Nations for the control of their absolutism for war and destruction and for the fulfillment of their higher natures for survival and progress, freedom and justice, compassion and peace. Against the background of the evolution of millions of years of man's primitive inheritance, the United Nations has become a primal necessity today for the mastery of the explosive potential of man's primitive inheritance and present possession of atomic power.

Moreover, in the evolution of political states in recent thousands of years from tribal states to city states to empire states of ancient and medieval times to the nation states of modern times, the nations today are confronted with the question as to whether the next transition will be from the nation states to a totalitarian world police state or more creatively to a more effective cooperation of nation states in a more adequate United Nations for the more inclusive collective security of freedom, justice, and peace on the earth.

In the last 500 years the commercial revolution of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, the industrial revolution of the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries and the atomic revolution of the mid-20th century have tied together the continents and oceans, nations and peoples in one fatefully interdependent world in which there can be no isolation from the skies above, the oceans around or the continents beyond. Instead of staying on the outside and being drawn into the world wars after they start, the people of the United States decided to join the United Nations and try more effectively on the inside to prevent the beginning of a third world war. In vertical perspective for millions, thousands, hundreds and tens of years a stronger United Nations has become a moral imperative in the atomic age.

In the horizontal perspective of the present world we see 2,800 million people living on our shrinking little planet, two-thirds of whom are colored and live in Asia and Africa. What America does about colored people here and in the world determines in vital part what we do about our own Judaic-Christian and democratic heritage and hopes in American and what peoples of Asia and Africa do about our leadership for freedom and peace in the world.

We live in an age of revolution. The United States was born in an age of revolution out of which came the liberation of the people of North and South America. The United Nations was born in an age of revolution out of which has come and is coming the liberation of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Thermonuclear power has raised in our time the question of liberation for what? The universal annihilation of peoples or the more effective cooperation of nations? This is a supreme question for this generation.

In the midst of the poverty, hunger, illiteracy, disease, and misery of hundreds of millions of people, the burning fuses of colonialism, racialism, national absolutism, and totalitarianism can, if not checked by the responsible self-determination of people and the effective cooperation of nations,

blow the world to pieces. A panicked press of a button can end the existence of people, their children, and treasures, and all their dreams and all their songs as the winds of the world carry the hydrogen fallout to wipe out the last remnant of people as they huddle on the remotest island and the farthest igloo.

In such a world in such a crisis we look both homeward and across the earth and listen to the revolutionary and universal faith of the great Virginian whose prophetic words went ringing around the earth and down the centuries, and are still singing in the hearts of the people in two hemispheres.

When human rights are conceived as trespassing on property rights it should be recalled that property rights are securer and individual rights are freer when human rights are fairer. States rights, an honored heritage from Jamestown and Plymouth Rock was unsheathed by Jefferson as the sword of liberty against the hysteria of the alien and sedition laws, later became the shield of human slavery in the South, and later still in the North the weapon of corporate privilege and power against humane legislation, and in our time the armor of massive resistance against the revised judicial interpretation of human rights under the Bill of Rights.

The flag of representative government, first unfurled on the banks of the James River in old Virginia, is, as massive resistance gives way to wise and increasing steps in democratic fulfillment, again flies its flag, higher and freer, in the modern world. States rights are moving to become more truly States responsibilities for the equal rights, freedom and opportunity of all people. In the choice between the beginning of integration and the ending of public education, the mothers of Atlanta are mustering for the children whose only schools are the schools of the people.

The American Republic, as we learned in our history, in its beginnings, was a political oligarchy of landed, propertied, Protestant, white, and male adults. From Rhode Island, Maryland, and Pennsylvania came ideas and attitudes, which in the Jeffersonian movement were given an impetus toward the removing of religious barriers and the admission of Jews, Catholics, and unbelievers to the rights of suffrage and public office. The ongoing Jacksonian democracy opened wider the doors of suffrage and office to the landless and propertyless people. The Civil War amendments abolished the disqualification of race, color, and previous condition of servitude. The women's rights movement later admitted half of the adult people to the rights of equal suffrage. The removal of the barriers of creed, property, color, and sex transformed in successive epochs the old monopolistic political oligarchy into an expanding, advancing democarcy. The barriers of the poll tax and registration remaining in some communities against the equal right to vote cannot forever hold back the spiritual momentum of 2,000 years and the democratic momentum of a century and a half of American history.

America has taught the Negro youth the heritage and hopes of America and in her heart of hearts she would not have them forfeit that heritage or deny that hope. In their day and generation they are renewing springs of American democracy fresh and resurgent as they write a chapter in the fulfillment of the American Revolution with its universal declaration of human rights that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

While America, because of her fear of subversion, stood aloof from the great Bandung Conference of Asian and African people the eloquent Sukarno welcomed the conference with these opening significant words: "We meet today on the 181st anniversary of the midnight ride of Paul Revere as he rode forth in the beginning of the first successful revolt against colonialism in modern times."

We need to make clear to ourselves and to the world that the advancing faith of the American Revolution and the widening meaning of the American Bill of Rights are not only the historic and past but are also the present and living sources of America's faith in herself, the world's faith in America and America's moral influence and power in the world.

Human pride, prejudice and discrimination are as old as history and as wide as the world. Across the centuries in successive periods, prejudice was variously expressed in the classification of peoples as: Jews and gentiles, Greeks and barbarians, Romans and provincials, Iberians and people to the north of the Pyrennes who were white in color, tall in height, and considered by the cultured Iberians to be low in intellect, the celestial Chinese and the noncelestial other people, high-caste and low-caste Indians, Anglo-Saxons and the lesser breeds without the law, and Aryan-Nordic-German-Nazis and the allegedly inferior races of the world. In the present world are tensions between yellow and brown, brown and black, colored and white. Not in justification or rationalization of racial injustice and inhuman wrongs, but in explanation and for understanding and cooperation of the races for ending the wrongs and the betterment of relations of all human beings, as children of one God and brothers of all people, four factors are found to be somewhat correlated with the extent of interracial tensions: (1) the ratio of numbers, (2) the degree of the visibility of the differences, (3) the differences in historical and cultural background, and (4) the economic competition between low-income groups.

Without a Marshall plan; with full responsibility in difficult decades for the pensions and rehabilitation of Confederate veterans; with part responsibility for the pensions and rehabilitation of Union veterans; with the disproportionate loads of tariffs and discriminatory freight rates; and with the responsibility during recent decades of education one-third of the Nation's children with one-sixth of the Nation's financial ability, the southern people, amid almost the universal poverty of the war's desolation, rose from the ruins as unconquerable in spirit in the duties of defeat as they were brave on the battlefields against the heavy odds of a long and exhausting war. As part of this story of the risen South is the fact that though only one-tenth of the Negroes in the world are in the United States, more Negroes are in colleges and universities in the United States than in all the rest of the world.

As a vital part of the southern people, the Negro people, despite all the wrongs to these people, compounded by centuries of slavery and discrimination, have in the recent decades of their freedom and labor, made a progress unsurpassed by any people in a like period in human history. In their spiritual faith and patient upward struggles, their zest for living and laughter, songs merry and sad, and creations of enterprise and spirit, they have revealed the innate capacity of a great people in their rich, various and enduring contributions to the making and meaning of America.

In the free minds and generous hearts of millions of southern people of both races, who have long cooperated in human relations and works of personal loyalty and kindness, will live and grow the unfulfilled teachings of our religion for the equal freedom, dignity, and opportunity of all human beings, the struggles of freedom for a higher freedom, and the renewing faith of the American dream, with its message of hope and brotherhood in this age of suspicion and fear.

The gospel of love and understanding preached by Martin Luther King, who draws his inspiration from Jesus, his techniques from Gandhi, and his advice from his noble teacher, Benjamin Mays of Morehouse College, will yet prevail in our time over fear and hate. The cross, warm with the blood of human brotherhood, will triumph over all the burning crosses lighted with the hot oil of prejudice, privilege, and power.

In the Old South, where slavery made one of its last stands in the modern world, industrialism is making fresh beginnings on virgin soil. We have the lessons in the tragedies of one and the opportunities in the power of the other to work out together nobler human relations than have yet characterized the history of industrialization in either Europe or America. As the schoolhouses open wider their doors, and as the factories move into the waste places and the rivers come rushing from the mountains with the power for the electrification of our civilization, may we place in the center of it all, not the pleasures of today but the children of tomorrow, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Amid the global tides which surge upon our shores, east and west, no less hazardous than the outer spacious threats of tyranny from the highest heavens, is the complacency and possible decay of our own falsely affluent society of private prosperity and public poverty. Billions of private wealth go into damaging pleasures and wasteful excitement to the neglect of long-run investments in educations, research, libraries, hospitals, playgrounds, and conservation of soils, forests, and water resources in multiple services of the people. The slowing down of the rate of economic growth and industrial production in America is a setback to the dynamics of American leadership in the world.

The economic slowdown, the lagging retreat of human prejudice and the old colonialism, give emphasis and impetus to the rapid advance of totalitarianism and the new colonialism. The hazard of the precarious peace of deterrent terror make imperative the unyielding hopes and struggles for effective universal disarmament. The absolutism of nations and the drift toward the self-extermination of peoples must yield to the self-determination of peoples and the unresting struggle for the peace of nations.

Just as States rights, which was first used, as a sword of human liberty, became the shield of human slavery and just as the barricades which were originally erected for the self-determination of the French people for liberty, equality, and fraternity, became in Algiers obstructions to the self-determination and equality of the Algerian people, so the theory of national sovereignty which has served the cause of law, order, and the general welfare of the people of a nation, became at tenor the basis for national isolation, the U.S. reservation in joining the World Court, and the hazards of international disorder.

The hazards and hopes of the world situation, in a world in need of world law and order, require consideration of a more effective international program as follows:

1. Large long-range economic development programs in addition to more adequate support of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations in their moral equivalent of war in great campaigns against poverty, hunger, illiteracy, disease, racial discrimination, colonialism, armaments, and the war system itself.

2. A standby United Nations peace force, not only to salvage but to help prevent disaster.

3. Promotion of progressive steps in effective disarmament so as to supplant the old vicious circle of fear, armaments, war and annihilation with a new circle of faith, disarmament, economic development, and international cooperation in productive and humane programs.

4. Other procedures failing, resort to and emphasis on the moral power of a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly of the United Nations in regard to membership, disarmament, and the settlement of international disputes.

5. Promotion of the self-development and the responsible self-determination of colonial people and non-self-governing territories.

6. United Nations jurisdiction over the international problems of the polar region and outer space.

Ohio River Valley Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee of the House is now considering the allocation of funds to public works projects on or connected with several of our main rivers. These are important projects, to industry as well as to the residents of the river valleys which they will affect.

My friend, Raoul E. Desvernine has appeared before the committee and made an excellent statement on behalf of the projects proposed for the Ohio River Valley.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am calling this statement to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people:

STATEMENT OF RAOUL E. DESVERNINE ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL STEEL CORP. BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEES ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES IN SUPPORT OF VARIOUS PROJECTS IN THE OHIO RIVER VALLEY, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittees, my name is Raoul E. Desvernine. My office address is 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. I am Washington counsel for and representative of the National Steel Corp., which has its executive offices in Pittsburgh, Pa.

The National Steel Corp., with its several subsidiary companies and divisions, is the fifth largest steel producer in the United States. In 1959 it produced 5,331,500 tons of ingots and had net sales of $736,978,650. The Weirton Steel Division of National Steel, located at Weirton, W. Va., owns and operates iron and steel manufacturing plants on the Ohio River at Weirton, W. Va., and Steubenville, Ohio. The Great Lakes Steel Co., located at Detroit, Mich., a subsidiary of National Steel, owns and operates similar plants on Lake Michigan at Detroit, Mich. The Hanna Furnace Corp., another subsidiary of National Steel, operates blast furnace plants on Lake Erie at Buffalo, N.Y. Another subsidiary, the Midwest Steel Corp., has a steel plant in construction at Portage, Ind., on Lake Michigan. National Steel also owns and operates, through subsidiaries and affiliates, coal mines in Pennsylvania and Kentucky and ore properties in Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and also has ore-transportation facilities.

The sites of the producing plants of the Weirton Steel Division were selected primarily because of the availability of an essential water supply[1] and adequate navigable water transportation. Low-cost water transportation has been a vital factor in attracting an enormous growth of basic industries in the Ohio Valley.

Many other steel-producing companies located their plants in the Ohio River Valley for these same reasons, making the Ohio River Valley, with the Pittsburgh-Youngstown area, the largest steel-producing area in the United States. The Pittsburgh-Youngstown district of the steel industry must be included, as it is heavily dependent upon the Ohio River for shipping raw materials, coal and coke, fuel oil, and finished products. Many other industries also located their operations in the Ohio River Valley for the same reasons. The Ohio River Valley has become one of the great industrial production centers of the country and the Ohio River is one of the chief arteries of commerce in the Nation.

Commercial navigability depends upon a system of locks, dams, and harbors with flood-control facilities adequate at all times to assure shipments into a steel plant of raw materials, coal and ore; and also shipments out of the plant of its manufactured products to its national and foreign markets. Consequently, such locks, dams, and harbors are not only useful facilities but essential facilities to the steel production in this area. They are capital investments without which a large part of the Nation's industrial and steel production would cease.

Furthermore, these locks, dams, and harbors must be maintained as efficient modern facilities. Obsolete and wornout installations must be replaced or repaired and rehabilitated. The hazard of the stoppage of navigation through failure of these facilities must be foreseen and provided for.

New and enlarged navigation facilities must be built from time to time to meet the ever-increasing transportation plant demands as those plants expand to meet the Nation's increasing requirements for commercial peacetime use and for war and defense purposes. The actual and announced expenditures since 1950 for new and modernized plant facilities in counties bordering on the Ohio River and its navigable tributaries in the iron and steel industry alone are $2,228,700,000. These river facilities must be kept apace with the rapidly expanding needs for steel production and at all times adequate to meet foreseeable demands. In fact, the present program is already inadequate to meet foreseeable requirements and an acceleration of a greatly enlarged replacement and rehabilitation program is urgently required in the public interest.

National Steel's industrial life is vitally dependent upon an adequate water supply from and upon the uninterrupted navigability of the Ohio River and its tributaries—the Monongahela and Cumberland Rivers. This is likewise true of all other steel producing companies operating in the Ohio River Valley.

You have before you for your consideration and action requests for appropriations for the authorized facilities (locks, dams, and harbors) in the Ohio River Valley enumerated in schedule A below now in process of construction, modernization and repair with partial funds previously appropriated.

Additional appropriations to maintain construction schedules for fiscal 1961 to carry forward the construction of these facilities are now sought from your committee.

Appropriations sufficient to meet construction schedules for fiscal 1961 (as estimated by the Army Engineers) on all projects enumerated in schedule A have been approved and recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers and are provided for in the 1961 budget; except the budgetary allowances for the Markland and Meldahl projects which are insufficient to maintain efficient construtcion schedules and for which additional funds are asked.

Your committee's approval of these appropriations is now required to make funds available.

Schedule A: The projects in the Ohio River Valley modernization program, now in process of construction, which are of vital concern to National Steel, are specifically the following:

A. Projects for work in process

	Recommended for fiscal 1961
1. New Cumberland project (Ohio River)	$6,180,000
2. Markland project (Ohio River)	13,900,000
3. Capt. Anthony Meldahl project (formerly known as New Richmond project) (Ohio River)	18,000,000
4. Greenup locks and dam (Ohio River)	9,959,000
5. Lock and dam project No. 41 (Ohio River)	9,700,000
6. Pike Island project (Ohio River)	9,000,000
7. Barkley project (Cumberland River)	18,000,000

Not to maintain construction schedules of projects in schedule A above during fiscal 1961 and not to then carry forward construction to completion would not only deprive the national economy and the operations of National Steel of the benefits to be derived from the use of these facilities when completed, but would also imperil the capital thus far invested in them. To interrupt or delay work short of completion by not now making appropriations sufficient to maintain construction schedules would not only be economic waste but it would be an indictment against Congress' original judgment in authorizing these projects and appropriating funds to initiate construction.

Each year, your committee, in full understanding of the necessities, has appropriated sufficient funds for the next fiscal year to carry forward construction on the projects referred to in schedule A, thereby assuring an efficient and continuous construction schedule. We have no doubt your committee will do likewise this year, fiscal 1961.

Schedules B and C: The following listed projects for new construction (schedule B) and for planning money for new projects (schedule C) are also of vital concern to National Steel.

B. New planned constructions

	Recommended for fiscal 1961
1. Belleville project (Ohio River)	$750,000

Planning money was provided last year. Appropriation of funds to start construction is now required. Budget for fiscal 1961 contained planning money but no appropriation to start construction. Unless appropriation is made to start construction a serious delay and reduction in the rate of progress of the modernization program will result in total disregard of the mounting traffic congestion which threatens to cut off further growth within the present decade.

	Recommended for fiscal 1961
2. Opekiska project (Monongahela River)	$500,000

The estimated cost of this project is $24,100,000. Funds in the amount of $272,000 have been previously provided for completion of planning. The fiscal 1961 budget makes no provision for funds to start con-

[1] It takes 30 tons of water to make 1 ton of steel.

struction. The construction of this project will complete the present program for the modernization of the upper Monongahela. Vast reserves of metallurgical coal lie in the area along this portion of the river.

	Recommended for fiscal 1961
3. Maxwell project (Monongahela River)	$1,500,000

One million five hundred thousand dollars is requested to complete planning and to commence construction. This is an increase of $100,000 over the $1,400,000 requested in the fiscal 1961 budget. The total estimated cost of this project is $32 million, of which $463,000 has been appropriated. This project is the initial step in the modernization of the middle reaches of the Monongahela River.

C. Planning money required

	Recommended for fiscal 1961
1. Cannelton project (Ohio River)	$150,000
2. Opossum Creek project (Ohio River)	200,000
3. Racine project (Ohio River)	50,000
4. Uniontown project (Ohio River)	200,000
5. Dam No. 4 project (Monongahela River)	150,000

The Army Corps of Engineers has recommended planning money for all of the above facilities in schedule C. On the other hand, the budget contains no approval of any appropriations for planning money for any of the facilities on the Ohio River projects listed in schedule C above.

Neither the Public Works Appropriation Acts for fiscal 1959 and 1960 nor the President's budget again for fiscal 1961 made provision for any funds for planning, advanced engineering and design work on the projects noted in schedule C. Yet, it must be borne in mind that there is not only an existing inadequacy of facilities to cope with current and increasing demands but many of the existing facilities are in such a deteriorated and wornout condition as to present the threat of possible stoppage or slowdown in traffic with irreparable loss and dire consequences to the industrial life of the Ohio River Valley and, in deed, the national economy in general. For instance, the Corps of Engineers has pointed out the existing hazardous approach conditions at the Uniontown project (dam No. 48) and has emphasized the need of immediate replacement. It should also be noted that each of these enumerated facilities replaces either two or three existing locks and dams ranging in age from 33 years to 49 years.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that there is usually a time lapse between the appropriation of planning money and completion of the construction work of about 8 years.

I refer to the statement of Mr. William J. Hull on behalf of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (submitted to your committee on these hearings) for full detailed information in respect of the present program for the modernization of the Ohio River and its tributaries with details respecting each of its component projects. Those set forth in schedules A, B, and C above are of primary concern to National Steel. Mr. Hull's statement gives in respect of each project the estimates of the Army Engineers for their completion as well as estimates for fiscal 1961 to maintain construction schedules and also for planning money. We emphatically endorse the recommendations contained in Mr. Hull's statement.

All of the facilities set forth in schedules A, B, and C above are essential to the commercial navigation and the commercial operations of National Steel.

All of these facilities are interrelated and interdependent and each is a part of one integrated system of water transportation. A failure or deficiency of any one facility could interfere with the free flow of river traffic over the entire Ohio River Valley system. For that reason, it is submitted that each project cannot be judged singly but must be viewed from the overall perspective of its relationship to the whole integrated system.

Nevertheless, I single out the plants of the Weirton Steel Division at Weirton and Steubenville as examples to illustrate the magnitude of the operations utilizing and dependent upon the use of the Ohio River and its tributaries, the Monongahela and the Cumberland Rivers.

The Weirton Steel Co. Division consumed about 2,651,067 net tons of coking coal in 1959, all of which were transported to its plants by water from mines to the north and to the south of the plant. In addition, the Weirton plant produced 1,831,580 net tons of coke products.

It also transported to its Weirton plant by water raw materials and operating supplies, such as iron and steel scrap, ingot molds, fuel oil, and acid amounting to 535,092 net tons for 1959.

It also moves substantial quantities of its outbound production by water to points on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and to the Southwest. The outbound steel production in 1959 amounted to 2,617,408 net tons of which 291,537 net tons were shipped by water. Also Weirton produced and shipped about 7,938,276 gallons of benzol, toluol, and other byproducts. Weirton also shipped by water 129,108 tons of tar and 14,591 of ammoniun sulphate.

Weirton employs on the average about 13,000 persons and its coal mines about 600 more.

And bear in mind that Weirton is only one division of National Steel and only one of several thousand industries, large and small, which are located on the Ohio River system because of its stable water supply and transportation facilities.

Furthermore, National Steel is engaged in a large expansion program, started in 1959 and scheduled for completion in 1961. This will substantially increase its production and, consequently, its demands upon the water and navigation facilities of the Ohio River Valley. These increased demands must be foreseen and provided for.

On behalf of the National Steel Corp., its divisions and subsidiaries, we earnestly petition your committee, for the reasons herein set forth, to make or approve appropriations for fiscal 1961 sufficient—

(a) To carry forward the construction during fiscal 1961, in accord with construction schedules, of all facilities set forth in schedule A above now under construction; and

(b) To start construction on projects set forth in schedule B above; and

(c) To plan, engineer, and design all projects set forth in schedule C above.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views.

Pan American Day 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the pan-American system, it gives me great pleasure to extend my best wishes and sincere feelings of friendship and admiration to our sister Republic south of the Rio Grande. Pan American Day has come to be a commemorative symbol of the sovereignty of the American nations and the voluntary union of all in one continental community.

It should be restated that the Latin Americans are in a special position with relation to us. They constitute the one really effective regional organization—in the full sense of that term—that exists in the world today—an organization with a long, historical tradition that on many occasions has demonstrated its effectiveness. It is not a mere military alliance, for the inter-American regional system has far broader purposes and objectives.

It is my dearest hope, therefore, that the unity, friendship, and understanding, that has traditionally characterized the pan-American system, will be increased and strengthend. Thus, on this memorable day I move to ask all of the Americas to join in a common effort to fortify this free and unique association.

U.S. Lady of the Year—Dortha Soule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this year a lady I have known for a great many years, who was born in Arizona, was selected as U.S. Lady-of-the-Year by the magazine U.S. Lady.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which deals with her recognition, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. LADY OF THE YEAR—DORTHA SOULE

(By Arthur L. Schoeni)

The sociologist who once declared "big families usually get the most fun out of life," might have had in mind ones like that of Dortha Soule, chosen "U.S. Lady of the Year."

Eleven children, seven of her own and four adopted when her twin sister was killed in an auto accident 6 years ago, make up the busy and happy family of this outstanding mother. She is the wife of Comdr. Robert M. Soule, U.S. Navy, Assistant Bureau of Naval Weapons representative at the Chance Vought Aircraft plant in Dallas, Tex. Dortha was chosen as the No. 1 lady by a committee composed of wives of the service Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—the first Navy wife to be so honored.

The Soules and their "stair-steps" brood of lively youngsters, ranging from 3 to 18 years in age, reside in Breezy Hill Manor, a 3-story 7-bedroom house resembling the family dwelling in the movie, "Giant," with overtones of Mount Vernon.

Dortha had three children of her own when her sister, Dorrie Peterson, was killed in an Arizona auto accident. Her husband had died 2 years earlier. She went to Arizona and brought back the four youngsters to live with her own and since then has added four more Soules, the last two being twins, Debbie and Denise.

When Commander Soule was transferred to Dallas last July, the problem of finding a home large enough to house a family of 13 persons presented itself. A doctor's former

residence atop a hill, with lots of space all around it, proved the answer. Three cars, three television sets, four horses, a lake to fish in and room for the youngsters to run in help solve transportation and recreation problems. The horses belong to others but the children get in plenty of riding on the Texas prairies.

The family includes Gayle 18, Lynne 17, Gary 15, and Dee 10, all children of the Peterson branch of the family, and Vicki 16, Bobbie 13, Ronnie 9, Dorris 6, Kent 5, and the 3-year-old twins.

Not only does Dortha find time to care for her large family but she has been active in PTA, church, and scouting groups and has won her 100-hour Navy Relief pin several times over. She goes bowling each week at the naval air station and is one of the top scorers in her league.

Being a Navy wife, she has moved her family across the country several times and once to Adak, Alaska. Her big ambition is to take them overseas for duty, but the Navy rule against transporting large families such distances has not made that possible as yet.

Sea duty being what it is in the Navy, with her husband commanding fighter squadrons aboard aircraft carriers in far-off waters, Dortha has had to do much of the rearing of her family herself. On one stretch, Bob was away from his family for 27 months, with only a 3-month break in the absence. Before coming to Texas, he was stationed in Newport, R.I., while attending Naval War College. On arrival there the family lived out of suitcases for a month until their household effects arrived. "You get pretty tired of the same old clothes at a time like that," Dortha said.

When Bob transferred to Dallas, it was the first service duty change he had made that did not involve shipping his household effects and family all the way from one coast to the other. But even the transfer to Dallas produced a minor crisis.

Bob had come to Texas ahead of time to obtain housing for his family. When he returned to Rhode Island to bring another car and a couple of the boys back, he left the buslike Goliath car at Amon Carter Airport at Fort Worth. Dortha and nine youngsters flew down to Texas—but their plane landed instead at Dallas, 30 miles away. On top of that, Dortha had lost the keys to the Goliath. Luckily, Bob had left a set of keys with an officer in the Navy office at Chance Vought and a phone call to him brought the needed wheels to Love Field in Dallas.

A few months after they had settled down in their new home another crisis arose. A cold wave hit Texas, sending temperatures down to 20 degrees. The family's huge house is heated by butane gas and the tank supply ran out at 10:30 p.m. The Soules bundled the smaller children into one room and tried to keep it warm with a small electric heater. The rest of the family just shivered through the long, cold night and into the next day until a new gas supply could be obtained.

"We can laugh about it now, but it wasn't funny at the time," Dortha commented wryly.

"In spite of having an extra large family," she explains, "we try to treat each child as an individual. They have various kinds of amusements, parties, and frequent overnight guests. I may be pretty busy, but not too busy to do those things for them."

On the day U.S. Lady went out to take pictures of Dortha and her family they had, besides the 13 members of the group, another of Mrs. Soule's sisters and her small son, plus a visiting Navy ensign who was calling on one of the attractive daughters.

Since they live short of the boundary line where school buses will pick up their children, the Soules have a transportation problem that keeps both busy as chauffeurs. The parents run shuttle service to get their eight school-age youngsters back and forth to classes.

As is the case with most large families, the elder children are helpful in looking after the younger ones and as assistants doing household chores.

Both Bob and Dortha are natives of Arizona. They were high-school sweethearts since the days when Bob was drum major for the school band and the twin sisters were majorettes. Besides his other affiliations, Bob is a member of the Society of Experimental Test Pilots, organized recently in the Dallas area. He is a graduate of the Navy's test pilot school at Patuxent River, Md.

Minnesota School Boards Association on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently the board of directors of the Minnesota School Boards Association drew up a series of statements and a resolution on the subject of Federal aid to education which I believe would be of interest to the Congress.

The text of the statements and resolution follows:

MINNESOTA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
ST. PETER, MINN.

The board of directors of the Minnesota School Boards Association, at their regular meeting of April 4, 1960, approved the following statements, and adopted the following resolution relative to Federal aid to education.

The board of directors recognize that:

1. We have in the United States a moral obligation to afford every child a public school education, commensurate with his ability, regardless of race, color, religion, or geographic area.

2. Some school districts appear to be negligent in providing a minimum standard of education which should be the obligation of every school district in the Nation.

3. The Federal Government has a broader tax base than local school districts or State governments. Approximately 75 percent of the total tax dollar is now controlled by the Federal Government.

4. Flexibility of school boards to finance their educational programs is restricted to the property tax dollar. It would appear that in some areas the local property tax cannot absorb heavier obligations of any sizable amount.

The board of directors also wish to point out that:

1. By Constitution, education is a function of the State. Through its legislature, it has created public school districts and delegated control of these districts to locally elected school boards.

2. It has been demonstrated that the majority of States have resources necessary to finance adequately an improved program of education.

3. The State of Minnesota could provide a greater financial base for the support of its public schools by its own legislative action. The expediting of reorganization of school districts would be a first step in this regard.

4. Minnesota would receive less money in any Federal-aid program presently suggested than its citizens would pay in taxes to support such a program.

5. Many States which are operating a dual system of education because of segregation would receive greater benefits than Minnesota under any plans presently proposed.

6. Many of the States which offer special tax exemptions to Minnesota industries to relocate within their borders are likely to receive the greatest benefits from Federal aid.

7. Moneys have been distributed under the National Defense Act to private and parochial schools. It should be pointed out that some States now allow free transportation and others free textbooks to these schools. It is therefore apparent that under present policies Minnesota tax moneys would be used to support private and parochial schools in other States.

8. Federal aid to education necessarily brings Federal controls.

In view of the above statements: Be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minnesota School Boards Association oppose any legislation that would provide additional Federal moneys for education except for federally impacted areas; be it further.

Resolved, That in the event the National Congress passes additional programs of Federal assistance to education, the moneys be definitely designated for public schools only; and be it further

Resolved, That as we recognize that Federal controls will inevitably accompany Federal aids to education, we recommend that any further Federal assistance be directed into those phases of the educational program where such controls will least affect the autonomy of local school boards.

Sunrise Easter Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200 years ago in the village of Schoenbrunn, near the present city of New Philadelphia, Ohio, Moravian missionaries and the Christian Indians, among whom the Moravians lived, celebrated what was surely one of the first sunrise Easter services in frontier America.

Sunday at Schoenbrunn and in the Moravian churches at nearby Gnadenhutten and Tuscarawas this traditional service will be repeated.

Easter dawn will be heralded by the sound of 18th century trombones from the church tower in Gnadenhutten. Later the trombone choirs will march through the village, calling the faithful to worship. Services beginning in the churches will be concluded in nearby cemeteries just as the first rays of the sun appear.

The liturgy used in these services is the most complete statement of creed that the Moravians have.

The special character of this traditional service in Tuscarawas County recalls to us the splendid contribution of religious faith, spiritual strength, and rugged individualism, for which all Ohio is indebted to its earliest Christian settlers.

City Where Everything Is: Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following first in a series of articles from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News by James Lehrer, April 10, 1960, which speaks for itself:

CITY WHERE EVERYTHING IS: DALLAS

(By James Lehrer)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The once-in-a-decade Federal census, now underway, will testify statistically to Dallas' amazing growth in recent years. But what's the story behind the statistics? This series, by News staff-writers who are specialists in their fields, shows where Dallas is today, how it got there, and where its future lies.)

An east Texas farmer was asked why he went to Dallas to do his shopping instead of Houston, Shreveport, or some other city.

"It's the natural thing, mister," he drawled. "Dallas is where everything is."

That homely phrase, probably, sums up present-day Dallas as neatly as possible. What is not already here is either on its way or plans are being laid to get it.

The pedestrian walking down Main or Elm knows and can feel it. The downtown section, which has added more office space in the 1950's than any other city in the Nation besides New York City, continues to expand.

The motorist driving through the residential and outlying business and industrial districts is aware of it. There's hardly a block in the city that does not reflect growth with a new building, a house, an apartment.

The businessman—large or small—can see the proof in the new addition to his building or in his increased list of employees.

A look at his paycheck, the newer car he's driving and the larger house he's living in is enough for the Dallas workingman.

Some call it "Big D"; to others it's "Dynamic Dallas." The words, "dazzling," "diversified," and even "delirious" have also been heard and read before Dallas.

No matter the name, Dallas is a city—a grownup city whose stature grew simultaneously with its population and wealth.

When a Paris or London businessman makes out his itinerary for a trip to the United States it now reads, "New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Dallas."

For the world, including Dallas itself, has finally realized that this city is more than Neiman-Marcus, 20 or 30 millionaires and the State Fair of Texas.

It's a city with a population of more than 700,000 supporting a metropolitan area of more than 1 million persons. When the Bureau of the census finishes nose counting this month, the tabulation is expected to show a 706,000 tally for Dallas, 955,800 for Dallas County and 1,090,000 for the four-county metropolitan area.

The rise has been spectacular. It seems almost inconceivable that only 60 years ago Dallas had a population of 42,638. By 1940 it had risen to 294,734, and the 1950 count was 434,462.

And now, 10 years later another 300,000 have been added.

The county's growth goes from 82,726 in 1900 to 398,564 in 1940 and to 614,799 in 1950.

Now included in Dallas' sphere of strength and influence is the metropolitan area, which takes in Collin, Denton, and Ellis Counties in addition to Dallas County. The U.S. Bureau of the Budget last year officially recognized this area as part and parcel of metropolitan Dallas.

The nontraveling easterner would probably look at Dallas' population figures and clip off an observation like: "That's an awful lot of cowboys."

He would be surprised to find that more than 27 percent of the city's working force is connected with manufacturing, according to Texas Employment Commission figures released in 1958.

Then come the retail employees with 15 percent, folowed by those in services; transportation, communications and utilities; finance, insurance, and real estate; construction; professional services, wholesale; cafes and filling stations.

No mention of cowboys.

And when each of these workers sits down behind his desk or turns on the machine at his job he contributes to and is part of the growth that has made Dallas the Southwest's leader in just about everything.

It's the manufacturing, the financial, and the trade and distribution center. It leads in construction, in transportation, in oil, and research.

The Dallas resident can absorb his culture and be entertained here in just about any manner he chooses. The city is dotted with live-theater productions and art museums. The resident with an ear for music can listen to the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, opera, or dance bands at the hotels and night clubs.

Mr. Dallas can send his children to modern schools—public and private—where the teachers, by comparison, are well paid and well trained. When college time comes there's Southern Methodist University and the University of Dallas.

Regardless of his faith, he can find a place to practice it in one of the approximately 750 churches in Dallas. Long regarded as the place where everybody goes to church, Dallas has the largest churches in the Nation in three major Protestant denominations—Southern Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian.

When the Dallas man, woman, or child gets sick there's no longer a need to go east for treatment. The medical facilities—both in research and in individual patient care—are the best in the Southwest and among the best in the country. There are more than 40 hospitals and clinics in the city, ranging from the large general hospitals—Parkland Memorial, Baylor Medical Center, St. Paul's and Methodist—to small clinics specializing in everything from alcoholism to lung and eye diseases.

The sports fan has it made here. This fall he will be able to watch two professional football teams and topnotch Southwest Conference ball in the Cotton Bowl. By summer of 1961 a major league baseball team, the Dallas-Fort Worth Rangers, will be throwing the ball around in the new Continental League.

And if he's a sports participant there are many bowling alleys, tennis courts, golf courses and amateur leagues in football, baseball, softball, basketball and just about every sport known to man.

Name it—Dallas has it.

It's a complex, hard-to-describe city that has risen to its leading position rapidly. But it's no gold rush-type boomtown, boasting size but lacking depth.

To some it's as conservative and substantial as Boston, to others as freewheeling and light as Miami. Dallas residents can take their pick and live accordingly because as the man says:

"Dallas is where everything is."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Wasteful Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the fight against reckless and wasteful Government spending being waged with greater determination and zeal than in grassroots newspapers throughout the Nation. Wasteful spending proposals ostensibly aimed at improving economic conditions pose the greatest threat to those conditions.

The American Press in its current issue performs a vital and needful service by publishing the results of a poll of editors of grassroots newspapers on a number of key issues now before the Congress. While I may disagree with the majority view on a few of these issues, I respect the editors' rights to their views and appreciate this further evidence of their interest in and efforts toward achieving sounder government.

Mr. Speaker, I feel keenly that every Member of both bodies of Congress should have, in his deliberation of these crucial matters, the benefit of the stand taken by those editors responding to the questions posed in the American Press poll. Accordingly, and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the American Press article:

A large majority of the editors of America's grassroots newspapers would like to see their Congressmen vote as follows on controversial issues now before Congress:

1. For a law to apply antitrust laws to unions and thereby ban industrywide bargaining.
2. Against any Federal aid to education.
3. Against increasing the appropriation for ballistic missiles.
4. Against an appropriation to keep bombers constantly in the air.
5. Against an increase in the gasoline tax for roadbuilding.
6. For taxing cooperatives on all earnings.
7. For reducing price supports for farmers.
8. Against any increase in the soil bank.
9. Against continuing loans to veterans for homebuilding.
10. Against any increase in first-class and airmail rates.

On some issues included in a questionnaire sent to a cross section of the Nation's editors there was a wide difference of opinion. But on all of the questions summarized above over 60 percent were in agreement.

Replies received from almost 400 editors to a three-page questionnaire indicate that the country editors are as vehement as ever in their opposition to federally sponsored welfare programs; they feel that labor unions must be curbed further; they would like to see farmers gradually go back to a supply-and-demand status; they favor debt reduction before tax reduction; and they think greater Post Office efficiency should come before further rate increases.

As far as defense is concerned, most realize that they are not in a position to determine our needs and are willing to accept the judgment of the President and his advisers.

Answers and comments indicate that the country editors are as fervent as ever in their desire to reverse current trends and go back to what they define as "the principles on which this country was built."

"How wonderful our free system in America would be," writes Bill Plourd, of the Fullerton (Nebr.) Journal, "if it were not for the selfish pressures of highly organized groups determined to enjoy special privileges regardless of the rights of others or of the country's welfare. The politician who places his party's advancement above his country's well-being, the monopolists in the fields of both labor and management who are determined to take and not to give regardless of the effect upon the consumer, and the groups who operate on the theory that more Federal appropriations are the answers to all our difficulties—these are responsible for the problems that bedevil us in America today."

Such sentiments, which might bring a "quit dreaming" sneer from today's sophisticates, would win hearty applause from any group of country editors, it is made clear from their comments in the American Press survey.

The gripe of the country editors is that the country is losing its moral stamina and the things which they consider to be obviously good are being circumvented.

Over and over again were comments such as that of Edward M. Perkins of the LeRoy (N.Y.) Gazette, who said:

"The greatest need of the Nation today in Congress, State legislatures, and county units of government is for men who will vote their honest and considered opinions rather than voting the way that promises to best assure their reelection.

"We are bedeviled today with too many who are thinking in terms of pleasing the gimme-gimme crowd and who will not stand up and and be counted for the things that are best—yes necessary—for the preservation of the Nation as a whole."

Fifteen questions were included in the questionnaire sent to approximately 1,200 editors representing every State in the Union. The 397 replies received at the time the results were tabulated represent a good cross-section of all areas of the country.

The results are being sent to all Members of Congress. Similar polls made by the American Press in past years have proven to be of great interest to many Senators and Representatives, and it is expected that the views expressed here on subjects which Congress is debating this year will be of equal interest.

The questions and answers follow:

Question 1: "Several suggestions have been offered to prevent reoccurrence of nationwide strikes, such as the steel strike. Which, if any, of the following would you like to see Congress approve?"

Answers:

(a) Enaction of a law to apply antitrust laws to unions and thereby ban industrywide bargaining, 66 percent.

(b) Setting up of a Labor Court with power to hand down final decisions when labor and management cannot reach agreement, 25 percent.

(c) Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, 15 percent.

(d) Use of factfinding boards to recommend strike settlements, 17 percent.

(e) Appointment of a presidential commission, when a strike threatens, to study the dispute and make recommendations based on the public interest, 23 percent.

(f) Other or no answer, 7 percent.

(The totals here are greater than 100 percent because some voted for more than one suggestion.)

Question 2: "Do you favor increasing the minimum wage to $1.25?"

Answers: Yes, 17 percent; no, 77 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

Question 3: "Several bills for Federal aid to education have been introduced. Which, if any, would you favor?"

Answers:

(a) A bill to authorize grants of $500 million a year for school construction? 12 percent.

(b) A bill to authorize $800 million a year for increasing teachers' salaries? 9 percent.

(c) A bill to help States pay bond interest on bonds for school construction? 12 percent.

(d) No Federal aid to education, 66 percent.

(e) No answer, 5 percent.

Question 4: "Do you favor, as do some Congressmen, increasing the appropriation for ballistic missiles and space exploration beyond the amount requested by the President?"

Answers: Yes, 37 percent; no, 60 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Question 5: Gen. Thomas S. Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, has recommended that the United States spend $750 million a year to keep bombers constantly in the air as a deterrent against attack. Would you vote for this program?"

Answers: Yes, 29 percent; no, 63 percent; no answer, 8 percent.

Question 6: "The President's budget predicts a surplus of $4.2 billion. For which of the following purposes would you prefer the bulk of this surplus be used?"

Answers: (a) To reduce national debt, 80 percent.

(b) To increase defense expenditures, 11 percent.

(c) To lower taxes, 18 percent.

(d) For greater social welfare programs, 6 percent.

(e) For Federal aid to education, 2 percent.

Question 7: "Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, favors a major tax change which would wipe out all present deductions, except for personal exemptions, and would thereby permit a tax reduction of 40 percent. Does this sound like a good idea to you?"

Answers: Yes, 39 percent; no, 48 percent; no answer, 13 percent.

Question 8: "Last year the President asked for a 1½-cent boost in the gasoline tax (to 4½ cents) to carry on the interstate highway program. He got only 1 cent. He now claims this is slowing down the program and the extra one-half cent is needed. Do you favor this increase?"

Answers: Yes, 38 percent; no, 47 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

Question 9: "The President has asked that all corporate and excise taxes due to expire

in June be extended for another year. Do you favor this?"

Answers: Yes, 49 percent; no, 47 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

Question 10: "Proposals have been made to tax cooperatives on all earnings, before cash distributions, or to tax them on retained earnings. How do you feel about this?"

Answers:

(a) Tax cooperatives on all earnings before cash distributions, 71 percent.

(b) Tax cooperatives on retained earnings only, 20 percent.

(c) Don't increase their taxes in any way, 5 percent.

(d) No answer, 4 percent.

Question 11: Those who receive dividends argue that dividends are the only form of personal income taxed twice. The large corporations pay 52 percent tax on earnings and shareholders then pay a personal tax on dividends. Do you think dividends should continue to be taxed?"

Answers: Yes, 47 percent; no, 46 percent; no answer, 7 percent.

Question 12: "Do you favor reducing farm price supports, decreasing them, or leaving them as they are now?"

Answers: Leave as they are, 18 percent; reduce, 74 percent; increase, 5 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Question 13: "Do you think funds for the soil bank should be increased to get more land out of production?"

Answers: Yes, 15 percent; no, 82 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Question 14: "Over 150,000 loans have been made to veterans for building houses. Total outstanding is now about $1 billion. The President believes there is no further need for this readjustment program and has asked that it be terminated. Do you think it should be terminated?"

Answers: Yes, 71 percent; no, 27 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

Question 15: "The annual Post Office deficit is now estimated at $55 million a year. The President has asked for an increase of 1 cent in first-class mail and airmail to help offset it. Do you favor these increases?"

Answers: Yes, 35 percent; no, 64 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Milwaukee Journal the Third-Ranking Newspaper in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently a poll of the Nation's newspaper editors selected the 15 outstanding dailies in the country for "most superior news coverage, integrity, and public service."

We in Wisconsin are particularly proud that one of our State's fine newspapers, the Milwaukee Journal, ranks third in the national poll. Of course, we Badgers know that it is a fine newspaper. Now we are glad that the Nation recognizes its excellence.

With a circulation of more than 375,000 copies daily, and over a half million copies of its Sunday edition, the Milwaukee Journal is bringing to homes, businesses, and particularly to our individual citizens, a wealth of news, special features, editorials, and reports on international affairs, as well as items on almost all aspects of American life. For it outstanding record, the Journal and its splendid staff deserve the plaudits, not only of the people of Wisconsin, but also of the country as a whole.

In recognition of the Journal's outstanding contribution to a better informed citizenry, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following: First, an article from the Christian Science Monitor listing the 15 top-randing daily newspapers of the Nation—in which the Journal ranks third; and second, an article from the Milwaukee Journal itself, outlining ways in which it is expanding its activities to better serve the public.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 1, 1960]

EDITORS' POLL PICKS 15 U.S. TOP-RANK DAILY NEWSPAPERS

NEW YORK.—A poll of the Nation's newspaper editors conducted by Scholastic Magazines has selected the 15 daily newspapers in the United States most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service.

The poll was conducted in connection with the special issue of "How to Read Newspapers," published annually by Practical English, one of the scholastic magazines for high school students.

In order of preference, the newspapers chosen were: New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, Milwaukee Journal, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Washington Post and Times Herald, Louisville Courier-Journal, Wall Street Journal, Atlanta Constitution, Chicago Tribune, Des Moines Register, Kansas City Times-Star, Baltimore Sun, Miami Herald, Chicago Daily News, and Los Angeles Times.

The poll was taken in two parts. First, a list of all newspapers in cities with 200,000 population or more was sent to all daily newspaper editors in the United States. They were asked to check the 12 newspapers which, in their opinion, were most superior for news coverage, integrity, and public service. Room was allowed for write-in votes.

A run-off ballot was then drawn up, including newspapers which polled at least 12 votes. (Write-in candidates with two or more votes also were included.) More than 335 editors voted in the final run-off ballot.

The results of the run-off showed such a close vote that 15 newspapers were chosen instead of 12.

JOURNAL'S EXPANSION TO COST $11,525,000—SIZE OF PLANT WILL DOUBLE; START IS NEAR—LARGEST BUILDING EXPENDITURE DOWNTOWN IN 25 YEARS LOOKS TO FUTURE NEEDS

The Journal Co. will start next week an $11,525,000 expansion program which includes a $5,755,000 addition to the Journal Building at the southwest corner of North Third and West State Streets, and $5,770,000 worth of new equipment.

The building and its equipment are expected to be in use before the end of 1961.

The go-ahead on construction, under planning for 5 years, was voted at a special meeting of the Journal Co.'s board of directors Tuesday.

INFORMATION DINNER HELD

Announcement of the plans was made by Donald B. Abert, vice president and general manager, at the annual business information dinner of the Journal Co.'s Unitholders Council Tuesday night at the Milwaukee Athletic Club.

"The Milwaukee Journal, under the late L. W. Nieman, its founder, and Harry J. Grant, its board chairman, has been keenly interested in the development of this community and of our State," said Irwin Maier, executive vice president and publisher. "Presently, among other things, we share the general concern about the deterioration of downtown Milwaukee. Our new building program is tangible evidence of our faith in Milwaukee and our belief in the future of Milwaukee's downtown."

The new Journal Building, more than doubling the size of the present six-story building, will be the most expensive built in downtown Milwaukee for more than a quarter of a century.

BUILDINGS TO BE CONNECTED

The contemporary styled building, of reinforced concrete and faced with pink Kasota limestone, black granite, and gray brick, will extend 170 feet on West State Street and 200 feet on North Third Street, covering the entire quarter block. Its north half will be three stories; its south half, six. It will contain 221,000 square feet and 2,926,000 cubic feet.

The structure will be connected with the present 192,000 square-foot Journal building, at North Fourth and West State Streets. The present Journal building, completed in 1924, also is faced with pink Kasota limestone. The connection between the new and existing buildings will be at all levels except that a truck court will run through the center of the combined structures at ground level. All alley openings will be retained.

Into the new building will go full air conditioning, elevators, two new eight-unit presses with color decks for run of paper (ROP) color reproduction and other installations for the mailroom, loading dock, composing room and the stereotype, paper and ink, engraving and other departments.

The prime architect is the firm of Eschweiler & Eschweiler; the consulting architect, Pereira & Associates, Chicago. The work will be in three phases: excavation, pile driving, capping and construction of the basement slab, to start immediately; next, construction of the new building; third, remodeling of the present building to coordinate with the new facilities.

"We believe we will have one of the finest, most up-to-the-minute newspaper plants in the country, designed in every detail to meet present and future production needs quantitatively and qualitatively," said Abert. "Our present building, which Harry J. Grant conceived and developed, has served us well since 1924. This addition to it will enable us to provide improved service just as the existing plant met our growth needs up to the present.

"We shall have the plant to take our growth in stride, to produce more editorial content and to hurdle the growing circulation and advertising volumes with relative ease and at reasonable cost.

"The move also symbolizes the Journal Co.'s community leadership and its confidence in Milwaukee's and Wisconsin's future."

BIG CHANGES PREDICTED

The steadily growing need for the new structure was pointed out in talks by Wallace Lomoe, vice president and executive editor, and Robert K. Drew, vice president and business manager.

"The next 10 years will be a period of great change in newspaper content and possibly in news gathering organization," Lomoe said. "The material demands of the populace will be more fully met and people will turn more and more to examining their ways of life and seeking more knowledge on all subjects. We are going to be called upon to report and interpret in more fields."

Last year, more than 90,000 tons of newsprint was used. Its 1960 cost will approach

$13 million, Drew said. "Advertising rose to 55,689,107 lines last year, headed for 58 million in 1960. Circulation was up 50,737 copies of the daily Journal and 89,972 Sunday in 10 years.

"We will be housing approximately 500 more people than 10 years ago, 140 of them in the production department alone," Drew said. "Our growth pattern over the last decade is further borne out by the 10-year trends in production volume: Total columns produced in the composing room, up 23 percent; total pages printed in the pressroom, up 44 percent—almost 4 billion pages."

REAL ESTATE ACQUIRED

Abert continued the growth story:

"The seeds of our expansion program were sown during World War II when we were doing some postwar planning. No one imagined then how vigorous and dramatic would be the Journal Co.'s growth after the war. It was then that we st arted to acquire contiguous real estate.

"Our recordbreaking years in the early fifties made it evident that * * * we would have to control the whole block for future plant expansion, and we set about the difficult assembly of what now is known as Journal Square." (The block bounded by North Fourth, North Third and West State Streets, and West Kilbourn Avenue.)

The new building is designed so that the pressroom can some day be extended in one long line along North Third Street from West State Street to West Kilbourn Avenue.

The Federal National Debt

SPEECH
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleague from Oklahoma in this matter. It has been a very disturbing thing insofar as the gentleman from Florida is concerned that in a time of high prosperity in this Nation, the greatest that we have ever known, we continue to operate this Government on the basis of a deficit financing.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced a bill, H.R. 5203, that would make it mandatory for the President of the United States to submit to the Congress a balanced budget and require the Secretary of the Treasury to set aside the first 5 percent of the income, based on the income of the previous year, to apply on the national debt. Of course, the gentleman realizes that under the proposition of the income of the Federal Government now being approximately $80 billion, we could apply approximately $4 billion a year toward this tremendous debt. I think it is about time that the Members of the Congress begin to take cognizance of this tremendous, staggering debt. We have shirked our responsibility in that regard and have continued to finance the Government on a deficit operation, thereby placing on the shoulders of future generations the responsibility of paying this staggering amount of money. I commend the gentleman for his interest in this matter. I might say that the bill that I introduced has been referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and I hope the gentleman will join me in an attempt to dislodge that bill, or at least have some hearings, so that the American people will know that some of us in the Congress are interested in this very vital situation. Let us assume some fiscal responsibility in our own time and not pass along this huge debt for future generations to pay.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I am happy to know that we share this concern together. The legislation we are sponsoring has the same general purpose, and I do hope that we, as he suggests, can get some favorable action in that direction. I think it is certainly high time to do so.

National Defense Education Act Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it now appears evident that before this session of Congress adjourns we will be called upon to take up active consideration of a measure to delete the disclaimer affidavit provision from the National Defense Education Act.

I have stated repeatedly in this Chamber my unalterable opposition to S. 2929, which seeks removal of this provision from the act.

I am pleased to point out at this time, however, that I am not alone in my stand in favor of retaining the disclaimer affidavit. Many national organizations and, indeed, a great number of college students and faculty members, share my sentiments in this regard.

In a recent issue of the Manchester Union Leader, a letter to the editor over the signature of Mr. Blaylock Atherton, of Nashua, N.H., embraces a resolution recently passed by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. The resolution praises the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath for their efforts in opposing S. 2929.

Mr. President, I think this resolution, as well as the introductory remarks of Mr. Atherton, president of the New Hampshire Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, warrant the attention of the Members of Congress. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded, entitled "Students Proud of U.S. Loyalty Oath," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Mar. 9, 1960]

STUDENTS PROUD OF U.S. LOYALTY

To the EDITORS:

One of the most impressive features of the trustees' meeting of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Washington was the presentation concerning the loyalty oath made by two university students at the noonday luncheon. These men represent the fighting National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath. They are contacting students throughout the country, and report an overwhelming percentage are in favor of retaining the oath.

The society strongly supports retention of the loyalty oath (Resolution No. 19 at Pittsburgh Congress). Its repeal is now before Congress. The more students who express themselves the stronger is the opposition to the repeal.

I strongly urge college or university students in this State to contact their Senators and Congressmen to urge them to vote against repeal of the oath.

The following resolution was adopted by the board of trustees of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, February 13, 1960, at Washington, D.C.:

"Whereas the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution at its 69th annual congress in Pittsburgh, Pa., in May 1959 adopted Resolution No. 19, which approves the taking of the oath of allegiance and the loyalty oath by an applicant for direct financial assistance from the U.S. Government as a condition to receiving assistance; and

"Whereas there has been formed a bipartisan National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath, which is composed of students at various colleges and universities across the Nation who are proud to declare their loyalty and allegiance to the United States, and whose purpose is to coordinate all student activities defending the loyalty oath and affidavit clause in the National Defense Education Act and to bring such activities to the attention of Members of Congress and the American public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, by unanimous vote of its board of trustees at its regular meeting in Washington, D.C., on February 13, 1960, That it approves the efforts and actions of the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath in opposing Senate bill 2929, which, if adopted, would repeal the nonsubversive affidavit requirement in the National Defense Education Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presidents of each State society, to Members of the Congress of the United States, and to the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath."

BLAYLOCK ATHERTON,
President, New Hampshire Society, Sons of the American Revolution.

NASHUA.

Appleton, Wis., Goes on Record for Better Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Appleton supporting a pay increase for

postal employees, in as concise and persuasive an exposition of the case for a pay increase as I have read, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the increasing cost of living has wiped out any advantages which were gained in the last pay raise given to the postal employees; and

Whereas the last increase in pay, given to the postal employees over 2 years ago, contained the agreement that 2½ percent was only a temporary increase; and

Whereas the postal employees have been largely ignored by the trend toward higher profits and higher wages, therefore making it necessary for four out of five seeking part-time work just to finance their basic needs; and

Whereas we are aware of the great devotion to duty these postal employees exhibit, and we also recognize that they add to the pride of any community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the city council of Appleton, Wis., go on record favoring a just and equitable pay increase for our postal employees, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Postmaster General Summerfield, Senators Wiley and Proxmire, and Congressman Byrnes.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.
Alderman ERVIN BOGAN, *Chairman.*
Alderman ALVIN TEWS.
Alderman DOUGLAS OGILVIE.
Alderman ROBERT STUMPF.
Alderman KENNETH LOOS.

Persecution of Teenagers in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the relative security of military might, in the luxury of unparalleled living conditions, in preoccupation with earning a living and otherwise utilizing their time, the good people of the United States may not be sufficiently aware of the crimes perpetrated—and being perpetrated—against people of Hungary whose only crime was to value freedom more than personal safety, and who, in 1956, fought unsuccessfully, and against staggering odds, for that freedom.

Some of our youth of today are not waiting until their tomorrow arrives to assume an active role in good citizenship and an active interest in achieving peace and freedom for mankind everywhere. In this connection, I have just received a petition drawn and circulated by students of Don Bosco High School, Ramsey, N.J., to which more than 1,500 signatures have been affixed protesting execution of teenagers in Hungary.

The petition stresses four points: First, that Congress pass a resolution condemning the persecution of teenagers in Hungary; second, that the United States urge Soviet leaders that as long as Hungarian minors remain in prison for the crime of wanting freedom there can be no effective agreement on any point; third, that a week be set aside and dedicated as Hungarian Youth Week; and, fourth, that during such week all teenagers offer prayers in memory of the young, heroic dead of Hungary and offer thanks for the freedom of America.

That secret trials and execution of Hungarian freedom fighters have taken place is not an open question but a known—and admitted—fact. The Hungarian Communist Government denies that executions have included teenagers, and the State Department's best intelligence is unable to prove these repeated denials to be erroneous, as are so many Communist protestations. But, adding to the Hungarian leaders' undeniable record of brutality the fact that they refuse to allow United Nations investigators to enter the country to find out for themselves, at the very least raises much doubt as to the truthfulness of the Communist denials. Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand, special representative of the U.N. for Hungary, himself drew that much of a conclusion in a press conference on April 8 in Geneva. He has been trying to gain entry into Hungary in order to investigate the repeated reports coming from behind the Iron Curtain that teenage freedom fighters—who were little more than children when imprisoned as a result of the 1956 revolution—are executed upon reaching the age of 18. Even Sir Leslie could not categorically confirm such execution of teenagers. But in discussing the whole subject of reprisals in Hungary, giving names of adults found guilty and executed, he reasoned that if the Hungarian Communists had nothing to hide there was no reason to keep him out of the country.

It is easy to understand the horror and repulsion generated by reports that teenagers are being placed before firing squads. Confirmed or unconfirmed, this does not detract one whit from the wanton killing of adult freedom fighters. One human life is as precious as another. The Communist crime is no less a crime when carried out against adults.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the students of Don Bosco High School, and the school's Americana Discussion Forum which has spearheaded this drive for moral action, for their concern for the enslaved people of Hungary and for their efforts to advance the cause of universal freedom. I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the texts of both the letter I received from Peter Schmid, president of the Americana Discussion Forum, and the petition that was signed by more than 1,500.

AMERICANA FORUM,
DON BOSCO HIGH SCHOOL,
Ramsey, N.J., March 29, 1960.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: On behalf of the students of Don Bosco High School, and with full approbation of the faculty, I am sending under separate cover, signed petitions which we sincerely hope will bring about some action against the current brutality in Hungary, where youngsters, upon reaching their 18th birthday are put up against the firing squads for having participated in the fight for freedom.

We strongly feel that action of this type should be taken immediately or else the entire gamut of talks, conferences, mouthings of peaceful coexistence will always be but useless and worthless political tactics of evasion in the cause of expediency and not truth.

We likewise feel that America should take the lead, and take it courageously, in expressing some righteous indignation in the true cause of freedom, based on justice, and the belief in the intrinsic integrity of man.

We are further convinced that Congress will see the need for definitive moral action in this regard, and that you will place the action indicated in our petition on your agenda for immediate disposal.

Yours very truly.

PETER SCHMID,
President, Americana Discussion Forum, Don Bosco High School.

We, the undersigned, respectfully request that the Congress of the United States pass a resolution condemning the persecution of teenagers in Hungary. Further, we urge that the Russian leaders be given to understand from the floors of both Houses of Congress that there can be no effective attempt at agreement on any point so long as Hungarian minors remain in prison for the crime of wanting freedom. We request that one week be set aside and dedicated as Hungarian Youth Week. During this week, all Americans, especially teenagers, will offer prayers in memory of the young, heroic dead of Hungary, and will offer thanks for the freedom of America which we so cherish.

(Signatures omitted).

Rural Exodus—More Farmers Give Up, Move to Jobs in Cities As Their Incomes Fall—Auctions Rise 50 Percent in Idabel—Iowa Farm Town Slumps; Tight Credit Is a Factor—"It's Too Big a Gamble"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under a front-page headline which I have placed above these remarks, the Wall Street Journal in its edition of Tuesday, April 12, sets forth, in calm and dispassionate reporting, the penury, poverty, and hopelessness which now embrace a large part of our agriculture at a time when other areas of our economy are enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am placing this article in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope that this report on the tragic conditions on our farms may serve to dispel differences among us in this body and to suspend all political consideration, so that in this session of the Congress we may enact legislation to restore stability to agriculture and to enable the farm families of America to share equitably in the rewards of our free enterprise system.

The article follows:

RURAL EXODUS—MORE FARMERS GIVE UP, MOVE TO JOBS IN CITIES AS THEIR INCOMES FALL—AUCTIONS RISE 50 PERCENT IN IDABEL; IOWA FARM TOWN SLUMPS; TIGHT CREDIT IS A FACTOR—"IT'S TOO BIG A GAMBLE"

(By John F. Lawrence)

WEBSTER CITY, IOWA.—In a scene reminiscent of the dust bowl days of the thirties, Willard Whiteaker, a 47-year-old tenant farmer, packs his wife, six children, and all their belongings in the family car and their farm truck and heads for Eugene, Oreg.

This lean, ruddy-faced farmer has lined up a job there as an apprentice carpenter at $90 a week. Last year, he averaged less than $30 a week working a 320-acre farm here in central Iowa. "I couldn't see much hope of my income going up this year," he says.

The Whiteaker family is part of a vast flight from the farm that stems not from drought and dust but to a large extent from producing too much corn, oats, pork, and other farm products.

Before Mr. Whiteaker departed for Oregon he relaxed and analyzed the problem.

"It seems everything we buy goes up and everything we sell goes down. When I started farming in 1948, I bought a tractor for $2,000. Hogs brought 20 cents a pound and corn was $1.25 a bushel. Now I'd have to pay $3,500 for the tractor but corn's down to $1 and I only got 12 cents for the hogs I sold last winter."

NUMBER OF AUCTIONS RISES

The sharp rise in the number of auctions held last winter indicates the migration from the farm was one of the heaviest in recent years. Farms usually change hands in the winter for occupancy just prior to the start of spring planting. When a farmer decides to leave the farm, an auction is generally held to dispose of machinery, tools, and livestock. Two out of three auctioneers, local farm organizations, and rural newspapers in 15 States surveyed by the Wall Street Journal, said the number of sales were higher during the past winter than a year earlier. The average increase was 50 percent, but some auctioneers reported holding twice as many sales as in the winter of 1958–59.

Last winter's exodus marks an acceleration of a decline in farm population that has been going on for a quarter of a century. The Nation's farm population, at last count on April 1, 1959, was 21.2 million, down from 32.4 million in 1933. The decline has averaged 430,000 annually over the past decade.

This drop in the number of farmers shrinks the rural market for refrigerators, washers, clothing, and the thousands of other consumer products these people buy. As the number of farms put on the market climbs, it tends to weaken rural real estate prices which, until last winter, had been going up since World War II. Paradoxically, crop output tends to rise as the number of farmers declines, providing new problems for Federal farm glut cutters. Most of the farms sold are joined with other units run by better farmers who succeed in coaxing more out of the land.

Here in Webster City's Hamilton County, there are slightly more than 2,000 farms now, 70 fewer than in 1953. Yet production of corn, the biggest crop, topped 10 million bushels last year, 1 million more than in 1953. Yield per acre was 74 bushels last year, up from 57 bushels 6 years earlier.

IMPACT OF LIVESTOCK DECLINE

The biggest exodus has taken place in the Corn Belt, a region that takes in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and parts of surrounding States. This heavy hog raising and cattle fattening country bore the brunt of last year's skid in livestock prices. This decline dragged down 1959 net income per farm in Iowa to $3,357, 29 percent below 1958. Farm income nationally was off 16 percent.

"I've had 50 auctions this winter compared with 33 last season," reports Melvin Wehrheim, who runs the Wehrheim Auction Service in Webster City. "I started in business 25 years ago and this is the biggest season I've had," he says. "As usual," he says, "most sales were for elderly farmers who were retiring. But this winter 23 farmers were quitting to get other jobs, compared with 15 who left for that reason a year ago," he explains.

"We've had close to 100 sales in DeKalb County this winter, twice as many as a year ago," says E. E. Golden, an agent for the Department of Agriculture in DeKalb, in northern Illinois. One DeKalb auctioneer was booked solidly 6 days a week in January and February. When more farmers decided to sell out, he had to book two sales on some days, morning and afternoon affairs.

Auctioneer Hugh Campbell, of Chillicothe, in western Missouri, has handled 56 sales since the first of the year, about 10 percent more than a year ago and the most since shortly after World War II. The area's big crops are corn, hogs, and wheat.

The trend also is apparent in farm areas outside the Corn Belt. "I've never seen so many sales for fellows who shouldn't be quitting," says Alvin Kohner, Winona, Minn., auctioneer. "In one stretch this winter 9 out of 10 sales were for farmers under 40." Winona is in a heavy dairy cattle and poultry region.

MORE AUCTION ADS

In Texas, another key farm State, Joe Pinson, editor of the Clarksville Times, reports, "We've been running about 20 percent more farm auction ads than we did last year. It's the most we've had since the 1930's. Just across the Red River at Idabel, Okla., the McCurtain Gazette reports about a 50 percent jump in the number of auctions. The papers serve a major cotton producing area.

The drop in income that prompted Mr. Whiteaker to abandon farming is the major reason farmers are selling out. Many farmers are experiencing a similar income squeeze.

Nationally, farmer marketings in 1959 reached 127 percent of the 1947–49 average. But prices farmers received for their products were only 82 percent of the 1947–49 base period. Reflecting higher prices for tractors, increased labor rates, and an upward trend in many other expenses, farm costs last year jumped to 145 percent of the 1947–49 level.

The result was a drop in 1959 farmers' profits, or what Government economists call net farm income, to $11 billion, 28 percent less than the average for 1947–49. Actually, net farm income trended steadily downward throughout 1959, reaching an annual rate of $10.9 billion in the fourth quarter. That was 17 percent below the rate in the final 3 months of 1958. Farm income reached a record high of $17.3 billion in 1947.

With heavier production failing to boost profits, some farmers figure it's useless to continue trying.

"When prices go down, you have to increase production some way; so you buy more cattle to fatten and work longer hours," relates Maurice Hemmen, who just sold his farm to become a salesman for a steel farm buildings manufacturer in Webster City. "With prices still going down this year I just decided to quit beating my head against a wall and get out."

TOO BIG A GAMBLE

The big investment also adds to farming risks. "It's become too big a gamble," contends auburn-haired Alice Burkhart, wife of another farmer near Webster City. "You have $5,000 tied up in fertilizer before you even begin to plant. Then you're at the mercy of the weather." Her husband, R. E. "Curly" Burkhart, climbs from a grain bin, reeking of moldy corn, and says: "The winter was so damp the corn never dried." He lost about 2,500 bushels, 10 percent of his crop. He's packing up to move to Jewell, Iowa, 10 miles south, and run a bowling alley.

With incomes so low, jobs in the city naturally look more attractive. "Incomes were poor around here last year and many of the younger farmers realize they'd be better off in factory jobs," states Bernard Hart of Frankfort, Ind., secretary of the National Auctioneers Association. "Some of the older farmers are quitting, figuring they may as well go on social security a little early," he adds.

"Farming was getting to be a rough life," relates Duane Burtnett, 35-year-old Iowa farmer who moved to Webster City this winter to drive an oil company service truck. "I made only $2,400 in 1958 on the farm and $1,400 less than that last year. I'm a farm boy, never lived in town until now, but my outlook here certainly is better than on the farm." A father of four, he'd been forced by low returns on the farm to hold a part-time city job the last few years.

"I'm going to work for a national credit rating association at a starting salary that's a good bit more than the most I made in any year farming," says Dale Mott on his 160-acre rented farm just west of Williams, Iowa. He expects his income to be steadier from the city job, too. Last year the drop in hog prices hurt him on the farm. He bought 200 head, purchased the feed for them and wound up losing $8 a head when he sold them in the fall. "That pretty well wiped out last year's profit," he says.

TIGHTER CREDIT CURBS

Tighter credit restrictions at the banks this year are another reason for the increase in the number of farmers taking flight.

"We have about 10 percent less to lend this year compared with a year ago; the big pinch will be in the next 30 to 60 days when demand for loans normally is at a peak," reports Lorenz A. Horn, president of the First State Bank in Webster City. "Our loans are up to 62 percent of deposits now instead of the usual 50 percent because farmers haven't paid up last year's notes."

"The banks have been riding along with some of these fellows for several years, hoping income would turn up; now they're trying to shed some of them," says Robert Lehman, who heads the Production Credit Association here. The group makes short-term loans with money obtained from the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, a quasi-Government agency. The association currently is lending about $450,000 a month, 50 percent more than a year ago. "Farmers turned away at the bank are coming across the street to us," Mr. Lehman explains.

Few farmers have been forced to sell out by anxious creditors, but many have sold voluntarily because they realized they were rapidly becoming overextended. The association has quietly advised a few of its farmer members to sell, confides Mr. Lehman.

"A lot of young farmers around here who bought expensive equipment on time the last couple of years figured they could sell out this year, pay off their debt and still have a few dollars left over," says Mr. Campbell, of Chillicothe, Mo. "They were afraid if they stayed another year they might come out of the auction still in debt."

GROWING MECHANIZATION

The decline in farm population has been spurred by growing mechanization, which reduces the need for manpower on the farm. Since the war, farmers have mechanized at almost breakneck speed. Small farms have been combined so bigger machines could be worked to capacity. Many farmers with small acreage sold out to more prosperous neighbors.

With so many farmers leaving for town, there's more land available for sale or lease this spring and demand for it is weaker.

Very little of the land left behind will stand idle, auctioneers and real-estate men say. This is because there still is a good demand for land from farmers who want to increase the size of their operations in the hope this will improve efficiency. Land that isn't sold by the time planting begins probably will be rented at the last minute to neighboring farmers, they explain.

But many of the small communities that grew up before the automobile whittled the distance between outlying farms and the county seat face a bleaker outlook. In a dimly lighted drug and variety store in the center of Williams, Iowa, a tiny community 9 miles east of Webster City, R. O. Bauman stands under an old wooden sign that reads "Poultry and livestock medicines" and complains: "A lot of people that have been dealing here are gone and those who replace them just won't have the loyalty. They'll go off to bigger towns." He made only $1,200 on his business last year. When he started out 15 years ago he made about $4,000 a year. Roughly 70 percent of his business is with farmers.

Most farmers who've come to town this winter have had little trouble finding new jobs. But, if the trend continues, their search may become more difficult. "In the past 3 months 25 farmers have been in here looking for full-time city jobs, 40 percent more than last year," reports Val Ewing, manager of the Iowa State Employment Service office in Webster City. "Many of these farmers have no other skill and we've had to find them jobs where they'll be trained. We've placed them all so far."

What sort of jobs are they getting? Two are selling insurance, two others are selling feed for livestock, another is working as a mechanic in a farm equipment dealership, and several are taking janitorial jobs in a local frozen foods factory, says Mr. Ewing.

Not all areas are experiencing the upswing in farm sales. Especially in areas where last year's farm profits were equal to or more than 1958, the auction season was about equal to a year ago. In California, for example, the number of auctions increased in dairy and poultry farm areas where incomes were poor, but held about even with the previous year in regions concentrating on orchard crops, where returns were more favorable.

In Georgia, auctioneers report fewer sales than in the previous season. Both plenty of farmers are leaving for city jobs, they say. "Farmers are putting the land into the soil bank instead of selling out," says George E. Collins, a Decatur, Ga., auctioneer.

Where Blame Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 15, 1960, edition of the Portland (Oreg.) Orgeonian.

Mr. Speaker, blame placing seems to be the favorite sport of politicians when they start discussing the problems facing agriculture.

It would be so much better for the American farmer if we could forget the partisan view long enough to tackle the real job of getting sound, economic farm legislation out of this Congress.

Unfortunately, day after day we hear the same old, worn-out theme about Secretary Benson's administration of farm laws or about the virtues of discredited, unimaginative programs which would get us in even more trouble than we are already in.

So it was with interest that I read this editorial "Where Blame Lies," that reflects my own feelings.

The editorial follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Feb. 11, 1960]

WHERE BLAME LIES

Presidential Candidate HUBERT HUMPHREY says, "There's not a thing wrong with agriculture that another election can't cure."

This ought to rate near the top among silly campaign statements. Senator HUMPHREY is a veteran Member of Congress. He might have said, "There's not a thing wrong with agriculture that Congress couldn't cure."

The Democratic campaign technique of blaming the Republican administration for outdated farm policies adopted by Democratic Congresses, while refusing to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson the key legislation they have sought, is beginning to wear on the public nerves.

So is the "me too" denunciation of Secretary Benson by Republican Members of Congress from the Farm Belt States who have helped sabotage the Benson programs.

President Eisenhower gave Congress all the latitude it could ask in his farm message Tuesday. He outlined the failures of the present program with great simplicity and his proposals for reform were clear. But he did not tie the hands of Congress. He said he would sign any alternative legislation which provided a constructive solution of costly surpluses.

This is a challenge which Congress will find trouble in attempting to convert to political ammunition. The President was right on the beam when he said the American people have every right to expect Congress to act promptly and effectively to avert the very "real danger this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation."

Alfred Kohlberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with the recent untimely death of Alfred Kohlberg, the Nation has suffered the loss of one of her most diligent fighters against the Communist conspiracy.

His battle against the menace of international communism commenced during the latter part of his lifetime, but this did not deter in any way his vigor and singleness of purpose in trying to awaken the American people to this danger.

There have recently appeared two outstanding columns about Mr. Kohlberg which I feel are worthy of the attention of every Member of this body. The first is an editorial entitled "He Did Not Pass by on the Other Side," written by publisher William Loeb of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, and the second is a column, "The China Lobby," written by George E. Sokolsky.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these excellent commentaries about Mr. Kohlberg's life be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, April 13, 1960]

ALFRED KOHLBERG: HE DID NOT PASS BY ON THE OTHER SIDE

(By William Loeb)

Alfred Kohlberg, who died late last week, is worthy of front page space because he was an example of an American businessman who did not think communism was not his business. Kohlberg was a successful businessman who, until he was approximately 60 years old, had never realized the extent of the Communist conspiracy in this Nation and in the world. Then, to his amazement, when he stumbled on a small segment of the Communist conspiracy, he was so outraged that he decided to do something about the overall menace.

For the remaining approximately 15 years of his life Kohlberg devoted most of his time and income to attempting to awaken the rest of the United States, and especially the business community, to the fact that the Communists are very close to a take-over of complete power in this country.

Much to his surprise, Kohlberg found himself battling principally wealthy men, business leaders and their lawyers. Kohlberg was amazed and puzzled to the end of his days by the fact that publishers of great newspapers, the owners of great magazines and the presidents of huge corporations opposed almost to a man what he was trying to do.

To Kohlberg it was incomprehensible, as it is to any logical-minded individual, how the chief beneficiaries of the free enterprise system could be so stupid where the question of communism is involved.

Of course Kohlberg soon discovered the answer. The answer is a combination of complacency, conceit, and complete ignorance.

Kohlberg could do nothing about the two former traits, but he did do a great deal in his lifetime in seeking to remove the ignorance which so many American leaders displayed toward communism.

Kohlberg's awakening could well serve as a pattern for other American business leaders. Kohlberg found in the beginning when he came up against the Communist conspiracy in this country that he had very little knowledge of the background of that conspiracy. By patient study he made himself an expert on the ins and outs of the Communist line and how it comes in inherent and deadly conflict with everything for which this Nation stands.

The great difficulty that Kohlberg discovered was that most business and professional leaders are simply too busy in their own careers to be bothered with spending any time even to consider for a moment that they, themselves, are in danger from the Communist conspiracy.

It was against this preoccupation with the immediate, material things and with the neglect of the safety of our Nation that Alfred Kohlberg fought so dedicatedly and so devotedly during the last years of his life.

Even after a severe heart attack a number of years ago he did not slacken in his efforts to awaken this great and dear land of ours before it is too late.

Alfred Kohlberg did far more than his share to save this Nation. It can only be hoped that his example will lead others to follow in his train. Once awakened from their deadly sleep, it will be easy for the United States to save itself, but there are needed many Alfred Kohlbergs because this Nation's slumber is deep.

No, Alfred Kohlberg did not pass by on the other side—on the side of indifference. He left no opportunity go by to save his beloved country from the Communist conspiracy.

THESE DAYS—THE CHINA LOBBY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Alfred Kohlberg was an American merchant who traded with Nationalist China. His specialty was textiles. His business grew to fair dimensions and he joined various organizations which concerned themselves with Far Eastern affairs. Among others he joined the Institute of Pacific Relations and found therein something which contradicted his experience. He was not particularly interested in politics and his discoveries surprised him, for he had heretofore respected great names.

He thereupon set out to investigate the Institute of Pacific Relations not knowing especially what he would find. This one event set off a whole series of congressional investigations including those of the McCarran committee and the McCarthy committee.

Kohlberg had stumbled on a truth, which rarely happens to any of us. He found that many public organizations of the American people, private organizations with high-sounding names and headed by distinguished men, were infiltrated by Communists, on the administrative level, who formed each organization's policies and determined its goals. Kohlberg took up the fight and never stopped until he died last week.

Naturally Kohlberg was called many ugly names. These he accepted as labels of distinction, but the one that pleased him most was "China Lobby." He proclaimed himself to be the "China Lobby" and challenged all and sundry to investigate him. I do not know how many thousands of dollars of his own money Kohlberg spent advertising himself as the "China Lobby" and demanding an investigation. A man of means and integrity, he, of course, would not have accepted a cent from Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tze-tung or anyone else to support his opinions. He was a man of strong convictions with enough cash on hand to back them up.

A merchant, not a scholar, he was without any interest in the sectarian attitudes of the various anti-Communists. He was really not so much a doctrinaire anti-Communist as he was pro-American. He did not split the fine hairs of definitions; it was sufficient for him that he had witnessed what the Communists did to China and he did not want them to do the same to the United States. For Kohlberg, it was sufficient that he regarded the Communists as indecent and profane.

A Jew, he organized the American Jewish League Against Communism. He insisted that he could not understand how a Jew could possibly be a Communist or sympathetic to communism. He expected the entire Jewish people to rally to his organization. They did not.

This disappointed Kohlberg but until the moment he died, he continued to finance various organizations and groups in the battle against Soviet Russia. He must have spent a fortune of money; he gave of his health and even after he had had several coronary failures, he kept his work going. He retired from his business but he never retired from the cause which he had made his. He was a little David fighting a world of Goliaths, and he fought well.

Where does the moral strength come from which transforms a merchant into a battling leader of men in a cause to which many devote their lives? Kohlberg reminded one of the prophets of old, the men who feared not the mighty, who rejected power, who never considered themselves. No great orator, no powerful writer, nor organizer of movements, a man with a delightful sense of humor, whose wit led him into many arid fields, Kohlberg, with a profound sense of justice, developed an enormous and significant following of men and women, some publicly important in their own right, who turned to him for counsel and advice.

And it is one of those peculiarities of life that many who hated him as a fanatic who destroyed their shortcuts to the truth, in his last years recognized the intuitive patriotism of Kohlberg. He knew no divided loyalties. The United States was his country; he rejected affinity for any other. If he labored for Nationalist China, it was because he believed that was best for the United States.

And now Alfred Kohlberg is dead. He will no more trouble bureaucrats with his investigations or his wit. He, who burst the blubber of many puffed up officials, is no more to plague them. But what Kohlberg started will never die.

Baring Telegraphs Question on Advisability of Narrows Bridge Bond Flotation While Charges Remain Unrefuted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a telegram I sent on April 16, 1960, to Dillon, Read & Co., Inc., attention, Mr. Frederic H. Brandi, president; White, Weld & Co., attention, Mr. Philip M. Neagle, partner; W. H. Morton & Co., Inc., attention, Mr. William H. Morton, president; and Allen & Co., attention, Mr. Charles Allen, Jr., partner. All addresses are located in New York City.

This telegram refers to the well-documented charge, among others, that the Narrows Bridge is improperly placed and would provide the key to a planned waste of $453 million in public roadbuilding funds.

The various charges have been made known to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York; to various members, I am informed, of the Legislature of the State of New York; and to the Governor of the State of New York.

None of the charges has been refuted.

On the contrary, the New York Times, April 16, 1960, reports that the Governor of the State of New York signed on April 15, 1960, a bridge bond bill to lift the 4-percent interest limit on securities sold to speed work on Narrows span.

In light of the increasing knowledge of the highway program scandal now spreading across the United States and as further revealed by the editorial and lead article "New Roads and Urban Chaos" in the April 14, 1960, Reporter magazine, it appears that attention to the charges discussed in this telegram and an investigation of the facts by members of the underwriting investment and banking professions and by the investing and general public at large can only be to their personal, the public, and the national interest.

The first of the four identical telegrams follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1960.

DILLON, READ & CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y.

Attention: Mr. Frederic H. Brandi, president.

As I have been informed that you are actively seeking to implement a financial program of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority and are seeking to arrange the sale of its bonds for its proposed Narrows Bridge, and as I understand charges of misstatement of engineering fact and exaggeration of representation of Narrows vehicular traffic flow have been made in connection with the proposed Narrows Bridge and its proposed associated Seventh Avenue Brooklyn approach, and against the desirability of the Narrows Bridge arterial plan itself, and as I understand these charges have not been answered, and as the Seventh Avenue approach if constructed is to be financed in part with Interstate Highway program Federal funds, and as false information concerning the status of demolition activity on the Seventh Avenue approach was presented to me by the superintendent of public works of the State of New York, and as this false information was baselessly alleged to me to be accurate by the city construction coordinator who was then and now is chairman of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and as a special committee of the Congress is now in existence to examine the Interstate Highway program, do you believe your best action in connection with the Narrows Bridge would be to withhold further support until said charges have been answered or refuted?

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

Wisconsin Youth Conclave, April 21–23, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that the National Youth Conference—recently adjourned in Washington—made a variety of recommendations for improving the outlook for the youth of America.

The big challenge now is to translate the program from the conference rooms into the daily lives of people in local communities.

As an illustration of constructive effort at the State level, Wisconsin is holding its seventh State youth conference, April 21 through the 23d at Stevens Point. Sponsored by the Wisconsin Youth Committee, the theme of the conference is to increase "Youth Participation in Community Affairs."

Recently the La Crosse Tribune, an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper, published an article reviewing the constructive program of the upcoming meeting in our Badger State.

The article reflects a realistic, creative effort to help our young folks resolve the many problems confronting them in this complex age. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, Apr. 8, 1960]

STATE YOUTH CONCLAVE TO BE HELD APRIL 21-23

"The Growing Concept: Youth Participation in Community Affairs" is the theme of the seventh State Youth Conference, which will be held in Stevens Point April 21-23 under the sponsorship of the Wisconsin Youth Committee for Community Youth Participation.

The statewide youth conference is held every 2 years, alternating with the Governor's Conference on Children and Youth.

Its purpose is to encourage interest of youths in participating in community planning and assuming active roles in civic affairs.

In addition to a program of speakers, including Gov. Gaylord Nelson, there will be forums on the challenge of the space age, the psychology of prejudice, and investing in values for the future.

There will be workshops on developing teenage codes, examining the teenage dilemma, student councils, understanding mental health, service projects, vocational planning, social activities, developing wide interest in youth participation, citizens of a democracy, understanding delinquency.

Youth councils, community recreation, spiritual growth, understanding the value of money, understanding the space age, student exchanges, school guidance programs, exploring youth-adult relationships.

Developing understanding of rural-urban relationships; and studying the field of mass communication, such as "rigged" television, payola, false advertising and their effect on the community.

The Wisconsin Youth Committee is composed of 40 youths elected from 10 districts in the State.

This area is in District 7, consisting of Pepin, Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, Clark, Monroe, La Crosse and Vernon counties.

A feature of this year's State conference will be a report on the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth held in Washington, D.C., March 29-April 2.

Economic Growth a Legitimate Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times sets forth clearly and concisely why the economic growth of this country is an essential issue in the coming campaign and that the discussion of the issue does not, as the New York Times points out, represent a diabolical plot by those primarily concerned with securing greater Government intervention in our economic life.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC GROWTH AS AN ISSUE

The earlier indications that the issue of our Nation's future economic growth would become one of the major topics of this year's Presidential campaign are rapidly being borne out. Only this past week Vice President Nixon, Adlai Stevenson, and Senator Kennedy have all discussed the question. All three made clear they believe substantial growth in our output is a necessity, thus rejecting the strange view recently advanced that an emphasis on this issue is in some way a diabolical plot by those primarily concerned with securing greater Government intervention in our economic life. How best to secure this needed growth will undoubtedly be a topic of sharp debate in the months ahead, but on the question of need there is now agreement.

Why we need rapid economic growth, perhaps as much as 5 percent annually, was well spelled out some time ago in the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report on this subject. Our population is growing rapidly. We need increased output to clothe, feed, house, and otherwise provide for the additional tens of millions who will join our Nation. But that is not all, for even now there are millions of Americans whose low standard of living is a reproach to the great majority who enjoy the blessings of an "affluent society." We need tremendous investments in additional social capital, in schools, hospitals, libraries, roads, and the like.

But these domestic needs are only part of the reason we will require rapidly rising output. Barring some real settlements of the major causes of international tension, our defense costs are likely to rise because of the growing complexity of modern weapons. Space exploration has added a new domain demanding heavy expenditures. Both because of moral considerations and because of the political requirements for survival, we are obligated to provide—through private and Government investment both—great sums of capital for the underdeveloped countries whose burning desire for industrialization is one of the great dynamic forces of the contemporary world.

Finally, but not least important, we need more rapid economic growth because of the challenge posed by the continued swift rise of Soviet economic capabilities. It was not a good omen that last week's news brought word of an 11 percent gain in Soviet industrial output during this year's first quarter, while our own industrial production declined last month.

Salisbury, the New York Times, and Birmingham—An example of Irresponsible Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 12, there appeared in the New York Times an example of the most severe type of irresponsible journalism. Harrison E. Salisbury wrote what purported to be an accurate account of the race situation in Birmingham, Ala., my district. The article, which was entitled "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," was, no doubt, widely read throughout the country and many people who were unaware of the true facts received an entirely erroneous impression of the conditions in Birmingham. In an effort to correct some of the damage which has been done, and all acts of irresponsible journalism do damage, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Mr. E. L. Holland, Jr., editorial page editor of the Birmingham News. This editorial appeared in the Birmingham News on April 13, 1960. At that time, Mr. Holland was at Princeton University attending a conference on industrialization in the South.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 13, 1960]

BIRMINGHAM?—A CITY GRIPPED BY FEAR, HATRED

(By E. L. Holland, Jr.)

PRINCETON, N.J.—You go north to Princeton, storied, ivied manse of the intellect, a community, you are told, largely southern in some ancestry. But what hits you in the face is the New York Times of Tuesday, April 12, the day of arrival.

It is a gory mess, journalism. You have come north from the South, riding high and glorious in a winged silver bird aboard which they shove champagne at you before you attack filet mignon. The sky is clear; the clouds are slight; the sun shines, all's right with the world.

You pay off this fellow and that on the trip from Newark to Princeton (the railway porter will tote your bags at 35 cents per), and you must take two trains to make the 30-odd miles. There, at the place where Scott Fitzgerald whiled away his time before becoming the novelist Hemingway pouted at most, you find all the brown ivy intact, the kids walking around in snowwhite tennis shoes and looking as if knowledge was whipped cream.

You passed acres of dingy two-story houses, factories, overhead wires of one electrical sort or another; you have seen grime and wondered why somebody didn't do something about it.

But this impression disappears on the Princeton campus where all is orderly and neat and clean and windswept.

Still, you run into that New York Times story on page 1 of the historic journal in which Harrison E. Salisbury reports, the headline says, that "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham."

You have just come from Birmingham and you do not know what Salisbury has in mind. You read his story and you still do not know.

Salisbury is a famous newsman, an ex-Moscow reporter for the Times. You have a feeling that he hasn't quite got home.

He notes that whites and blacks walk the same Birmingham streets, but that those streets, the water supply, and the sewer system are about all that the two races share.

You read that every channel of communication, every bit of middle ground has been fragmented, and that this is reinforced "by the whip, the razor, the gun, the bomb, the torch, the club, the knife, the mob, the police and many branches of the State's apparatus."

Telephones are tapped, Salisbury reports, and whites and blacks don't talk freely. Watchmen, Salisbury says, guard Negro establishments. Federally handled mail is

stymied and sometimes it does not reach its destination. The eavesdropper, the informer, the spy have become a fact of life.

Salisbury says some Negroes have nicknamed Birmingham the "Johannesburg of America."

The business goes on. Businessmen, says Salisbury, told him to watch how he reported. "Lives are at stake."

He fetches back to recall Roy Cohen and Florian Slappey stories, this to snipe and wickedly. He takes note of the Birmingham-Southern College situation, regarding students and the Negro problem, and he gives young student Reeves a martyr's halo. He cites a pair of Negro preachers picked up and the image yankeeland gets is one of utter horror.

This report from Jersey need go no further at this point. What this writer wants to ask of Salisbury is: Whom did you talk with? What Negroes and whites gave you this garish picture of a peaceable southern community?

The reason for this prompt response, be it noted, is that on Princeton arrival we were told that among faculty members, this page 1 New York Times story was a hot topic of gossip.

This comes most inappropriately, when a conference of southerners and others is beginning at this fine old school, discussing industrialization in the South.

It comes but a handful of days after the elected officials of Alabama raised questions about distorted charges in an advertisement in the New York Times—an ad sponsored by those who would defend the Reverend Martin Luther King against an accusation that he had committed perjury in connection with income tax returns. Salisbury may have made this trip. He may have talked with various Birmingham people. We say this though, and flatly:

Other northern newsmen have come South in this racial hegira. Virtually all have checked in with local newsmen to discover the sources of information.

These, invariably, have been offered. We have not seen Salisbury. If he was in Birmingham, he worked quite secretly.

Certainly he knew what he was out to get. He got it—or had it before he began writing.

Here we stand, at Princeton, ready with others to talk southern industrialization.

But on page 1 of Tuesday's New York Times is a thrust which pictures a decent southern community, perplexed as are many with racial problems, as a city shot through with fear.

That headline says worlds: "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham."

This is the big lie. Perhaps the biggest of all. Salisbury has done his damage. Radio Moscow please copy. And, brothers and sisters, have no doubt they will.

Oshkosh Northwestern Hits Congress Extravagance With Self

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Oshkosh Northwestern has established an excellent and consistent reputation as a champion of thrift and fiscal prudence in government at all levels—local, State, and National.

Recently it spoke out vigorously against an extravagance that is both the most conspicuous and the least defensible by this Congress: The expenditure of huge sums on sumptious, luxurious quarters for Members of Congress itself.

I ask unanimous consent that this unusually persuasive editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAILFINS

An argument prevalent now, as always, in Washington and which cuts across party lines concerns whether America needs greater public or private spending. In the argument the word "tailfins" appears—auto tailfins being used as a symbol of the silly things Americans will buy when the Government doesn't spend all their money for them.

Those in favor of greater public spending are fond of stressing that the Government should sponsor or subsidize art, music, and the "finer things." Whether a Bach bureau or a new WPA theater project touring company would make more Americans happier than a new car with tailfins, does not even seem debatable. Communities that really want music or drama have it, and can have as much more as they are willing to pay for. What they aren't willing to pay for, many people contend, shouldn't come out of the taxpayers' pockets through payroll deductions.

But politicians are hardly in a position to ridicule or complain about tailfins, because we have a tailfin Government. Right now the United States is preparing plans for a new office building in New York with the cost set at $68 million—much more than larger privately built structures are costing. This added cost, it is presumed, results from lavish use of marble, bronze, and the other costly materials that go into Government structures—the bureaucratic equivalent of tailfins.

What is more, the debaters are riding to and fro between the Senate and the Senate Office Building in a miniature subway line on which they managed to spend $3 million, and on which they must spend $3 million more. It is true that the subway cars boast no fins but there is no evidence that a finless austerity has taken over the thinking of our legislators.

Statement by Congressman Edward A. Garmatz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include in the RECORD a statement made at a Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearing by one of the greatest Congressmen in this Nation. I have known and served with him for many long, wonderful years. I have traveled to shipbuilding plants and repair plants in many lands with my old friend, Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, this man has brains and ability and an unlimited supply of energy and he is one of the greatest Americans that I have ever known, and I wish every one of his constituents could know, as I know, what he has done for his district, his State, and his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we will wipe out this 6 percent differential that the west coast has on shipbuilding. It should have been wiped out long, long ago, but now we have the Great Lakes and the east coast joining with us on the gulf coast, and I am sure we will put an end to this very unfair, unfavorable, and uncalled-for 6 percent differential which has been granted to the west coast for so long. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when the west coast needed this differential and I joined with a great Congressman on the west coast in helping to give it to them. That was the great Congressman Dick Welch, of California, who has gone to his reward. I will guarantee you, if Dick Welch were living today, he would vote to abolish this 6 percent differential. I do not want any part of this great Nation to have an unfair and unjust advantage of any other part of the United States. It is just like two people doing business with a bank—one that had to pay interest at 6 percent and one that did not have to pay any interest at all. You could not compete with the man who had the advantage of the 6 percent that the west coast is getting.

Now, I consider this as practically finished and it is "peanuts" compared to what is going on in the rest of the world in the building of ships, tankers, repair plants, and so forth. What I think we should do, Mr. Speaker, is to give the west coast, the gulf coast, the east coast, and the Great Lakes a real differential in building ships, so we can compete with all of the foreign nations that have more business than they can handle. Congressman GARMATZ and I visited many shipyards, and everywhere we went in England, France, Italy, and Scotland, these yards—these yards that the United States had helped them build—had more business than they could handle, and we were told in many instances they had a backlog that would carry them over until 1965.

Our committee has just passed a resolution to grant a 33⅓ percent subsidy to fishing boatbuilding. I am sure we will have no trouble in passing this bill when it is finally voted out of our committee, and I believe it will be voted out on our return from our Easter recess. What we did for harassed fishermen who had been told they should have their ships built in Japan and other foreign countries, we should do for the builders of cargo ships and all other ships; even if it takes more than 33⅓ percent—say 40 percent—this should be done, and at once, if we expect to survive as a shipbuilding nation.

I believe that Chairman Clarence Morse and his Maritime Board would go along on this a thousand percent, because Chairman Morse and his Commissioners accompanied us on the trip above referred to, where we found the shipyards in every country we visited loaded with work and in every instance it was ships and tankers for our great firms in this Nation—the United States of America.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are, indeed, grateful to the members of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee that they have scheduled these hearings on H.R. 8205 and similar bills, to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

As long ago as 5 years, we knew that the need for this differential no longer existed, and at that time I introduced the same bill as H.R. 8205, but the subcommittee did not reach it on the agenda. In the meantime, the situation continues to improve in favor of the west coast shipbuilders, until now, the point has been reached where the 6 percent proves to be a subsidy to them.

In its report on this legislation last August, the Navy Department stated, and I quote:

"It now appears, however, that Pacific coast private shipyards are gradually overcoming their previous competitive disadvantage through increased efficiency, application of improved industrial techniques and because of expanded west coast production of basic materials. During recent years, Pacific coast shipyards have been quite successful in competing for naval ship work.

The Department of Defense has no convincing evidence that west coast shipyards are now at a significant disadvantage. The Department of Defense, however, is not in a position to state whether or not some degree of subsidization is still required to enable those shipyards to participate in ship-construction programs on a competitive basis."

Mr. Chairman, the Defense Department may not be in a position to state whether such subsidization is still required, but facts and figures available prove that it definitely is not required, and they will be presented by other witnesses during these hearings.

If there ever was justification for a differential in favor of the Pacific coast shipyards, it no longer exists. The Pacific coast shipbuilding industry is not an infant industry, but a thriving giant. During the Second World War over 44 percent of all tonnage built in this country's recordbreaking shipbuilding effort (embracing Atlantic, gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific shipyards) was constructed in Pacific coast yards. Today 36.5 percent of all tonnage under construction for the Maritime Board is in Pacific coast yards.

One of the justifications offered for the 1936 differential was the higher cost on the Pacific coast of material and components, which were believed to be more costly because they were manufactured in the East and had to be shipped by rail to the West. Today this is not true. Whereas in 1936 only 3 percent of the Nation's steelproducing capacity was in plants west of the Rockies; today 9 percent of all steel capacity in the United States is west of the Rockies. By contrast, only 1½ percent of our steel production today goes into shipbuilding, so that there is enough steel capacity west of the Rockies to supply our entire shipbuilding industry nationwide many times over. Certainly there is enough to supply the Pacific coast shipyards, without any need on their part to purchase it in the East, or pay transcontinental freight rates. And the prices of steel sold by plants west of the Rockies are fully competitive with those of eastern steel manufacturers.

What is true of steel is likewise true of the other major components of shipbuilding. We are all aware of the tremendous growth of manufacturing on the west coast since the Second World War. West coast manufacturers now produce substantially all of the component parts used in shipbuilding and do so at prices competitive with those of the east coast manufacturers. Indeed, in many instances, the west coast manufacturers of major components are so competitive with east coast manufacturers, that shipyards on the east coast have found it cheaper to buy components from west coast suppliers, and have them shipped by rail across the country, paying transcontinental freight, than to buy from eastern suppliers.

For example, Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., a major shipyard in Maryland, recently purchased, after nationwide competitive bidding by suppliers, six cargo cranes at a price in excess of $1 million from a supplier in Alameda, Calif., for installation on two ships under construction in Baltimore.

Similarly, the same shipyard, after competitive bidding, placed an order for two main propulsion engines with the Sunnyvale, Calif., plant of the Westinghouse Electric Co., as the low bidder.

Such examples, which could be multiplied many times over, demonstrate that the west coast yards have not a disadvantage, but an actual cost advantage.

Even in the occasional instance where the west coast shipyards may look to the East for material or components, in almost all instances, the suppliers will deliver the components laid down at the shipyards, at the same delivered price, regardless of location. In short, the suppliers will absorb the rail freight. These facts suggest that any difference in cost which may have existed in 1936, is now wholly illusory, or, indeed, favors the west coast shipyards.

And the results bear out this view. Only the other day a west coast shipward outbid east coast and Great Lakes competitors on a major contract for the construction of Navy vessels. In that bidding no 6-percent differential was involved. The west coast yard was the low bidder.

Results like these made clear that whatever economic justification may once have existed for a differential favoring Pacific coast shipyards has now disappeared.

At the time section 502(d) was enacted, the proponents of the legislation acknowledged that the differential could only be considered as temporary. A continuation of this differential at this time is unjust, unfair, and discriminatory.

If west coast shipyards believe it should be continued, let them come forth with some facts to prove it.

Coming from a district in which the shipbuilding industry is a vital part of the city's economy, I would be interested in having some concrete facts and figures to pass on to my constituents, who find it difficult to understand why the west coast should receive such favored treatment at their expense, especially so, since such preferential treatment exists in no other area of procurement.

I am confident that when all the facts and figures have been submitted to your committee, you will see the fairness and necessity for favorable action on H.R. 8205 and similar legislation.

National Space Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, to us as a nation, and to a world poised on the brink of a new frontier—outer space—the future promises great new illuminations, experience, discoveries, and progress for the human race.

Historically speaking, our space exploration accomplishments of today—impressive as orbiting satellites, moonshots, and other accomplishments may be—will, in all likelihood, be topped by even greater discoveries, advancements, and accomplishments of tomorrow.

As in all fields, the Nation, meaning not only the leaders, but also the people as a whole, needs to crystallize, insofar as possible, a concept of just where we are and where we are going in the space age, if we are to progress at maximum speed.

The challenge, of course, is highly complex. Realistically, however, we are in a space race, whether we like it or not.

The clear establishment of a program of national goals, supplemented or modified as required by time and changing events, would serve, I believe, to, first, give greater direction to our national efforts to explore space; second, create greater confidence of what we are shooting for in space; and third, provide a program to encourage trained and aspiring individuals to enter the field vocationally, and provide us with space engineers, scientists, technicians, astronauts, and other skilled personnel needed for the future.

Recently, I outlined a series of recommendations which, I believe, could well serve as a foundation for our new venture into space, both for defense and for peaceful purposes. By no means would I consider this an all-comprehensive program. In the days ahead, the space exploration efforts of all nations—still in infancy—will unveil new mysteries and unknowns of space environment, vehicles, instruments, and knowledge.

Based upon moderate experience, however, I believe there are fundamental programs and objectives which can now be crystallized as space goals. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have my suggested 12-point program printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWELVE-POINT SPACE PROGRAM

In the interest of our national progress and international prestige, I believe we must go "full speed ahead" with an independent space program—not attempt to imitate, or even match one for one, feats by the Soviets. The U.S. goals should include:

1. Successfully manned space flights by 1961.

2. Establishment of a communications-satellite system, including transmission of radio, telephone, teletype, and television.

3. Further improvement of the weather satellites—and maximum utilization of its information data—for improved weather forecasting.

4. Hitting the target date of 1964—or, if possible, earlier—for completion of the Saturn booster of 1½-million-pound thrust and early followup development of a second-generation Saturn with a 15-million-pound thrust.

5. Effective accomplishment, as planned by NASA, of the following: Lunar impacts (reconnaissance), 1961–62; planetary probes to Mars and Venus, 1962; and lunar soft landings, 1963–64, carrying television, seismograph, radiation-detection devices to observe and analyze the surface and subsurface of the moon.

6. For scientific purposes, blasting of successive satellites, sounding rockets, and other launchings, including astronomical observ-

ance satellites to make observations from the obscuring and blanketing effect of the earth's atmosphere; through directed spectroscopes and other satellite instruments, to determine, among other things, the role the sun plays in natural events upon the earth; and, with satellites, investigate the upper atmosphere, ionosphere, the earth's magnetic field, the aurora and radiation phenomena, and the measuring of gamma and cosmic rays, and gathering other scientific data.

7. Adapting scientific and technological knowledge for creating a more effective space arsenal, including ICBM's, and military satellites, as needed, to act as a deterrent power, until safeguarded international agreements are reached—if they are—for inspection of armaments to carry out policies of dedication of space for peaceful purposes.

8. Creating an adequate national warning-tracking system—i.e., radar system, sentinel satellites, etc.—to provide us with a "space guard" against surprise attack.

9. Setting up an international traffic-control system, including exchange of information among nations on launchings and flights of satellites, and other space vehicles, to prevent unidentified flights from being interpreted as possible attacks and triggering a war.

10. Development of nuclear, ion, or other types of rocket power for flight control of space vehicles.

11. Establishing a Space Academy—similar to the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Merchant Marine—to provide an adequately trained Space Corps.

12. Establishment of space law, through cooperation of nations, the United Nations, and other international organizations, to assure protection of peaceful flights, to avoid unnecessary clashes of interest, and to attempt to assure nonviolation of rights of nations in space.

SPACE LEADERSHIP—OR FOLLOWSHIP?

Will this program be expensive? Yes. According to present planning, the Nation is expected to spend $12 to $15 billion in the next 10 years. For the future the cost will, in all likelihood, be even higher.

However, the question is not whether we will shoot for these and other objectives. Rather, I believe the big question is when will we do it—now, or later? Will we run ahead of—or lay behind—the Communists?

NEEDED: FLEXIBLE PROGRAMS

We recognize, of course, in a new exploratory field, the adoption of such national goals must be flexible to accommodate new developments and discoveries in vehicles, instrumentation, space environment, and other factors that may affect the program. Nevertheless, these goals, I believe, will—and should—serve as a "solid pad" for the national program for the immediate future.

PRACTICAL BENEFITS OF SPACE EXPLORATION

What will be the practical benefits of our space program? Among others, these should include: (1) A stronger defense; (2) improved radio, telephone, teletype, and television communications; (3) more effective weather forecasting to minimize loss from tornadoes, hurricanes, and other storms, and benefit agriculture and conservation programs for preservation of our natural resources; (4) further man's efforts to utilize heat and light from the sun and other natural forces of the universe; and (5) generally gather other data and information about the elements and forces of space for harnessing them to serve mankind.

WHY A SPACE PROGRAM?

In man's eternal quest for knowledge, space provides the new frontier for exploration.

During normal times, the exploratory efforts probably would go forward at a slower pace. However, communism—the foe of freedom—is "up there."

Consequently, we need an effective program to pursue our fundamental interests, to protect our rights, to assure to ourselves the benefits of space potentials—many of which are yet unknown—and to counter any attempt by communism to use space vehicles as a tool for conquest by that international conspiracy.

What is at stake? Our survival.

Water Conservation Stamp Termed Public Testimonial by Soil Service Administrator Williams—U.S. Chamber of Commerce Natural Resources Committee Chairman David L. Francis Discusses "Industry's Contributions to Water Conservation"—Watershed Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been present today along with my diligent colleague from Texas, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, at the luncheon meeting of the Seventh National Watershed Congress. Its sessions will continue through Wednesday, April 20, 1960, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here in the Nation's Capital City.

Toastmaster for the occasion was James B. Craig, editor of American Forests, representing the American Forestry Association. Donald A. Williams, administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, delivered the keynote address on "Water Conservation."

Following the luncheon session, the watershed congress devoted the afternoon to a panel discussion on the "Need for Cooperation and Cosponsorship in Watershed Development."

This informative panel period was presided over by John H. Jones, of Fairmont, W. Va. Mr. Jones is secretary-treasurer of the American Watershed Council and a member of the National Watershed Congress steering committee. A member of the panel who represented the business and industry viewpoint was David L. Francis, of Huntington, W. Va. He is a well known coal company executive and is chairman of the Natural Resources Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

When the Watershed Congress progresses to its Wednesday morning session for a discussion of financial limitations, a member of the panel will be Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, of West Virginia, who is scheduled to present views on "Local Projects Require Federal Assistance."

Chairman C. R. Gutermuth of the Seventh National Watershed Congress steering committee, and vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D.C., formally opened the 3-day sessions today following the invocation by Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, on November 4, 1959, at Jackson's Mill, W. Va., I was privileged to address the 18th annual meeting of Soil Conservation Service district supervisors of our State. My topic was "This Land of Ours." I said on that occasion that freedom is not license, and I added that the right to use natural resources does not confer the right to abuse them. We must devise, therefore, a body of State and National laws which will preserve the national heritage and the public welfare from the effects of private misunderstanding and private neglect.

But such laws must be only part of a national awareness of the need for increased effort and planning in the wise utilization of our material resources. Government has an inescapable responsibility to help initiate, support, and sustain this effort. Private interests must accept their stewardship of natural resources as a public trust, with an obligation to future generations. And, as individuals, I concluded, we must reexamine our purchasing habits so that use and function govern our consumption of precious resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, highlights and a summarization from the keynote address at today's water conservation stamp luncheon of the Seventh National Watershed Congress by Soil Conservation Service Administrator Donald A. Williams.

There being no objection, highlights and a summarization from Mr. Williams' speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF ADDRESS BY D. A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, AT SEVENTH NATIONAL WATERSHED CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1960

1. The commemorative water conservation stamp and the Watershed Congress are public testimonials that the Nation recognizes water as a resource of primary concern to us all. That it is fitting the water stamp should follow immediately after the soil stamp for these two—soil and water—are the foundation of all life and they are so interrelated that the conservation of one requires constant consideration of the other.

2. Water conservation means managing the water available to us at any time or in any place to provide for maximum benefits from its use including enjoyment of its recreational and esthetic values, control of its destructive energy, and equitable distribution for legitimate needs.

3. Water management begins with land management, that this is a fundamental truth rooted in the nature of the hydrologic cycle itself. Our water supply comes to us as precipitation falling on the wide expanse of our land. The first arbiters of our water supply, therefore, are the farmers and ranchers and the public land administrators and users who decide the kind of crops, the degree of grazing, the forestry policies, and the conservation and water control practices that prevail on the country's watersheds.

4. People everywhere need to know more about our water resource: where water comes from, who it belongs to, and the opportunities for its management and use. The current study by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources is making an important contribution to that understanding. The National Watershed Congress is another valuable means to that end.

5. Vigorous and positive action for water conservation needs to move in step with our national program of soil conservation. Some

principles to guide us in establishing policies include: The first use of water on the land is to support the biological function of the soil and make possible the use of land within its capability. Every water user—agricultural or urban—has an obligation to return as much water as possible to the common supply with the least impairment of quality. Property rights in water must be respected, and the States not only are responsible for determining those rights but have an obligation to adapt their water laws and the administration of them to modern requirements. Watersheds are the natural management units of the water resource, and watershed projects should give full consideration to future needs and multiple uses of water.

6. These principles can be effectively carried out within the concepts of our American democracy through private initiative and the aggressive cooperation of local, State, and Federal Governments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech by David L. Francis on "Industry's Contributions to Water Conservation."

There being no objection, excerpts from the speech were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO WATER CONSERVATION

(Excerpts from address by David L. Francis, chairman, Natural Resources Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., to the Seventh National Watershed Congress, Panel on Watershed Development, Washington, D.C., Apr. 18, 1960)

Businessmen in the natural resources industries should be grateful to the steering committee of the National Watershed Congress. Thanks to this committee, business and industry have been given equal listing on this program today with other segments of our economic system in sharing responsibility for watershed development. I hope the results of this panel presentation will demonstrate that industry is a willing partner with others who want our vital water resources protected and conserved.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in behalf of business and industry. The national chamber believes in the objectives of this congress, and is one of the original sponsors of the congress.

It is not an idle statement to say that industry is interested in water conservation. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which represents all business, has a well-developed body of policy declarations on the subject of water resources. These policies reflect the informed views of a majority of the chamber's voting members across the country. The declarations are put in writing for all to see, and are used as the basis for frequent expressions of the business viewpoint to the Congress, the executive departments, and the public as well.

* * * * *

CONSERVATION AND ECONOMICS

Conservation is more than sparing trees and saving soil. Such efforts are important, but conservation cannot be practiced without regard for economic laws. A forest manager, for instance, knows that he cannot cut a path ahead of himself to infinity; he is a conservationist because he must think about new trees to replace those removed for useful purposes. He must practice forest conservation or else someday go out of business for lack of resources. With the forester, therefore, conservation is an economic necessity.

The farmer faces an identical situation with his replaceable topsoil. And the rancher needs the renewable grasses to feed his livestock year after year. In the various fields of mining, also, business managers are working to produce the greatest economic value from nature's store of raw materials. The laws of economics apply to low-grade deposits, thin seams, and recoverable reserves. And every prospector and mine operator learns to be a practical conservationist.

As the resource developer applies conservation to his own business, he also discovers that what he does may affect others—and what others do may affect him, too. For example, improper land management upstream can produce serious damage to downstream water supplies. Good forest cutting practices can reduce erosion and save reservoirs from ruin by siltation.

What this amounts to is a recognition of the public interest in resource management, whether the resources are privately owned or publicly owned. Watershed development requires contributions from the owners, and the developers, and the users of the natural resources. Conservation and economics must be combined to a maximum degree in order to produce the greatest public benefits.

The key word is motivation. In our economic system the primary motivation is provided by incentives which reward the doers and the risk-takers. There is no reason to disregard the basic principles of private enterprise, local initiative, limited government, and responsible citizenship.

Businessmen will cooperate with others in cosponsoring needed programs whenever the incentive is present and the reward becomes apparent. And I don't mean this in a strictly monetary sense, either. Because the typical businessman—such as a member of our natural resource committee—realizes that whatever is good for his community is also good for his business. His reward, heretofore, may be rather indirect, but it is not thereby less real to him.

So, I suggest that business executives in your community are good prospects for leaders in watershed associations. Give them a good incentive, and you'll have your cooperators and cosponsors.

Many business organizations are already busy with water conservation programs. They are helping create public awareness of important conservation concepts. They are helping improve industry's concern with resource use in general and watershed programs in particular. They are voicing more responsible recommendations to government.

* * * * *

ORGANIZED ACTION PROGRAMS

Water shortages can be prevented. The upstream watershed program is one way of helping to smooth out the uneven flows resulting from floods and droughts. Better land-use practices, storage dams, and retention reservoirs release excess water gradually, thus reducing flood-season runoff and increasing dry-weather flows. This upstream method helps to cut losses and to supply the water needs of cities, industries, and farms.

Urban water shortages can be avoided by keeping the local public supply ahead of demand. Expanding the municipal water system takes time and money. Those communities that are planning ahead are able to build new facilities. Those which begin planning now, before serious shortages hit, will be ready to meet future demands for water.

Numerous problems beset our public water supply officials: politics, public apathy, ceilings on bonds, low-water rates. These are a few. Solutions must be found in each community, and a local chamber of commerce may be the source of help. Business leadership often is needed to overcome inertia, correct past mistakes, and put the management of the local water utility on a sound basis.

Pollution of streams and other bodies of water decreases the amount of usable water. Hence, correction of pollution is the same as adding to our available supply. Municipalities and industry are instituting waste treatment where none is now provided. They are expanding their present facilities. Industrial research is moving ahead to find out how to prevent pollution from new products, chemicals, atomic wastes, and the like.

These programs contribute to better water supply conditions for all. Solutions begin at the local level—often in the very headwaters of our streams. Everyone is involved.

CONCLUSION

There is good evidence that business and industry are vitally interested in the watershed movement. My 4 years on the Natural Resources Committee has brought me into contact with hundreds of businessmen who who are not only thinking but also doing something about their communities' water problems. These businessmen—and thousands more like them—are serving in many ways, as private citizens and in organized groups.

The objectives of the watershed development program are sound. Business organizations and industrial enterprises are going to continue to participate in promoting this program and other economically sound methods of improving the Nation's water resources. They are realizing that the public interest is basically their own interest.

Both educational and action projects are expanding in this field as business and industry learn of the incentives and of the opportunities. Cooperation and cosponsorship are opening up new opportunities, and industry in general is willing to be accepted as an equal partner wherever its particular contribution can be effective.

Social Security Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution sent to me by a group of my constituents who are among the many in my district who support social security health and hospital insurance:

Whereas due to the present high costs of medical and hospital nursing service and surgical services, many old people find it impossible to meet the costs; and

Whereas the Ponce De Leon Club, composed of 180 persons over 60 years old, finds that this excessive cost has brought a lot of hardships to many of its members; and

Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee has rejected H.R. 4700, the so-called Forand bill, to amend the Social Security Act, so as to provide against the costs of hospitals, nursing homes, medical and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits and for other benefits; and

Whereas Representative A. J. FORAND has filed a petition asking the House to bypass the committee and bring the measure to a vote of the entire House, said petition re-

quiring 219 votes or signatures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ponce De Leon Club of Santa Rosa, Calif., in regular monthly meeting, calls upon the Representative from this district, namely the Honorable CLEM MILLER, to sign this petition of Mr. FORAND, and do all in his power to advance the action on this bill, and to work for its passage. And be it further requested that the Honorable CLEM MILLER insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Signed at a regular meeting of the Ponce De Leon Club held in Santa Rosa April 6, 1960, in the State of California.

LILLIAN EAVES,
Secretary.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.

Salisbury Article in New York Times Slanders Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1960, there appeared on the front page of the New York Times an article written by one Harrison E. Salisbury, datelined Birmingham, Ala., and headlined "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham." This article purported to be an accurate account of the current racial situation in Birmingham, Ala., my district.

The article is, in fact, one of the most vicious slanders of a community of decent people that has ever come to my attention. No doubt, many of the Members of Congress read Salisbury's article and, not knowing what the real situation was, naturally concluded that it was a truthful objective report.

In an effort to correct some of the damage which has been done, and irresponsible journalism always does damage, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald of last Thursday, April 14. The editorial was headed "Another Slander."

ANOTHER SLANDER

If the New York Times were out deliberately to promote race friction and to brainwash its readers into the belief that hate and fear and lawlessness are rampant in the South it could not have done better than print the story which appeared on page 1 of its Tuesday edition and is reprinted on page 4 of today's Post-Herald. It is not the first time this newspaper has printed a twisted picture of the South.

Written by Harrison Salisbury and under the heading "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," Tuesday's story leaves the reader but one conclusion:

That mob rule has displaced law and order; that Negroes and white alike live in an atmosphere of fear and hate and that at any moment rioting might start blood flowing in the streets.

We do not know with whom Mr. Salisbury talked but it is quite evident that among his contacts were those who gave him the story he came to find.

As a reporter he brings no credit to the profession. As a propagandist he is an expert.

The pity is that thousands who will read him have no way of knowing what great injustice he does to a community and a people who, despite problems, pressures, and endless aggravations from the outside, have maintained and continue to maintain remarkably good relations between the races.

Fear and hatred do not grip Birmingham. Mob rule has not and we are determined will not take over. And if violence should erupt it will come only because those who profit from promoting racial strife light the fuse.

Annie Applegate Kruse: A Wonderful American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the game of American politics at the grassroots level never had a more active player than Annie Applegate Kruse. Annie Kruse died April 11, 1960, following a short illness. She was 84.

Annie was a Democrat by choice and a Democrat by action. She was an example to others. She was born in Scotts Valley near Yoncalla, Oreg., November 15, 1875. She was the granddaughter of Charles Applegate and the great niece of Lindsay and Jesse Applegate who came to Oregon in 1843.

The Roseburg News-Review has commented in its news story that, "In her long and colorful life, Mrs. Kruse was very active in the Yoncalla community and has written two books on this area." It was always amazing to me how Annie Kruse managed to do so much while other people wondered how they could get anything done.

Annie Applegate Kruse could be praised for many things. She and her late husband, John, raised a fine family. Her sons, Elmer and Homer, live in Yoncalla. She was a first-rate precinct worker because she believed politics was as good as the people in it. She was willing to speak up on issues and tell why she supported or opposed them. She made her opinions known to all of her many admiring friends—including Senators and Representatives.

Hers was the kindness of the pioneer sort—straightforward, unassuming, without glitter. There was no affectation, but a lot of heart and good commonsense.

Annie kept up with world and national affairs.

She had an active interest in matters before the Congress. One of her special interests was the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. More than a year ago she wrote to me about this legislation, which she strongly supported.

The other body has approved S. 812. It and many House bills are to be considered this week when hearings are held by Representative CARL ELLIOTT's Subcommittee on Special Education.

I want to put in the RECORD at this time part of my friend Annie Kruse's letter in which she strongly spelled out her reasons for supporting such legislation:

YONCALLA, OREG., *February 15, 1959.*
Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: One of the most interesting TV programs to our community was when you and Senator HUMPHREY appeared speaking for the reactivating of the CCC. Many a parent of teenage boys are praying for its inactment. The progressive educational system has filled our schools with young people who cannot read, write, or spell. As you can well appreciate, they were taught finger painting and how to get along with people in the grades and now they have been promoted when their teachers got tired of fooling with them until, in high school, they are a cumbering nuisance. Yet I know that some of them, for the most part, I will say, are intelligent, good in math and science, but are not allowed to go on because they cannot read. It is appalling. If your projected law goes into effect, I am also sure that from among these boys will be found scientists, inventors, and scholars in other lines that will help America back into world leadership again.

One hundred and fifty dollars is not near enough; neither is 1 year's service. And not only the hills of the Northwest or the reclaiming of the Southwest, to say nothing of our National Park System—all of it. Alaska, the land of the young, calls for the hardy and especially well-trained young people. I say again, begin with the youth of this generation or we will wake up to find the hordes of Asia overrunning our hemisphere. Taking the backward youngsters out of high school will in a measure overcome some of our sex troubles—going steady, marrying too young, too many children, divorce, absentee fathers—all a potential danger to our country. Your projected program will also relieve some of the schoolroom congestion, make room for those who are capable of going on to college. I wish to call to your attention that Thomas Edison could not learn at school. I have heard them say that his teacher, after 3 months, took him home, telling young Edison's mother that there was no use to send him; that he was hopeless. John Locke was expelled from college because he could not learn, so was William Penn. And a long list of others who, in time, not only became famous, but contributed greatly toward the civilization we now know.

Where is the money coming from to finance this plan? You might print it, or set up a U.S. bank between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System in which to handle our Government bonds. An investment of this kind would pay itself out sooner than any other. This is not hurting your popularity—everyone, Republican and Democrat alike, are saying the same thing—get our youngsters to work, give them something to do.

My best of love to you, Priscilla, and the youngsters.

ANNIE KRUSE.

In her 84 years Annie Applegate Kruse worked to make this a better country. Her efforts will be bearing fruit for a long, long time.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the March 12, 1960, issue of the Roseburg News-Review:

APPLEGATE DESCENDANT DIES AT YONCALLA HOME AT 84

Annie Applegate Kruse, 84, a lifetime resident of the Yoncalla area died at her home Monday morning following a short illness.

She was born November 15, 1875, in Scotts Valley near Yoncalla. Her husband, John Kruse, whom she married in 1893, preceded her in death in 1949.

She was the granddaughter of Charles Applegate and great-niece of Lindsay and Jesse Applegate who came to Oregon in 1843.

In her long and colorful life, Mrs. Kruse was very active in the Yoncalla community and has written two books on this area. Her first was titled "Yoncalla, Home Of The Eagles" which dealt with the history of the community and people of Yoncalla and her second was "Roseships, A Tale of Southern Oregon," a story of the Yoncalla tribe of the Umpqua Indians.

She was active in the Yoncalla Saddle Club and Civic Club, a charter member of the Women's Club and a past master of the Elk Creek Grange.

Mrs. Kruse was responsible for developing West Park Place in Yoncalla, where over 100 homes now exist. She also donated to the city a sum of land for a park and playground.

When Gladys Workman, author of a book on Oregon history, appeared on "This Is Your Life," Mrs. Kruse was there as one of her close associates.

She is survived by two sons, Elmer and Homer, of Yoncalla; two brothers, John, Portland, and Charles Applegate, Yoncalla; three sisters, Mrs. Bertha Stock, Yoncalla, Emma and Suzie Applegate, Portland; six grandchildren, eight great-grandchildren, and numerous other relatives.

Funeral services will be held at the Yoncalla Methodist Church Thursday at 1:30 p.m. The Reverend Roy Knight will officiate with vault interment in the Yoncalla cemetery. Mills Funeral Service is in charge of arrangements.

Soil Conservation Service—Quarter Century of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, all Americans will want to join in a salute to the Soil Conservation Service on its 25th birthday. SCS is the evangelist of the gospel of the conservation of our most vital resources—soil and water. Through its leadership we not only are blessed with abundance of food and fiber in our time but we also are bequeathing plenteousness of the land to the generations to follow us.

As a part of the celebration marking this quarter century of achievement, Mr. Speaker, and by permission of the House, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks I made over radio station WKIX, Raleigh, N.C., on April 17. These remarks follow:

CONSERVATION

(By HAROLD D. COOLEY)

During this month of April we celebrate a date important to all Americans. This Nation marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service. On April 27, 1935, the Soil Conservation Act was signed into law. In the last quarter century, the Soil Conservation Service has influenced not only our farming operations but also the lives of millions of Americans. The work of our farmers, healing and protecting the land under the guidance of this service, will mean better lives for the generations that will follow us. I salute the men of the Soil Conservation Service who do credit to the Nation they serve.

The people of North Carolina have a special interest in the 25th anniversary of the nationwide program of soil and water conservation. Chiefly, this is because it is the home State of Hugh Hammond Bennett. And you literally can't think of Hugh Bennet without thinking of soil conservation—nor can you think of soil conservation without thinking of Hugh Bennett.

Since his graduation from the University of North Carolina in 1903, he has devoted his entire life to a study of the soil. In 1905, as a member of a soil survey party in Louisa County, Va., he first discovered the cause and true significance of soil erosion. From that point on, Bennett's life became a crusade for conservation.

In observing the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service, we have an opportunity to take stock of accomplishments. We are prone to forget, after a quarter of a century, the problems and the obstacles that had to be overcome in soil and water conservation. We forget the gullied land, the barren acres, the overgrazed pastures that were commonplace only 25 years ago. Today North Carolina, like much of the rest of the Nation, is a green and fertile land because of Hugh Bennett, the wisdom of a forward-looking Government, and because of the devoted and dedicated work of thousands of our farmers.

We forget, too, the rehabilitation of the thousands of young men who worked in CCC camps in those early days. Many of us can remember the great depression and the hordes of distraught young men riding on freight trains across the country, looking for work and finding none. The CCC camps gave them jobs on the land that made possible a quick demonstration of conservation measures.

In demonstration projects throughout the country, farmers learned that gullies and wasted land were not the inevitable result of farming. They learned that the land could be rebuilt, pastures could be improved, crop yields and farm income could be increased, timber and pulpwood could be produced through sound conservation farming. In North Carolina we had demonstration projects at High Point, Wadesboro, Greensboro, Reidsville, Franklinton, Charlotte, Burlington, and Lexington.

Another major event in the progress of soil and water conservation was the establishment of soil conservation districts. Bennett had felt from the beginning that the farmers themselves should take over the soil conservation movement. And it was significant that the Brown Creek Soil Conservation District, the first soil conservation district in history, included Hugh Bennett's home county, Anson. The Brown Creek Soil Conservation District was set up on August 4, 1937.

Soil conservation districts were established under State laws. The first such law was passed on March 3, 1937. By the end of that year, 22 States had enacted such laws authorizing creation of soil conservation districts, with legal status. They were created by action of farmers to assure continuance and progress of soil and water conservation throughout the Nation.

By July 1, 1945, all 48 States had enacted soil conservation district laws. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands passed such laws in 1946, and Hawaii and Alaska in 1947.

The soil conservation movement quickly took on international aspects. Agricultural leaders from countries all over the world came to America to get the inspiration and the know-how that farmers in this country had developed. Hugh Bennett himself traveled to many foreign countries to help them get underway conservation programs that would conserve their resources of soil and water. Soil conservation services, patterned after our own, were set up in many countries.

In our own country, June 9, 1947, was observed as Billion Acre Day. On that day the San Juan Soil Conservation District in Colorado was chartered, bringing the total farm and ranch land in soil conservation districts to 1 billion acres.

From the beginning, Bennett had insisted that the fundamental principle of sound soil and water conservation was the use of each acre within its capabilities and the treatment of each acre in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement. There was on September 9, 1946, an occasion of special significance to the people of North Carolina. It was the celebration of Hugh Bennett Day arranged by the Brown Creek Soil Conservation District.

Thomas Wolfe, one of the greatest writers North Carolina has ever produced, was the author of a novel titled "You Can't Go Home Again." But Hugh Bennett came home to North Carolina that day to a welcome in which the whole State joined. The principal speaker on that occasion was another great North Carolinian, Jonathan Daniels, author, journalist, and former Presidential secretary. I should like to quote briefly from the speech that Jonathan Daniels made on that occasion:

"In wartime," Daniels recalled, "we were fed from acres which, when Hugh Bennett began as Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, were producing only duststorms for dark skies. But any people who think that Hugh Bennett's science is a mere matter of water and wind, soil and plows, have only the slightest understanding of the meaning of the man. What he discovered was the carelessness and blindness of man.

"What Hugh Bennett taught us," Jonathan Daniels continued, "was that in our ignorance and blindness and almost in secrecy, the treasure of our lands and our lives can slip from beneath us—and suddenly be gone forever."

That was a great tribute to a great man and to the relentless force of a personality that awakened America to the danger of the wasteful, careless road we were following with respect to our soil and water resources. Once awakened, we have remained alert to the needs of the land.

We have made tremendous progress in soil and water conservation in the past 25 years. We think today of soil conservation as a way of life. We have learned to think in new terms about the land. We realize that our present bounty can be as fleeting as a desert mirage, unless we guard continuously our precious heritage of soil and water.

Conservation farming is efficient farming. It includes such practices as irrigation to assure production when droughts occur; drainage to prevent damage to crops during wet years. It means growing trees, pastures, and row crops on land where these crops are best adapted, where they can be grown with less damage to the land. It means the preservation of the very source of life itself. It means a good life in our time and, above all, a priceless heritage for our children and for our children's children.

Truly, this is a momentous event that we shall commemorate on April 27—the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service. I should like to quote again from the speech by Jonathan Daniels:

"This earth and its promise are ours," he said. "And upon it we shall measure ourselves and the future. The good earth is hacked but not lost. The hope of the Garden is not gone. But suddenly—very suddenly—in surprise and chagrin, we could face a desert where we hoped to behold fulfillment of our dreams. Blindness is not restricted to agriculture. Indeed they are blind who see what Hugh Bennett has taught us only in our fields. He has been talking and teaching not about our soils but ourselves. We need to contemplate not only our fields, but our old fears."

Justice Douglas Attempts to Defend 1954 Desegregation Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Birmingham News of Wednesday, April 13, 1960. Mr. Lawrence comments upon an address which Justice William O. Douglas delivered before the Cornell Law School a few days ago, in which Justice Douglas discussed the desegregation decision of May 17, 1954. I urge that the Members of Congress read Mr. Lawrence's remarks with care.

A JUSTICE DEFENDS THE DECISION—DOUGLAS BREAKS CUSTOM TO TRY TO JUSTIFY COURT'S 1954 ACTION ON SCHOOL SEGREGATION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It is a rare thing for a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to discuss publicly at any time afterwards a case in the decision of which he has participated. It has always been the custom for justices to stand on what they wrote in the opinion itself no matter what criticism came later.

The address, therefore, that Justice William O. Douglas delivered before the Cornell Law School at Ithaca, N.Y., a few days ago has begun to attract attention, particularly because it reopens and, in a sense, supplements the text of the famous desegregation decision of May 17, 1954. It revives debate, too, on whether the Supreme Court in that case decided a question of constitutional law or a question of psychology.

"Judges," said Justice Douglas, "like the cases with which they deal, are more than statistics. The electronics industry—resourceful as it is—will never produce a machine to handle these problems. They are delicate and imponderable, complex and tangled. They require at times the economist's understanding, the poet's insight, the executive's experience, the political scientist's understanding, the historian's perspective."

JUDGE HAND FEARED "THIRD LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER"

This view will be disputed by those who feel that the Founding Fathers set up a Supreme Court to decide not what the law or the Constitution ought to be but what it really is, based on written acts of Congress and written provisions in the Constitution. This is why Judge Learned Hand, retired, America's most outstanding jurist, expressed in his famous lecture to the Harvard Law School 2 years ago the fear that the Supreme Court of today might become a "third legislative chamber."

But it is in relation to the desegregation decision that Justice Douglas' new comments will be widely debated. He gave to the Cornell law students this concept of the present-day Court:

"There is the myth that has received great impetus since *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483). It is that the Court made an exception in those school segregation cases and picked them out as the occasion to rely on sociological data, not on law or precedents. Yet those who work in constitutional law know that business facts, economic data, institutional practices, and social materials often are relevant to enlightened decisions on constitutional issues. The Brandeis brief, filed in 1908 in *Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U.S. 412), and containing vast citations to economic and social data bearing on the hours of work by women, is the classical example."

But Justice Douglas missed the main point of the criticism that has been made about "sociological" data. Nobody has objected to the introduction of data of any kind in a formal brief filed prior to the argument before the court. What is objected to is the lack of an opportunity to the other side to present a rebuttal or even to cross-examine the experts or "authorities" before they are cited for the first time in a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The 1954 desegregation cases, moreover, involved precedents that had allowed the States from 1868 to 1954 to establish schools with "separate but equal" facilities. Indeed, contrary to a general impression, the famous case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.*, involved a State law, passed in 1949, that permitted but did not require cities of more than 15,000 population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. The Topeka board set up segregation only in elementary schools and operated all other public schools on a nonsegregated basis. The lower court ruled that the facilities in both kinds of schools were equal and that the 14th amendment wasn't being violated.

SIMILAR DATA AVAILABLE IN OTHER, SIMILAR CASES

The Supreme Court of the United States, however, based its judgment on a number of citations of a sociological nature, even though similar data were also available for use in the many cases decided in the period between 1896 and 1954 by eminent justices, including Charles Evans Hughes and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Yet the 1954 decision said:

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (1896) contrary to this finding is rejected."

When does authority become "modern"? The separate but equal doctrine was upheld by the Supreme Court as late as 1950. The very fact that the Supreme Court did reverse decisions and precedents of long standing and base its judgment on psychological data is the reason why it has been severely criticized as having opened the way for a nine-man judicial autocracy to function. If there is to be a scrapping of the written Constitution and the substitution of an unwritten constitution to be formulated out of the doctrines of poets, historians, economists and even business executives, there are many citizens who would favor a system such as prevails in Great Britain, where the Parliament, elected by the people, is the body that writes the law of the land.

Presidential Poll—15th District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, each year for the past 5 years, it has been my privilege to conduct a poll of public opinion in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio which I represent here. The poll this year, taken during the last 6 weeks was based upon a questionnaire containing 22 questions dealing with a broad range of public issues which will occupy the attention of the Congress during the current session.

In the preparation of the questions, every effort was made to eliminate wording which would influence responses. The questionnaire was distributed throughout the seven counties of the district in southeastern Ohio without regard to the political philosophies held by those receiving it. It was also reprinted in a number of daily and weekly newspapers of the district. Many of those participating in the poll obtained their copy of the questions from these publications. Schools using the questionnaire as a basis for the discussion of current issues reported the results of classroom debates. None of these student reports indicated unanimity of thinking on any of the questions. I am convinced, therefore, that this poll represents a broad and representative sample of the thinking of the people of the district.

The tabulation of the results includes all of the replies which I received prior to April 2. This number totaled almost 6,000 replies. Although the expression of affirmative or negative opinions on each of the questions is a valuable gage of popular attitudes, the detailed and thoughtful comments I received on the various questions multiply the value of this survey. Although it is not possible to reduce these remarks to statistical terms, I should like to explain some of the reactions I received to several of the questions.

The importance of Government economy and the need to balance national spending and income was perhaps the most important single issue according to the several thousand comments included in the questionnaires returned. It was generally recognized that increased Federal spending is a temptation of popular government which can often cause disillusion through resulting inflation and increased taxation affecting those who were to be benefited most.

A total of 46 percent of those responding expressed opposition to legislation for an additional temporary one-half cent per gallon gasoline tax. The temporary character of the proposed tax was often doubted and the question was asked in return, "Is there such a thing as a temporary tax?"

Perhaps the most perplexing question proved to be that regarding defense spending. The text of the question was "Do you feel that the $45½ billion requested for defense next year is sufficient for our national security?" Of those responding, 66.2 percent expressed their feeling that the amount was sufficient. However, 21.4 percent did not answer the question with a categorical "yes" or "no." Many persons cited the complexity of technological developments in defense weapons as their reason for failing to answer. Large numbers insisted that the Nation must provide whatever funds are necessary for this

program vital to our survival. At the same time, they stated the belief that a careful balance must be struck and that blank check policies for defense would be both ineffective and uselessly costly. Veterans were particularly vigorous in stating their opinion that service rivalries, duplication, and waste in our Armed Forces remain major obstacles to both defense strength and efficient management.

The question pertaining to providing medical benefits under the Social Security program received considered comment. Few persons doubted the seriousness of the problem. A majority of the 36.7 percent favoring the proposal were outspoken in their support of such assistance to older persons. Among the 57.4 percent opposing the plan, many pointed out difficulties of financing, entry of Government into the field of medical care, and a feeling that such a program would prove inadequate for real needs after years of investment.

The following is a tabulation of the results of my 1960 poll:

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Do you believe it advisable that the Federal Government balance its budget and reduce the national debt?	87.5	8.0	4.5
2. Are you in favor of providing Federal tax benefits to companies which will employ greater numbers of persons over 50 years of age?	50.2	43.7	6.1
3. Do you believe that the Defense Education Act should be changed to eliminate the requirement that students receiving Federal loans take loyalty oaths?	20.8	75.9	3.3
4. Would you favor Federal aid for school construction even though it would require tax increases or deficit financing?	28.3	66.4	5.3
5. Do you feel that the $45½ billion requested for defense next year is sufficient for our national security?	66.2	12.4	21.4
6. Would you favor granting the President the power to veto parts of appropriation bills passed by Congress in place of the present system requiring his acceptance or veto of entire bills?	64.4	30.3	5.3
7. Do you support a temporary increase in the Federal gasoline tax of ½ cent per gallon to pay for the highway construction program?	46.0	50.8	3.2
8. Do you favor changes in the Taft-Hartley Act to eliminate the power of States to enact their own right-to-work laws?	24.2	68.4	7.4
9. Are you in favor of the United States greatly increasing spending in its program for the exploration of outer space?	23.2	69.1	7.7
10. Do you believe Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations?	11.9	81.5	6.6
11. Are you in favor of proposals to give up U.S. ownership of the Panama Canal in favor of international control?	12.9	81.1	6.0
12. Do you feel that Congress should enact legislation to give the Federal Government greater power in negotiating settlements of prolonged nationwide labor-management disputes?	71.3	24.4	4.3
13. Do you support a national fair trade law whereby a manufacturer could require that his product be sold to a consumer for a stated minimum price?	32.1	60.5	7.4
14. Do you favor increasing the hourly minimum wage from $1 to $1.25?	51.5	43.7	4.8
15. Do you favor ending agricultural controls and the termination of price supports?	73.2	18.3	8.5
16. Do you favor legislation to provide medical benefits under the social security program financed by an increase in the tax? (Present social security law provides that the combined employee-employer tax will become 9 percent on incomes up to $4,800 in 1969.)	36.7	57.4	5.9
17. Would you favor the Federal Government exercising greater surveillance over practices in radio and TV programs and advertising?	58.7	35.1	6.2
18. Do you believe Congress should pass civil rights legislation providing Federal guarantees of individual voting rights in Federal elections?	73.9	17.5	8.6
19. Are you in favor of policies which seek to fight inflation through increases on interest rates for installment credit buying?	50.8	40.5	8.7
20. Do you feel that the chances for world peace are better today than they were 10 years ago?	51.6	38.6	9.8
21. Would you support legislation to provide a Federal pension of $100 per month for all World War I veterans at age 65?	46.2	48.1	5.7
22. Are you in favor of continuing our present policy of purchasing sugar from Cuba at prices higher than those prevailing on the world market?	5.3	91.1	3.6

Rockefeller Wisely Repudiates "Stop Nixon" Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1959, I extended my remarks, emphasizing the fact that the public relations being produced by Rockefeller's aids smacked of Stassenism and was a disservice to the Governor.

Even now there are forces at work trying to prevent the nomination of Vice President NIXON by intentionally misinterpreting current political trends, but I am happy to say, Rockefeller is not buying any of it. Just last week in my own State of Illinois, Republicans took the most joy in the showing of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who ran unopposed in the presidential primary. Though he did not campaign, NIXON piled up 725,000 votes and approached the 1956 total of 781,000 received by President Eisenhower, but NIXON's record was better percentagewise.

I am sure that NIXON's total vote in Illinois, as well as in the Nation, next November, will be second to none. Furthermore, as is so comprehensively and effectively explained in the following editorial by David Lawrence, NIXON will not compromise with his conscience as to the proper moment to begin his drive for the Presidency even though he has been getting all kinds of free advice these days.

I include the editorial at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1960]

MEDDLING IN THE GOP CAMPAIGN—SOME OBSERVERS ARE CRITICIZED FOR USE OF ROCKEFELLER'S NAME TO BLOCK NIXON

(By David Lawrence)

Many people, among them some editorial writers, who haven't the slightest interest in the success of the Republican Party, are nevertheless trying to tell that party it should turn down Vice President NIXON for the presidential nomination this year.

The wish is father to the thought, and the attempt right now is to use the name of Governor Rockefeller—without his consent—to try to prevent the nomination of RICHARD NIXON. The New York Governor has said explicitly that he does not intend to become a candidate for either the Presidency or the Vice Presidency. But the folks who don't like Mr. NIXON keep up the rhubarb as a means of discrediting the Vice President.

Thus, every now and then, a movement to draft Governor Rockefeller is squelched and then bobs up again. The other day one of these abortive attempts was wisely repudiated by the Governor himself. He saw it as an effort to involve him in a "stop NIXON" drive.

Why do these meddlers in Republican politics want to stop NIXON? They themselves wouldn't vote the Republican ticket anyway, as they are mostly leftwingers or so-called liberals or persons who still resent Mr. NIXON's part in catching Alger Hiss and other Communist stooges.

No candidate of the Republican Party this year—who, to win, has to rely on the support of a largely conservative strength—would throw such support away in a misguided effort to lure the imaginary strength of so-called independents or liberals.

The Republican Party has enough potential votes on the conservative side to elect a President this year. If, however, the so-called liberal or leftist group succeeds in influencing the selection for the Republican nomination of someone who is going to enter the campaign suspected of being at heart a radical or a spender, many conservatives will be tempted to stay at home and let a full-fledged Democrat have the responsibility of steering the Government as between liberal, radical, and conservative practices.

One of the reasons the Republicans have had a hard time getting their voters to the polls in recent years is that some conservatives have been alienated by the Eisenhower administration on particular issues. In the last 2 years, however, many of these conservatives have rallied behind the President because of his policies at home, which have helped to stabilize the economy of the country, and his policies abroad, which have helped to keep us out of a nuclear war.

As for Governor Rockefeller, he has played his cards well to date. He has an attractive personality and is rapidly getting worthwhile experience by his service in Albany. It will stand him in good stead in the future. He would immeasurably aid the national ticket if the convention drafted him for the vice-presidential nomination, but only if the vast majority of the Republican voters were disabused of any idea that he is just another "leftwing liberal."

Governor Rockefeller is the kind of man who, if he someday becomes President, would make a fine Chief Executive. He is young yet, and if he accepts the vice presidential nomination now and does all he can to try to elect the ticket in November 1960, he will be the logical choice of his party in 1964 should Mr. NIXON be defeated this time. He would then, of course, remain in office as Governor of New York, as did Governor Dewey after his national contest.

If, on the other hand, Mr. NIXON is elected, and Governor Rockefeller were to become Vice President, he certainly would be young enough in 1968 to step from the Vice Presidency to the Presidency on the same path that Mr. NIXON would have traveled.

Vice President NIXON is being given all sorts of advice these days about how he should conduct himself in the preconvention campaign. It is said he isn't getting enough publicity because he isn't making any active campaign.

Someday the politicians themselves will discover the true secret of Dwight Eisenhower's success. He has ignored the so-called political rules. He has never compromised wtih his conscience. He has done what he thought was the right thing—the honest thing. Strangely enough, even when some of his official acts aroused widespread criticism—and some of them were properly criticized—the public nevertheless thought them to be honest mistakes of judgment.

All that RICHARD NIXON has to do is to be honest with himself and honest with the American people. Whether he becomes the nominee of his party should be less important to him today than whether he preserves his own self-respect. And that's the best rule in politics—never to be "political". The people like it, because politics today is regarded as the art of hypocrisy.

The Greek Ambassador Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Trujillo has forced 47 Greeks, 217 Spaniards, 52 Yugoslavs, and other Europeans to enter his armed forces. He tricked them into coming to Santo Domingo. Now he mistreats them.

The following letter was brought to my attention by the Ambassador of a great Latin American democracy. It is authentic.

"Does the Ambassador from Greece know about this?" I asked.

"He knows," my friend replied. "And so does the Organization of American States."

How long can this kind of gross violation of human rights continue?

The OAS peace committee has been refused entrance to the Dominican Republic but its members can gather plenty of evidence outside Trujillo's borders.

Marines will not be needed. Indignant public opinion, expressed in boycotts, strikes, and other ways, will rise up and smite down Rafael Trujillo.

Here is the letter that was smuggled out of Trujillo's prison:

DEAR SIR: We are writing to you from the Dominican Republic from the prison Victoria. We came here on the 16th of August, 47 Greeks to work. We were imprisoned by force for 17 days and on the 5th of September we yielded to the threat of hunger and accepted to go to the legion at Konstandja. Life here was unbearable, some escaped. They had forced us to join the legion. In the legion there were 217 Spaniards, 52 Yugoslavs and some other Europeans who were all deceived as we were. On November 5 they told us that they were going to send us back to Europe, but instead they brought us here to the prison where we are dying slowly from hunger. Our food is merely a black rice water and a piece of the worst quality bread. We all have become shadows and are dying slowly like the prisoners in the concentration camps of Germany. Our families in Greece don't know where we are. For 3 months now we have not written to them. The Spaniards and the Yugoslavs are also with us in the prison. It is of great importance that the Greek Government be notified as soon as possible in order to take action to free and save us from a sure death. On such a small paper we cannot write our real miserable condition. We are giving you our names to be published in the free press, so that our families see them and take action to save us from the hands of death. This present note is our S O S. Send it to Demetrios Psathas, newspaper Ta Nea, Athens, Greece.

Aristides Bertsatos, Karahalios Sotirios, Theothorakos Georgios, Aivaliotis Dimitrios, Katris Nikolaos, Emanouelides Konstantinos, Angelopoulos Georgios, Hadjigevrgion Afhauatios, Katsoules Todneus, Lukios Evengelos, Kamariuos Christos, Chlepetennis(?) Georgios, Kousoumis Odysseas, Nikolopaulos Thiouysios, Theodorou Christos, Xicomerites Vasilios, Zamboloneus Odysseus, Striptoulias Anastasios, Llylonas Apostolos, Garifalakis Nikolaos, Kalimeris Todumes, Levides Georgios, Zacharopoules Koustantinos, Sleantis Athunasios, Dimitrios Koudoubaris, Kozis Panayotis, Merkouris Autonios, Prevezianos Dimitrios, Blechrakis(?) Stamatios, Autonoglou Aveaam, Kopelakis Emmanouil, Vruiotis Koustautinos, Kaseris Dimiterios, Kiteus Loeyues, Agouros Argyres, Karabulios Nikolaos, Thalassiuos Emmanouel, Trihas Athanasios, Kazouris Todnues, Tzerakis Leonidas, Soroulis Stavros, Kornetas Apostolos, Visiliou Todnues, Mezaris Georgios, Aenmorities(?) Georgios, Koumenos Michael, Laskaris Andreas.

A Brook That Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving sermons I have ever read relates a water shortage in Israel during Biblical times to the water problem in America today.

This sermon, by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, as it appeared in the March 12, 1960, issue of the National Rural Letter Carrier, follows:

A BROOK THAT FAILED

(A sermon by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

"And it came to pass after a while that the brook dried up."—First Kings 17:7.

Parched and thirsty lips make all humanity kin. There is a modern song which to the ears of the mid-20th century epitomizes the age-long, plaintive plea for cool, clear water:

"All day I face a barren waste
Without the taste of water—cool water.
Old Dan and I, with throats burnt dry
And souls that cry for water—cool, clear water.

The shadows sway and seem to say
Tonight we pray for water—cool water,
And 'way up there He'll hear our prayer
And show us where there's water—cool, clear water."

There is a Biblical story of a stream that failed, the ancient record of a water shortage which has gripped the imagination of the long centuries. It tells of a prophet who prayed for water. In the famine which was scourging the land, Elijah had been safe by the side of a babbling brook, his needs of drink and food supplied by water and wings, the pinions of ravens. The scene is adorned with all the brilliant colors of an old-fashioned Sunday school card. And just as those gayly illumined tokens of juvenile attendance carried always a "golden text" beneath the scriptural portrayal, so here is the sentence which tells the ominous conclusion of a fascinating tale of the prophet and the brook—"And it came to pass after a while the brook dried up."

The little stream which was a lifeline for the prophet was one of the few left in the drought-plagued land. There was much suffering among the people, because for so long the rain had failed to fall on fields and forests. When in his panic Elijah discovered the brook he seemed bent on just saving himself. His was a solitary escape. At first, apparently the plight of others did not disturb his own peace of mind. He is pictured as comfortably stretched out on the green grass by the water's edge. Surely, in a dry and thirsty land the lines had fallen to him in pleasant places. Perhaps as the rainless days passed he noticed that the volume of the stream was diminishing. But still there was plenty to allay his thirst. But one fateful morning the prophet was aghast to find that his oasis of refreshment had vanished like a mirage of the desert. Where sparkling water had made the murmuring music of salvation there was but cracked and dier earth. With a wild fear clutching at his hears, Elijah found himself at wit's end, for it came to pass that the brook dried up.

What was he to do? Seek another crystal spring somewhere up in the solitudes, and save himself? Divine guidance, so he thought, had led him to the hidden place of his selfish safety. But there he had time to meditate. Let us believe that even before his brook failed his conscience had begun to trouble him. How often the love that followest us all the way brings its lesson in pain and loss. Elijah's heart began to go out to those who were suffering the pangs from which he fled alone. The brook that failed sent him forth to join himself with others in need, and with them face the water and food situation in cooperation and partnership. He had come to sense that the authentic call of God is never to hide his servants away in selfish comfort oblivious to the afflictions which have smitten others. There crept into the heart of the prophet a new feeling of oneness with all who were cowering under the pitiless pall of the rainless skies. With a compulsion, before conspicuous for its absence, he crossed the boundaries of his own country and found himself face to face with those who, to him, were heathen—a woman and her son. They, in the midst of the universal want and woe, were barely able to keep their bodies and souls together. The woman, too, was at what the Psalmist called the place of desperate extremity—wits' end. Her cupboard was bare. But no miser, coward soul was hers. With the stranger who came to her door she shared her last crust—Then a miracle happened. How the partnership of need solved the dreadful problem is not part of the story now. Suffice it to say, it did. And whole the selfish brook had failed, the shared barrel did not.

This lovely old etching is telling us that only together can humanity win. A dear preacher friend of mine whose once eloquent lips are stilled now, in dwelling upon this story, did not go into a long explanation of how it came to pass, that by pooling their efforts the trio found salvation. But, commenting about the dried-up brook and the

never-empty widow's cruse, he said simply: "Faith in God is not a condition to be hidden in some sacred canyon, as a personal security policy. It is rather an endowment to carry into the midst of life, with which to sustain desperate need. When woe was running down every road, Elijah joined himself to others who were in trouble. Here is a prophet who, because a brook failed, found himself. The unwasting meal, shared with others, is of far richer significance than the hidden brook alone."

But what does this water shortage in Israel so long ago have to do with water in America in this year of our Lord 1960? Answer: Very much. Even with all the ministry of rain it has come to pass that the brooks of our water supply are drying up across this favored land. It is not that the vagabond clouds, with their precious cargo of refreshing moisture, like white-sailed barques have failed to float across the sea of azure blue. They have delivered their priceless elixir, though unequally, to the land.

Now when the distilled water is drawn from the sea it is but being taken on a journey—for sometime, somewhere, it turns again home. The wise observation of Holy Writ is: "All the rivers run into the sea, unto the place where the rivers come." There would be no rain were it not for the sea and the winds. Every raindrop is the child of the sea, drawn from that mighty and unfailing reservoir of the great deep. The grasses know nothing of the sea save as they discover the ocean and the rainfall; but without the sea it would never come. The rain is the sea come to the plants, not in the majesty of the tides but in such little ways as even a grass blade or a flower's petal can harbor it and grow thereby.

The lake from which we channel the water to drink is fed by rains which visit continental spaces. But the refreshing boon, without which we die, reaches us in the cup of cool, clear water we lift to our thirsty lips. As one who stood refreshed by showers of blessing gratefully bore witness, "The harvests of life are sure when we win from cosmic tides their drops of rain."

When we, whose mortal bodies are three-fourths water, take into our hands a loaf of bread Maltbie Babcock reminds us of what is back of the snowy flour—

"Back of the flour is the mill,
(Perhaps a mill run by water)
And back of the mill is the wheat,
And the shower—yes, the shower—
And the sun, and the Father's will."

But even in our America there have continued, year after year, sounds of abundance of rain—that is, taking the vast expanse of the country as a whole. Yet the brooks of our water supply are drying up. One solemn reason is that like all the other riches of this continent, so prodigally endowed, man has been wasting his substance in riotous living. Senator Richard Neuberger gives a vivid bird's-eye view of this wasted substance in one sweeping paragraph: "The gutted forests of the Lake States, a dozen silty dust bowls, half a thousand polluted rivers, the vanished passenger pigeon, and the slaughtered bison of the plains, migratory fish runs choked off from their spawning grounds by chemical wastes and unscreened irrigation ditches, all bear tragic witness to our failure in stewardship." In these latter years America has been sobered and alerted by the warnings, sounded by men who see, about the bird life, the animal life, the river life, and the life of the land itself, denuded and eroded, as riches piled up for thousands of years run off to the sea.

And now the Nation is compelled to face the dire implications of a growing water shortage. From various parts of our vast domain is being lifted the agonizing cry—Water, water, cool, clear water. For now it has become evident that the national brook is running dry. Of course we know that there are no brooks or rivers in the Sahara and other deserts. They are dry and thirsty lands where no water is. But who would expect any concern regarding the limitless water supply of a land that has the Hudson and the Mississippi, and the Columbia, and a thousand refreshing streams which make of our continental expanse, except for a few spots not irrigated—a watered garden? By tapping waiting water many miles from arid land, the parched places blossom as the rose as man commands the magic liquid to come hither. And if other sources fail, man has already taken the first steps, startling in their results, to wring out the salt from the boundless deep and separating it also from other ingredients make it pure and fresh, to quench thirst and quicken the parched land.

But, listen America. With all our vast water supply the situation is not as rosy as a superficial appraisal might suggest. The fact is that in 1957 more than 1,000 communities endured water shortage to some degree. In some cases there was not enough water for lawns, and in some towns not enough to drink. Reports are disturbing with regard to the underground reservoirs of water. The levels are going deeper and deeper. In a number of States wells have to go down from 100 to 500 feet deeper than they did some years ago. Need of water is a powerful and dominating influence, and the need is pressing, everywhere between the Rocky Mountains and the Mississippi Valley.

The Governor of one of our great Western States recently declared that "every drop of available water must go to agriculture and industry. To be sure, at least for the present, there is enough water if fairly distributed. But the problem is to get it where the people are and where the need is imperative. Golden southern California is thought of as a land flowing with milk and honey. But it is a startling fact that 50 cities in that enchanted region get much of their water from the Colorado River, nearly 500 miles away.

The mushrooming population of our entire country and the higher standards of living have meant an enormous increase in bathrooms and in all sorts of household machines. Every person is using 60 more gallons of water per day than our grandparents required at the dawn of the century. Industry demands 12 times more water than it did threescore years ago. Rayon, for instance, is a modern product; but like all other new things it calls for more water. A ton of rayon takes from 200,000 to 300,000 gallons of water to make. What is a mere ton of steel as it is lifted to its place in a rising building? But it takes 65,000 gallons of H_2O to fashion it. We blithely buy our bulging newspapers never realizing that a good sized papermill needs 22 million gallons of water a day. When you stop at a gasoline station to "fill it up," every gallon registered means 7 to 10 gallons of water for processing. Cities are discouraging industrial concerns from building factories, saying, "We haven't the water to spare." What the use of water for human projects is doing to wildlife was indicated some time ago when 3,000 dead ducks were piled on the lawn of one of our State capitols in a dramatic protest against the pollution of their great river and the draining of marshes.

Some time ago the brook of water supply of New York City so nearly dried up that careless people were fined even for having leaking taps, and the use of water was sharply curtailed. All these symptoms could be increased at least a dozenfold in emphasizing our growing water shortage and the constantly mounting demand upon the supply.

This urgent problem cannot be solved by just lamenting about the brooks that fail. Like Elijah, we must join others facing the same problem. The water solution is a cooperative task. We, the people, must tackle it together. Water resources, without any more regard to geographical lines than Elijah showed, must be protected, conserved, and transported to assure adequate supplies for all the needs of our expanding industrial economy, as well as to assure adequate supplies for public recreational purposes and for the conservation of precious wildlife.

It is in the spirit of Elijah, driven from his selfish brook, to take into consideration the needs of others that Congressman CHESTER BOWLES in his recent, challenging book, exhorts what we must do now to coordinate the powers of Federal, State and local government. He declares, "We must tap new water sources and provide for the more efficient use and reuse of existing water resources." We must make an all-out attack on water pollution. And, above all, we must develop institutions which can handle land and water problems on a regional basis, including irrigation, land reclamation, and flood control projects which will correspond not to our official political boundaries, but to the special aspects of each region's watershed and water resource needs.

And so it came to pass when the brook dried up that Elijah went out to join his strategy of salvation with that of others. And so today, in our America, the brooks that are failing are driving us, with a sympathy for others, to face the problems that can be solved by the strength that is found only in unity of purpose and endeavor. Thus do we become workers together with God. And are we not assured regarding the Father God, from whom all blessings flow, that "He shall come down like rain," answering in the oceanic amplitude of His grace the cry of those who hunger and thirst after righteousness—for as the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God. And, as Longfellow tells us:

"As torrents in summer, half dried in their channels,
Suddenly rise though the sky is still cloudless,
For rain has been falling, far off at their fountains,
So hearts that are fainting grow full to o'erflowing
And they that behold it marvel, and know not,
That God at their fountains, far off, hath been raining."

Presidential Poll—Fourth District, Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release from my office and the results of a poll of choices for President which I included on my recent questionnaire sent to 131,000 of my constituents:

Senator WAYNE MORSE and Vice President RICHARD NIXON are the favorite presidential primary candidates of residents of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District. They led the field of presidential hopefuls in the postcard questionnaire mailed to 131,000 constituents by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Adlai Stevenson placed third and fourth. Steven-

son's name will not appear on the Oregon primary ballot.

A total of 17,831 persons named their choices for President. NIXON received 5,883 votes (33 percent of that total). MORSE got 2,957 votes (16.5 percent). KENNEDY received 2,536 votes (14.2 percent). Stevenson received 2,179 votes (12.2 percent).

A total of 10,423 (58.5 percent) voted for Democrats. A total of 7,407 (41.5 percent) voted for Republicans.

Oregonians in the Fourth District also had other favorites. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY received 1,160 votes (6.5 percent). Senator LYNDON JOHNSON received 817 (4.6 percent). Senator STUART SYMINGTON received 746 (4.2 percent). Gov. Nelson Rockefeller received 1,477 (8.3 percent).

A total of 76 miscellaneous votes (0.5 percent) were cast. Two votes went to "none of your business."

Senator MORSE was the leading Democratic candidate in five of the seven counties in the district. Senator KENNEDY outpolled him in two (DOUGLAS and JACKSON).

The presidential preference question was 1 of 13 in PORTER'S questionnaire. Results on the others, which deal with Federal issues, are now being compiled. In all, 20,419 people in the district responded to the poll.

PORTER said his wife, Priscilla, tabulated almost all of the returned questionnaires.

A complete breakdown of the presidential-poll results follows. It lists figures and percentages for the district and for each county:

Analysis of votes for President in the 4th Congressional District of Oregon on questionnaires distributed by Representative Charles O. Porter

	Morse	Kennedy	Stevenson	Humphrey	Johnson	Symington	Nixon	Rockefeller	Miscellaneous	Total Democratic	Total Republican	Total votes
4th district:												
Number	2,957	2,536	2,179	1,160	817	746	5,883	1,477	76	10,424	7,407	17,831
Percent	16.5	14.2	12.2	6.5	4.6	4.2	33.0	8.3	0.5	58.5	41.5	100.0
Coos:												
Number	514	247	158	162	57	49	465	134	1	1,187	600	1,787
Percent	28.8	13.8	8.9	9.0	3.2	2.7	26.0	7.6	0	66.4	33.6	100.0
Curry:												
Number	122	78	66	25	14	17	164	48	0	322	212	534
Percent	22.8	14.6	12.4	4.7	2.6	3.2	30.7	9.0	0	60.5	39.5	100.0
Douglas:												
Number	252	361	270	141	120	142	720	174	10	1,290	900	2,190
Percent	11.5	16.5	12.3	6.4	5.5	6.5	32.9	7.9	0.5	58.9	41.1	100.0
Jackson:												
Number	348	379	351	153	156	140	984	311	23	1,531	1,314	2,845
Percent	12.2	13.3	12.3	5.4	5.5	4.9	34.7	10.9	0.8	53.8	46.2	100.0
Josephine:												
Number	230	175	129	49	96	48	482	73	6	728	560	1,288
Percent	17.9	13.6	10.0	3.8	7.5	3.7	37.4	5.7	0.4	56.5	43.5	100.0
Lane:												
Number	1,206	1,026	1,055	514	291	284	2,372	652	33	4,394	3,039	7,433
Percent	16.2	13.8	14.2	6.9	3.9	3.8	32.0	8.8	0.4	59.1	40.9	100.0
Linn:												
Number	285	270	150	116	83	66	696	85	3	972	782	1,754
Percent	16.3	15.4	8.5	6.6	4.7	3.8	39.7	4.8	0.2	55.4	44.6	100.0

Postal-Rate Hike Is Not Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which appeared recently in the columns of the San Francisco Examiner and was reprinted in the Sacramento, Calif., Bee.

Despite protestations of the administration to the contrary, there are millions of users of first-class mail across the length and breadth of America who strongly share the views expressed in this editorial. These people are unalterably opposed to taxing first-class mail, which makes a profit, to make up for the heavy losses that occur in second- and third-class mail. As a group, they may not be too articulate, but what they lack in this direction they more than make up for in overwhelming numbers.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the public generally would like nothing better than to stymie Mr. Summerfield's efforts to thwart the will of the Congress and make the Post Office Department a self-sustaining business.

Unfortunately, first-class mail users have neither the expert public relations assistance at the command of the Postmaster General nor the latter's acknowledged wizardry with postal cost ascertainment figures.

The editorial from the San Francisco Examiner follows:

POSTAL-RATE HIKE IS NOT JUSTIFIED

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal-rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which is easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the Post Office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in every day fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

True, it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal Judiciary system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted. But the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become an issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about $2,500 million a year. No other Government department produces anywhere near as much revenue. But because the postal establishments costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense. Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska? Would a business operate a branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, most of them losing money because of slight patronage? Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

We suggest Mr. Summerfield ought to stop proclaiming (and complaining) how much his Department has lost and concentrate on getting the mails delivered as speedily and economically as possible.

And Congress ought to ignore the request for another boost in rates.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.* The Congressional
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N. Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Rule By Big Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Seven Years of Rule by Big Business" by Philip Stoddard Brown. Perhaps the most significant statement in this excellent article is:

It is increasingly evident that the present administration has performed best in those areas from which businessmen have been excluded, and worst where they have taken over. Surely the record of the Treasury, Commerce, and Defense Departments and many regulatory agencies is a disappointing and, in some cases, sordid one. The administration has not done well in developing missiles, in atomic powerplants, in administering foreign aid and regulating gas companies, airlines, broadcasting companies, and drug firms.

To my mind this article emphasizes the point which should be understood by all and that is that governmental matters are becoming so complex, involved, and important that they must not be placed in the hands of untried businessmen whose first loyalties may not be in the public interest. It also should be abundantly clear that there must be a genuine program to strengthen the career civil service system particularly in the upper grades.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1960]

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—SEVEN YEARS OF RULE BY BIG BUSINESSMEN

(By Philip Stoddard Brown)

Years ago I used to patronize a bank whose head teller was a whiz. He could count money faster than anyone I've ever seen. His every movement had a flourish and dexterity that was high art. Not only that, his whole manner was masterful, almost lordly * * *

Then one day I saw, and scarcely recognized, this man in a restaurant. Gone was his proud and confident manner. Inaudible was the crisp reply to a customer's question or the curt instruction to another teller. The deft and rapid flick of fingers and wrist was not visible. He was just a mousy little fellow in an ill-fitting sport jacket.

Longer in memory is the glimpse of the foremost bass singer of my hometown, playing craps in a country club locker room. Except as his turn came to roll, his companions took no notice of this pudgy drab man. Yet how commanding a figure he was in his white surplice, standing in the back row of the distant choir, his powerful voice rising in equal concert with the massive organ music. All other voices were shallow and as nothing compared with those deep rich tones that engulfed life, like eternity itself, and chocked me with emotion. Then it was that the great Jehovah seemed very near.

Life is like that. A man may play one role brilliantly and another drably. Last summer, my young son and I listened to a baseball game, during which his favorite player visited the broadcasting studio and was drawn into a running commentary on the game. His remarks ranged from "that was a real nice play" to "he's a real good fellow." By the time he had drawled "real good" for the 20th time, my son was amused, but I could see that he was also let down.

My mind went back to the dull gray pain I remember feeling years ago when I read about Bill Tilden, my great hero, standing pitifully in court waiting to be sentenced for conduct so jarringly incongruous with my memory of him at Forest Hills: His cannonball service, his giant strides, his flat deep drives and his imperious impatience with ballboys, linesmen, and umpires.

We never get accustomed to these let-down feelings. The boy in us cries "Say it ain't so, Joe."

Well, what prompted all this musing is reflection upon the long succession of prominent businessmen appointed to high office in Washington in recent years, whose ineptitude in public affairs has been embarrassingly exposed and whose exodus, in some cases, has been so undignified.

Most of these men had been successful in some field of business and I guess I have an inordinate respect for entreprenurial ability. Besides, many of these appointees were well-meaning, good men.

Yet, as the time for summing up approaches, it is increasingly evident that the present administration has performed best in those areas from which businessmen have been excluded, and worst where they have taken over. Surely the record of the Treasury, Commerce, and Defense Departments and many regulatory agencies is a disappointing and, in some cases, sordid one. The administration has not done well in developing missiles, in atomic powerplants, in administering foreign aid and regulating gas companies, airlines, broadcasting companies and drug firms.

The successful transfers of recent years have been those of civil servants and military people into business; the unsuccessful ones, in the main, those of businessmen into Government.

Why is this? Why did many businessmen (William Batt, Robert Lovett, Paul Hoffman, and others, perform so successfully in Government under former administrations not remembered for their cordiality toward big business?

Today, the business world has many more men and women who have thought seriously about social and political problems than it had 20, or even 10 years ago. Why have they not been the ones called to Washington?

The mistake, I think, has been in assuming that any head of a large corporation can administer any public agency wisely, and that administration is an art divorced from any profound knowledge of the jobs which any agency is set up to perform. Time and again, corporation executives with no understanding of the complicated problems at issue have been appointed to high office—sometimes to serve only a couple of years and then be replaced by others with an equal lack of understanding.

To be sure, heads of great corporations are more than private businessmen. They are rulers of vast nonstatist organizations and, to a large extent, of society itself.

These men should have reflected profoundly upon the public aspects of their activities. Many have. But the quality and tone of much advertising, much behavior toward regulatory agencies and legislative bodies and the frequent unconcern for the public domain are clear indications that many corporate executives have no more understanding of public issues than the run-of-the-mill professional boxer has.

When a great steel company, one of the world's largest, allows the management of a huge plant in the South to side with, and support, over a long period, the most irresponsible and reactionary political faction in the State, surely this reveals that political immaturity (or unconcern) can and does exist side by side with the expertise in steelmaking.

When the heads of great chains of stores—and the President himself—are unwilling to say a word in behalf of a Negro desiring to eat a sandwich and drink a coke alongside a white man in Atlanta or Richmond, nearly 100 years after Appomatox and adoption of the 14th amendment, this too reveals that they have opinions about public issues that most of us think are long outdated.

To be head of a large corporation is not qualification enough for a top Government job—or should not be.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas has a very particular interest in the problems of India. Kansas State University has for several years, through the International Cooperation Administration, had contracts for developing agricultural programs in that country.

It was my privilege to visit India 2 years ago, and to observe some of the work that has been done. As a Kansan, I am proud of the progress that has been made.

Last December, President James A. McCain, of Kansas State University, and Mr. Whitley Austin, a member of the State Board of Regents, visited India, and made a study of the projects that we have undertaken. They made some very worthwhile suggestions, which I received, and sent to the State Department, in the hope that some of the programs could be improved.

Mr. Whitley Austin wrote an editorial, entitled "Hard To Help," which appeared

in the April 16 issue of the Salina Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD TO HELP

Much of our program of technical and financial help to India could be financed without costing U.S. taxpayers another dollar.

We are interested in helping India because it is a stronghold of freedom in Asia, a barrier against the further advance of communism.

It is a major cold war front. The Russians thoroughly appreciate it and are sending men and rubles to India in an effort to win the vast subcontinent to their side.

In selling wheat and other commodities to India, we have built up a large reserve of rupees. Under an agreement covered by our Public Law 480, the rupees owed us for these commodities are held for our account by the Government of India.

These rupees may be spent by us in India for the purposes of loans and grants to promote trade and economic development, including agriculture. Nearly 1.5 billion rupees already have been obligated for these purposes.

But we still have on deposit nearly 3 billion rupees, or more than $500 million worth, enough to give tremendous stimulus to our technical help programs.

The Indian Government, however, must approve the additional help. It has not done so. This may seem strange because the help is for India. The explanation probably is that India feels the spending of this sum of rupees would deplete its resources and be inflationary.

The Indians are a hard people to help. They are one reason waging a cold war is so interesting—and so exasperating.

Clearer Public Understanding of Agricultural Problems Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger:

[From the Clarion-Ledger, Apr. 10, 1960]

CLEARER PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS IS NEEDED

Responding to an appeal from the Delta Council and other cotton industry groups, the National Cotton Council of America has developed a blueprint for a workable public relations program for agriculture, to offset a serious extent of public antagonism brought about by what seemingly is an organized campaign against farmers.

A positive approach to the solution of this problem was presented by National Cotton Council staff members at Cleveland, Miss., recently, sponsored jointly by Delta Council, the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation and the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association.

The success of this public relations program will, of course, depend largely on intelligent planning, hard work and a great deal of sustained effort by farmers and agricultural interests—including all agencies and organizations that service and supply agriculture's needs.

Miller P. Holmes of Yazoo City, president of the Delta Council, has summed up the problem this way: "We believe the most serious threat to agriculture today is the intensity of the effort on the part of many people to discredit farmers and farm programs.

"Right or wrong, and whether we like it or not, public opinion will eventually determine the kind of treatment farmers and their associates get, both in the marketplace and in the halls of Congress. This same public opinion will ultimately determine our economic position and standard of living."

Complicating the problem is the fact that there is enough truth in some of the charges against agriculture to cause many uninformed people to give credence to the entire antifarmer campaign. This means that agriculture has the big job of separating fact from fiction, at the same time setting its own house in order.

It is important for the public to recognize some very significant facts about agriculture and its importance. Farmers, their suppliers and those directly dependent on processing and distributing farm products account together for more than one-third of the Nation's total employment. Over 22 million workers are employed in agriculture and in agricultural industries.

Total farm investment in 1959 was $200 billion, equivalent to over two-thirds the value of all the stocks of all corporations represented on the New York Stock Exchange. Farmers' expenditures for labor, farm machinery, fuel, feed, fertilizer, insecticides and other production items have increased from $6.4 billion in 1941 to $25.1 billion in 1958.

Despite the publicity which indicates that farmers receive most of the Government subsidies, they are far down the line when total dollars are considered. Moreover, it would be difficult to find a segment of the American economy that does not receive some benefits from Federal subsidies.

Facts, however, are being ignored and many city people think of farmers as having both hands in Uncle Sam's pockets up to their elbows, and agriculture is pictured as the most heavily subsidized segment of the economy. A better program of public relations is a must for agriculture, to correct popular misunderstandings and supply the American people with factual information offsetting unfavorable propaganda.

Higher Salaries for College Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star concerning one of the most important problems facing us today—the education of the young people of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 7, 1960]

HIGHER SALARIES FOR MANY MORE COLLEGE TEACHERS

In the past we have frequently heard the low salaries of college and university teachers explained by the law of supply and demand. Certainly the cold, old economic law is part of the story. And, now, it pinches the other foot.

Enrollment increases, so far, have created a demand for faculty members that exceeds the supply. The demand will step up at an accelerating rate on the way to the surge of the middle 1960's. Colleges and universities have every reason to bid against each other for faculty talent.

Recently the U.S. Office of Education reported an average salary increase by 4-year colleges and universities at 10½ percent over the last 2 years. It is hardly a dramatic change but at this early stage of the trend it is highly significant. Plainly the competition for teachers will become more intense. It is reasonable to assume that the salaries will rise accordingly.

College trustees who have formerly justified their low salaries by the law of supply and demand can't escape the same law now. Neither can State legislators. Somehow the cries of anguish leave us cold.

The whole public has a direct stake in this operation of the law of supply and demand. A pronounced improvement in faculty incomes is an important attraction to young people who are expected to enter the teaching field in much greater numbers. The supply of teachers must be increased to meet the demand of double enrollments in a relatively few years. The American people will have to meet a higher pay standard for more teachers.

The Nation carries no obligation more important than the education of its youth. It is the Nation's future. This is one cost that taxpayers and private contributors must be prepared to pay. It is one cost that should be met cheerfully.

This is an era of a great national scramble for everybody's money. At the national level, people are taxed within an inch of their lives for a fantastic defense effort that is embroiled in a bewildering controversy. The American people pay billions to buy and store grain without in any way solving the farm problem. They pay for a multitude of high-sounding projects that they don't understand. They are constantly solicited for help by private organizations that are known to them only by name.

But it is easy to see the value of an all-out effort for education. And the culmination of education comes with the training of leaders, scientists, and thinkers at the university level. In the long sweep of history the very survival of the Nation depends on the quality and range of education offered its youth.

Even today American faculty salaries are generally comparable to earnings from skilled labor. We have no intention of minimizing the importance of skilled manual jobs. But it is a simple fact that the manual worker's investment in a preparation in no way compares with the cost of preparation of a teacher with a doctor's degree.

You can assume that the degree holder has spent the equivalent of some 10 years in the student role beyond high school. In his investment the 10 years of outright expenditures are incidental. Far more important is the expenditure of time, which is about one-fifth the productive years in a normal lifetime.

Of course, the real test of a teacher's value is not his investment in education, but his ability to teach what he knows, to inspire the oncoming generation. In the developing competition no doubt many mediocre faculty members will be overpaid. And the contribution of the great teacher will be far greater than any salary increases that may be given him. Here we are concerned only with the general effect of the trend. It is a profoundly important fact of our times.

Former Brooklynite Wins Freedoms Gold Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Brooklyn Tablet paying tribute to one of our outstanding young men in Maine, Daniel E. Lambert of Orrington, Maine. Mr. Lambert, fifth district commander of the American Legion, with a distinguished record of service in World War II, has been recently awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award by the Freedoms Foundation for his public address, "New Glory for Old Glory." It is a pleasure and a privilege to make more widely known, in this manner, the achievements of Mr. Lambert.

FORMER BROOKLYNITE WINS FREEDOMS GOLD MEDAL

VALLEY FORGE, PA.—One of Maine's outstanding Catholic speakers and lecturers has been awarded high honors by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. W. C. Sawyer, vice president of the Awards Administration, announced that Daniel E. Lambert of Orrington, fifth district commander of the American Legion, has been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award for his public address entitled "New Glory for Old Glory" delivered on Flag Day over radio and TV units of northern Maine. Sawyer announced that the four-times-wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II had been awarded the gold medal by the distinguished national and schools awards jury for outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life in 1959. The medal will be presented to the Orrington Legion official during special ceremonies to be announced at a later date.

Mr. Lambert has delivered hundreds of addresses and lectures on the subject of Americanism during the past few years. He also actively lectures on the role of the Catholic layman in the promotion of Catholic Action and has been one of the Nation's leading opponents against communistic teachings and has been cited by every veterans' group for outstanding work in the field of Americanism. It was recently announced that he would lecture throughout the New England area on the subject of the loyalty oath program in connection with the National Defense Education Act.

A native of Brooklyn, N.Y., Mr. Lambert was educated in St. Agatha's School, Brooklyn, and Cathedral College in New York City. He is the son of the late Walter Leonard Lambert who died in 1952. His mother, Mrs. Ellen McLoughlin Lambert and her daughters Mrs. Jerome Quigley and Mrs. Robert Calvosa and their families reside at 5016 Eighth Avenue, in Brooklyn.

Mr. Lambert, 36, is married to the former Elise C. Pooler of South Brewer. They have three daughters, Cynthia Mildred, Maureen Patricia and Margaret Marie, all students of St. Teresa's School in South Brewer. Active in the affairs of his parish, Lambert is a past president of St. Teresa's PTA and a member of the Holy Name Society. He also serves as a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Maine Friends of Retarded Children and the Bangor-Brewer Catholic Social Service Bureau and the Penobscot County Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Organized "Integration Sitdowns," in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past few months there has been a series of organized Negro "integration sitdowns" in various cities of the South. These occurrences were organized and directed by such organizations as the NAACP and CORE. These instances have demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt that these organizations of professional race agitation have neither a respect for legal rights of their own or any other race, nor have they the interest of the southern Negro at heart.

Recently in Savannah, Ga., local Negroes formed an organization called the Negro Protective League to combat the vicious programs of these organizations for race agitation. The Negro Protective League's announced purpose is to combat the vicious boycott programs organized and directed by the NAACP and CORE.

There appears in the April 17 issue of the Augusta Chronicle a splendid editorial which points out that the southern Negro recognizes clearly that continued progress for his race lies not in agitation and ill feelings, but in harmonious, cooperative relationships with the white population of this area. It is the local Negro himself who will be the chief victim of the NAACP-directed boycott tactics. The formation of the Negro Protective League is proof positive that the NAACP does not speak for all the southern Negroes and that its tactics are deplored, not only by the white people of the South, but by the southern Negroes themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of April 17 entitled "The Boycott Is a Boomerang" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOYCOTT IS A BOOMERANG

The fact that a 1,700-member Negro Protective League has been formed in Savannah to combat the vicious boycott program of the NAACP seems highly significant to us for at least two reasons.

The league's mere existence belies the vaunted boast of the NAACP that it speaks for all southern Negroes.

The league's defiance of the NAACP clearly demonstrates that the thinking Negroes of the South are fully aware of how intimately their personal welfare is bound up with that of the southern white man and with the progress and prosperity of the community in which they live.

Too, in taking the position that it not only will not join in the NAACP-sponsored integration sitdowns and economic boycotts, but will instead actively fight them, the Savannah group has shown it will not jeopardize the welfare of local Negroes to the whiplash demands of outside agitators who have no stake in the progress of that city or, indeed, the State as a whole.

The group realizes that use of boycott tactics is more than merely vicious; it is a boomerang, whose chief victim will be the local Negro himself, who will be left to suffer the inevitable results of the NAACP's mischief while the outside agitators, their destructive work accomplished, move on to other parts.

The Negro Protective League has declined this doubtful distinction of being the pawn of such irresponsible outsiders. It has refused to be blackjacked by demands of northern pressure groups and ambitious politicians.

Its stand, we feel, is well-taken, and does credit to the members of the league.

Savannah, even now in the process of developing one of the most important ports on the Atlantic coast, participating strongly in a program to acquire more and large industries in that area, stands on the threshold of a period of prosperity perhaps never before matched in the city's history.

The wealth which will accrue from such commercial and industrial development will not fall alone upon the white residents of Savannah. It is shared with the local Negroes as well, in the form of more and better jobs, higher pay, civic improvements, and better living conditions.

The individual members of the Negro Protective League, as responsible citizens of Savannah, know that any measure taken to sabotage the economic betterment of their city can, in the long run, only hurt them personally and perhaps damage irretrievably the slow but steady progress the members of the Negro race have made over the long period of years in companionship with their white fellow citizens.

The league seems to be saying, in effect, that its members have the patience and forbearance to seek progress by slower and more certain means.

The southern Negro will make that progress. But not by cutting his own economic throat or by giving away the birthright or his children.

The Sweetpotato Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article carried by the Washington Daily News of April 12 by Inez Robb regarding the delicious sweetpotato.

Sweetpotato production is one of the economic mainstays of the people of my district. The 1958 production for Louisiana was worth around $5 million and today this crop is worth around $20 million and we have more than 60 shippers and at least 30 canning plants. This is the result of breeding new high-yielding, disease-resistant varieties and research in grading, handling, shipping, and canning. Research has saved the sweetpotato industry in the South. A new sweetpotato processing pilot plant specifically for sweetpotato research is now under construction at New Orleans and the industry hopes soon to produce instant sweetpotatoes commercially.

The article follows:

THE SWEETPOTATO MUST BE SAVED

(By Inez Robb)

Life is real, life is earnest and Uncle Sam has a new worry: You and I aren't eating enough sweet potatoes. That is, we don't eat enough of 'em to satisfy the farmers who grow 'em.

We Americans eat only one-third as many sweet potatoes today as we consumed 25 years ago. Last year, we only ticked away a measly 7.3 pounds per person. It made sweetpotato farmers very unhappy. And if there is one thing Uncle Sam cannot afford, it's unhappy farmers.

CAMPAIGN

So, the Government is about to undertake a campaign to glamorize the yellow spud. At the moment I am bracing myself for a tempest of Federal pamphlets on ways to prepare the sweet potato, just as I am trying to work my way out from under a blizzard of unsolicited pamphlets, courtesy of the U.S. Department of Interior, on how to cook and serve shrimp.

Oh, the Air Force isn't the only segment of Government that goes hog-wild once it gets its hands on paper and printer's ink.

Anyway, I have been pondering the plight of the sweet potato, and have come to two helpful conclusions about its present decline. First, we live in a weight-conscious world. Everyone is either on a diet or just about to climb aboard. And the sweet potato has become classified in the public mind with such menaces as chocolate fudge sundaes and banana cream pie.

MUST GET BUSY

If the sweet potato is to be saved, agronemists and horticulturists—or would it be biologists?—must get busy and perfect a noncalorie impomoea batatas. This is the first essential step in the resurrection of the golden spud. Prove it's nonfattening, and half the battle is won.

The second step is equally important, perhaps more so, and that is once and forever to divorce the innocent sweet potato from the marshmallows. It would not surprise me to learn that the decline and fall of the sweet potato began the day that some incompetent cook with a few left-over marshmallows on hand, decided to use them up by topping a sweetpotato casserole with them.

The sweet potato is one of the blessings bestowed upon the old world by the new. Indians were cultivating the sweet tuber before Columbus set sail on his great voyage. The sweet potato is both native and delicious. It deserves to be eaten regularly and not associated strictly with Thanksgiving or Christmas.

Federal Support of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is the hope of many persons in the Senate that a bill for Federal support of education will be passed this year. Many of us believe that the bill should give States the opportunity to decide whether Federal funds should be used for construction or for increased pay for teachers.

An editorial in the April 13 issue of the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, discusses some of the problems facing one board of education which is now faced with voters' rejection of a budget and by resultant resignations from high school teachers. While the editorial discusses the situation in one New Jersey municipality, the conditions described in the editorial apply, I believe, to many thousands of towns and cities throughout the United States.

It shows how teachers must often make a difficult decision between uncertainty in their present positions and the prospects of better salaries and less uncertainty in other kinds of work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS TAKE THE LONG LOOK

The Middlesex Borough Board of Education received four more resignations from high school teachers the other night, bringing the total in 2 months up to 10 resignations in the high school and 12 for the school system.

In answer to a question, the board's personnel chairman, Howard Bassett, said that one of the principal reasons advanced by seven teachers who were leaving was a loss of confidence in their future in the system in view of the vote on the school budget. In February, for the fourth time in 6 years, the Middlesex voters had rejected the board of education's school budget.

Bassett elaborated that the teachers appeared to think that in 5 or 10 years they would be better off if they changed positions now.

This is the area in which the rejection of school budgets makes itself most felt and the long range implications are significant.

When school budgets are defeated and pared, when there is skimping on equipment and supplies, when teacher raises are less than had been proposed in the budgets, the immediate effect is not always great or obvious. The older experienced teachers with substantial periods of service do not leave. Many of them own their own homes in town or nearby. They have roots in the areas. They stay on.

But in the younger ranks, where the teachers have most of their career ahead of them, the budget defeats have more impact. The individual teacher's average loss by the budget defeat (in one community a loss of $50 of a proposed raise, and that before taxes) may be small, but if the teacher regards the budget defeat as a pattern for the future, as a picture of what the electorate wants for its teachers over the years, the teacher with decades of professional experience ahead of him moves now to a community which values its teachers more highly.

This, of course, is the tragedy of many school budget defeats here in central New Jersey in recent years. They have benefited the taxpayer but little in dollar savings, and they have commenced an erosion process in the teaching staffs of the schools.

The erosion process is slow. The communities with fine school systems have a broad base of high caliber teaching talent, much of which will stay on. But the replacements which will be obtained will be of lesser quality where the school budgets are being defeated and where the atmosphere is not one of full support for the schools. Inferior replacements will dilute the quality of the faculties.

A vote on a school budget, thus, is not just a thing of today. It is not just a yes or a no on school expenditures for 1 year. It is part of a long-range program which builds or tears down faculties and school systems.

Distressed Areas in the Southern States, February 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, underemployment and rural distress are the dominant problems in the Southern States. Five hundred counties of the total of 690 rural counties considered eligible for benefits under the area redevelopment bill reported to the House of Representatives are in the South. But there are also large numbers of urban distressed labor markets. Current information indicates a total of 82 have substantial labor surpluses and of these 66 have chronical labor surpluses, continuing for more than 18 out of the last 24 months. In some instances these antedate the last 2 years.

Among the distressed labor markets are 7 large major labor markets, 51 smaller ones, and 8 very small ones. The seven major labor markets in this chronic surplus and distressed condition are: Roanoke, Va.; Durham, N.C.; Charleston, W. Va.; Huntington, W. Va.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Steubenville, Ohio; and Louisville, Ky.

The largest number of smaller distressed areas are to be found in West Virginia, 16; Mississippi, 9; North Carolina, 8; Kentucky, 7; Alabama, 6; Maryland, 6; and Virginia, 4.

As part of my remarks, I include fact sheet No. 38 E, part II, which was compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee with offices at 99 University Place, New York City:

Employment and unemployment in surplus labor markets in Southern States, February 1960

State and labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Months surplus in last 24 months (March 1958 to February 1960)	Distressed area [1]	Most recent date of start of substantial labor surplus
VIRGINIA							
Major: Roanoke	January 1960	67,925	4,875	7.2	24	X	March 1958.
Smaller:							
Bristol-Johnson City	February 1960	51,000	3,450	6.8	20	X	1956.
Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	October 1959	20,075	2,300	11.4	24	X	April 1955.
Richlands-Bluefield	November 1959	30,925	2,850	9.2	24	X	January 1958.
Carroll and Grayson	do	16,000	800	5.5	28	X	March 1957.
Winchester	February 1960	18,600	1,200	6.5	14		
MARYLAND							
State	do	1,083,600	70,600	6.5			
Smaller:							
Cumberland, Md.-W. Va	do	39,650	4,150	10.5	24	X	January 1952.
Cambridge	December 1959	12,350	2,050	16.6	24	X	Pre-1958.
Hagerstown	October 1959	38,550	3,650	9.5	24	X	Do.
Very small:							
Garrett	April 1959	6,405	940	14.7	24	X	Do.
Crisfield	August 1959	7,750	525	6.9	24	X	July 1957.
Elkton	do	13,050	1,100	8.4	24	X	Pre-1957.
NORTH CAROLINA							
Major: Durham	January 1960	49,075	3,100	6.3	18	X	Pre-1956.
Smaller:							
Fayetteville	September 1959	33,525	2,385	7.1	24	X	March 1956.
Hendersonville	July 1959	15,360	1,230	8.0	24	X	Pre-1958.
Kinston	May 1959	21,400	2,400	11.2	24	X	April 1957.
Lumberton	August 1959	33,380	2,270	6.8	24	X	Pre-1958.
Mount Airy	July 1959	23,030	1,670	7.3	24	X	June 1956.
Rockingham-Hamlet	April 1959	14,735	2,595	17.6	24	X	March 1957.
Rocky Mount	do	42,845	2,945	6.9	24	X	April 1957.
Wilson	May 1959	22,825	2,860	12.5	24	X	Pre-1958.
SOUTH CAROLINA							
Smaller:							
Hampton	August 1959	5,750	370	6.5	24	X	Do.
WEST VIRGINIA							
Major:							
Charleston	January 1960	94,250	7,900	8.4	24	X	March 1954.
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	do	92,800	12,950	14.0	24	X	March 1957.
Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio	do	75,850	10,400	13.7	24	X	November 1957.
Smaller:							
Beckley	February 1960	22,260	5,750	25.8	24	X	March 1953.
Bluefield	December 1959	21,480	3,850	17.9	24	X	June 1957.
Clarksburg	October 1959	29,950	2,750	9.2	24	X	April 1957.
Fairmont	do	24,320	4,330	17.8	24	X	November 1952.
Logan	February 1960	21,050	3,370	16.0	24	X	March 1954.
Martinsburg	October 1959	21,350	1,550	7.3	24	X	January 1958.
Morgantown	do	19,550	3,700	18.9	24	X	Do.
Parkersburg	December 1959	39,830	3,300	8.3	24	X	Do.
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, W. Va.-Ohio	February 1960	36,400	4,420	12.1	24	X	November 1952.
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	do	17,140	2,560	14.9	24	X	Do.
Welch	December 1959	21,700	5,510	55.4	24	X	February 1954.
Very small:							
Elkins	February 1959	8,943	1,100	12.3	24	X	
Grafton	April 1959	4,801	1,517	31.6	24	X	
Marlinton					24	X	
Richwood					24	X	
FLORIDA							
Very small:							
Apalachicola	March 1958	1,925	450	23.4	24	X	
ALABAMA							
Major:							
Mobile	January 1960	118,500	7,200	6.0	17		
Smaller:							
Anniston	do	33,585	2,315	6.9	24	X	June 1957.
Decatur	November 1959	21,495	1,400	6.5	18	X	Pre-1958.
Florence-Sheffield	June 1959	44,750	3,050	6.8	24	X	June 1957.
Gadsden	January 1960	32,640	3,180	9.7	24	X	February 1952.
Jasper	December 1959	17,200	1,150	6.7	24	X	November 1952.
Talladega	May 1959	21,260	1,425	6.7	24	X	June 1957.
MISSISSIPPI							
Aberdeen	January 1960	13,260	860	6.5			
Biloxi	do	14,650	880	6.0	20	X	
Brookhaven	do	16,840	1,370	8.1	20	X	
Clarksdale	do	28,650	1,810	6.3			
Columbia	do	14,890	1,140	7.6	24	X	
Corinth	do	20,710	2,830	10.6	21	X	
Grenada	do	20,200	2,200	8.4			
Greenville	do	20,130	1,670	6.4			
Gulfport	do	21,900	1,940	8.8	24	X	
Hattiesburg	do	33,190	2,070	6.2			
Hazlehurst	do	20,160	2,130	10.5	20	X	
Indianola	do	14,320	1,050	7.3			
Kosciusko	do	15,630	1,890	12.0	20	X	
Laurel	do	37,040	3,200	8.6			
Lexington	do	10,340	1,010	9.8			
Louisville	do	24,810	1,730	7.0			
Meridian	do	34,550	2,630	7.6			
Oxford	do	41,590	2,490	6.0			
Pascagoula	do	21,570	1,750	8.1	24	X	
Picayune	do	7,780	640	8.2			
Tupelo	do	41,300	3,226	7.8			
Vicksburg	do	21,440	1,390	6.5			
West Point	do	13,820	990	7.2	20	X	

Footnotes at end of table.

Employment and unemployment in surplus labor markets in Southern States, February 1960—Continued

State and labor market	Month of report	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Months surplus in last 24 months (March 1958 to February 1960)	Distressed area [1]	Most recent date of start of substantial labor surplus
KENTUCKY							
Major: Louisville	February 1960	299,100	22,100	7.4	20	X	November 1957.
Smaller:							
Corbin	March 1959	26,050	3,050	11.7	24	X	July 1953.
Hazard	do	19,500	2,600	13.3	24	X	Do.
Madisonville	do	25,800	3,400	13.2	24	X	September 1953.
Middlesboro-Harlan	do	27,600	5,840	21.2	24	X	July 1953.
Morehead-Grayson	do	20,350	4,050	19.9	24	X	August 1954.
Paintsville-Prestonburg	do	23,250	3,600	15.5	24	X	July 1953.
Pikeville-Williamson	April 1959	23,350	8,300	35.5	20	X	Do.
TENNESSEE							
Major:							
Chattanooga	January 1960	[2] 115,380	7,500	6.5	23	X	January 1957.
Smaller:							
La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	October 1959			13.6	24	X	January 1954.

[1] X indicates area has been a surplus labor market in at least 18 of the past 24 months and would therefore be eligible for assistance under area redevelopment bill (S. 722).

[2] Estimated.

Source: State employment security agencies.

The Lyons Republican Emphasizes the Importance of Cancer Education and Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Lyons (N.Y.) Republican emphasized the importance of the fact that during the month of April the American Cancer Society is promoting an educational and fund-raising crusade. In this editorial, the progress which is being made in the fight against cancer is outlined, as well as the importance of the educational and research work which is made possible by the tireless leadership of the American Cancer Society.

Because of the importance of the message contained in this editorial from this fine newspaper, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD NEWS FOR OUR NATION

In connection with its April educational and fund-raising crusade, the American Cancer Society has announced that there are 1 million Americans alive today who have been cured of cancer. Twenty years ago, there were only 180,000.

But there is more to the story. The society considers cured only those alive and without evidence of the disease 5 years following diagnosis and treatment. By this standard, it is estimated that an additional 600,000 cancer patients diagnosed and treated within the last 5 years will live to enter the ranks of those cured. This means that today there are actually 1,600,000 men, women, and children cured of cancer, although 600,000 will not formally be counted until 5 years from the time of treatment.

Twenty years ago, only one out of seven who developed cancer was saved. Ten years ago, it was one out of four. Today it is one out of three. It is estimated that 165,000 Americans will be saved from cancer this year.

This is good news indeed. But, unfortunately, there also is bad news.

The dark side of the picture shows that 85,000 men, women, and children will die needlessly of cancer this year because their cancer will not be diagnosed in time and promptly treated. It is possible to save half of all those who develop cancer through early diagnosis and proper treatment.

But the good news in cancer control is not the result of accident. It has come about through cancer research and education. More and more men and women are having annual health checkups as the best possible protection against cancer at the urging of the American Cancer Society.

Let us cut down on the bad news and increase the good news by supporting the 1960 crusade of the American Cancer Society. Guard your family—fight cancer with a checkup and a check.

Blue Sky Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of April 18, 1960:

BLUE SKY PIE

We are striking no blow for Republicanism but give a look at what the Democratic Foreign Policy Advisory Committee would have us do if the Republicans don't win this fall:

As a starter this group, headed by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, an original one-worlder, would have the United States finance each year the education of 500,000 foreign students in American colleges and universities. This is some 100 times the 5,000 foreign students now being educated each year in the United States at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Advisory Committee, which also includes Representative CHESTER BOWLES, foreign policy adviser to Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, completely ignores the cost, holding merely that dollars spent in this fashion would make friends for America abroad.

Since each student brought here from a foreign country would cost approximately $3,000 a year, the proposed program would require $1,250 million to finance. An equivalent reduction in foreign aid would make some sense but the Advisory Committee has no such proposal. More foreign aid is needed along with a more liberal foreign trade policy, according to the committee.

According to these Democrats, the United States can survive only by making less on trade, giving away more in aid and spending our educational assets on our foreign friends.

Problems of Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, an editorial appeared recently in the Joplin Globe on the White House Conference for Children and Youth. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Joplin Globe, Mar. 30, 1960]

HOPES ON YOUTH

Some 7,000 persons are holding 600 round-table conferences in our National Capital this week on problems of children and youth. Their overall objective is to somehow help prepare our young people to do a better job than have the generations before them.

This is ever the hope of father for son. It is a desperate need today in the relationships between the families of nations.

Like each successive White House Conference for Children and Youth, this one becomes more important than preceding ones over a period of 50 years since they were initiated. Present-day youths inherit a new dimension of problems—space and rocketry in a nuclear age. In other words, they are to be asked to assume the responsibility of taming the lion their elders now hold by the tail.

This is why the conference theme is "responsibilities of young people." And what a responsibility to inherit, with civilization itself at stake. But, look also at the opportunities.

These thoughts are at the core of efforts to develop programs and inspirations to give the younger generation better training in education, in health, in environment, and in understanding to prepare their minds and bodies for their test.

President Eisenhower convened this year's conference on a note of fresh hope when he said, "Our children understand, as we did not in our own youthful years, the need—now approaching the absolute—for peace with justice." They are being taught, he said, the value of the individual and the dignity of all people, and the futility and stupidity of war.

It is estimated that some 5 million adults across the land helped to plan this year's White House conference on youth in a monumental effort to pass on to the new generation the benefits of the successes and failures of their elders in dealing with an increasingly complex society. The least we can say is that it is worth a supreme effort.

Significance of Berlin—German Issue at Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a recess in the Foreign Ministers' Conference provides the nations of the world an opportunity to take a new look at the fundamental issues involved in the upcoming summit conference.

As we know, there has been some question as to whether or not this long a recess was advisable. However, now that it is underway, we have the opportunity—and perhaps the obligation—to review the involved challenges.

Fortunately, the Western Powers have achieved a commendable degree of unanimity on proposals for the summit conference. Underlying the Western position are these fundamental—and, I believe, essential—principles: First, the West will not either encourage nor open the door to appeasement; second, the Western Powers are firm in their mutual agreement that there will be no concessions that would jeopardize the status of West Germany or West Berlin; third, agreement on disarmament—though a major issue—will not be bought at a price of jeopardizing our future by neglecting now to provide safeguards to protect non-Communist nations against surprise attack.

The Western Powers have long expressed a willingness to "go that extra mile" for reduction of armaments to reduce tensions and threats of war.

As in the past, however, the adoption of such safeguarded agreements, regrettably, depends to a large degree on whether the Communists are really interested in reduction of world armaments, or whether they are again playing the old game of deceit and subterfuge; that is, trying to get concessions from the West that would weaken our deterrent power while, at the same time, enabling them to engage in activities to ultimately jeopardize the security of the free world.

As one of the major upcoming events affecting the interests of the whole world, of course, the spotlight is focused on the summit conference.

Recently, a great many national and world leaders have given us the benefit of their thinking on major issues "at stake."

A few weeks ago, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and German Foreign Minister Dr. Heinrich von Brentano were here in Washington. The members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other of my colleagues will recall luncheoning and discussing major issues with these outstanding statesmen of West Germany.

The significance of the upcoming conference, particularly as this relates to problems of reunification of Germany and the status of Berlin, have been constructively reviewed by Secretary of State Christian Herter, Under Secretary Douglas Dillon, and other dignitaries and statesmen. The American press has also widely and constructively reviewed both the issues and the outlook for accomplishments at the summit conference.

At this time, I would like to cite a number of these articles, particularly as these relate to the significance of West Germany to the free world alliance.

First, I would like to introduce a letter to the editor of the New Yerk Herald Tribune, for the Appendix of the RECORD, by my friend Maj. Gen. Julius Klein.

General Klein is a distinguished combat soldier and expert in public relations. Author of the original combat public relations plan for the War Department in 1941 which formed the basis of our own public relations during World War II, General Klein has done much since World War II to create in this country not only a better understanding of the position of the Federal German Republic, but he has also been instrumental in creating good will between the United States and Israel. A past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, he has also served as consultant to important Senate subcommittees. For his significant work, in 1952, for the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, for example, Members on both sides of the aisle not only approved, but praised, his report.

Following General Klein's letter, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following articles, reflecting on the significant East-West conference: New York Herald Tribune editorial, April 14, 1960; New York World Telegram editorial, April 15, 1960; New York Journal American editorial, April 15, 1960; New York Mirror, editorial, April 15, 1960; and Chicago American editorial, April 15, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—GERMANY VITAL TO WEST

To the New York Herald Tribune:

On May 16 the Big Four Summit Conference will open in Paris in an atmosphere of gloom bordering on despair, particularly among the peoples of divided Germany whose destiny is not in their own hands, but rather under the control of alien states—men far from the stage, from the actors, and from the dramatis personae as well.

The reason for this attitude of negativism, which I observed on my trip to Germany a few weeks ago, basically is the threat of atomic extermination which is hurled at the German people day after day, week after week, by Radio Moscow and its satellites. While Khrushchev prates about the Camp David spirit and the relaxation of tensions, his psychological-warfare specialists raise the specter of missiles with atomic warheads on German soil, extinction by nuclear bombs, etc., etc. But even more menacing than these belligerent warnings is a lurking fear on the part of the West German population that they will be abandoned by their NATO allies, chiefly the United States, in the upcoming Paris negotiations.

The free peoples of the Western Alliance clearly state that they will never sacrifice Berlin in the interest of expediency.

We must make certain that these reassurances reach the ears of the German people, but particularly the ears of Nikita Khrushchev, who seems to have reached the false and dangerous conclusion that the free world is intimidated by his claims to power and supremacy.

JULIUS KLEIN,
Major General, U.S. Army, Retired.
CHICAGO.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 14, 1960]

NO MOUNTAIN FEVER THIS TIME

The foreign ministers of France, Britain and the United States, with other Western colleagues, are meeting this week in Washington in formal preparation for the summit conference in Paris next month. They will meet twice again before the curtain actually goes up. But this time the approach to the summit is being made at a deliberate and measured pace, quite different from the breathless scramble which brought East and West together at Geneva 5 years ago. This time, there is little mountain fever. The trails seem plainly marked and the ascent looks routine.

One reason for the lack of agitation and excitement is that the summit of 1960 is clearly not viewed by public opinion as a desperate rescue operation on which the fate of humanity depends. At Geneva, the heads of government were looked on as surgeons who had the world on their operating table in dire need of amputations and blood transfusions if it was to survive. But the Geneva meeting accomplished nothing in particular, and the world survived anyway.

At Paris, it will not be so much a question of rescue as of preservation, of holding present advantages as against the risks of seeking new ways to set the world, once and for all, in order. Of course, there is a more positive prospect in the field of disarmament. The possibility of some form of agreement to ban nuclear tests has become a strong one, and it is in this field that the greatest flexibility, perhaps the only flexibility, exists. Therefore disarmament is the most potentially fruitful of all topics of discussion, and that is why Western statesmen hope it will be the principal one.

It is unlikely that Mr. Khrushchev will show flexibility over Berlin or German reunification. Dr. Adenauer's belief that any change in the status of Berlin itself will be to the West's disadvantage is surely the right one. The big worry here is that Mr. Khrushchev will make a brutal effort to force the issue.

Another reason for the summit atmosphere is that in the past year the ground has been so often and so carefully covered. There has been the foreign ministers' Geneva conference of last summer on Berlin. There are the two current disarmament conferences, again on the shores of Lake Leman, and the issues and positions are being endlessly aired. There have been spectacular visits between the world's capitals. In the past month only, Mr. Khrushchev has been to Paris, General de Gaulle to London, Dr. Adenauer to Washington, and Prime Minister Macmillan to both Washington and Paris. The summit, in a manner of speaking, is a continuing body.

On the whole, these things are to the good. A summit meeting which arouses no great hopes can cause no great disappointments. And it should be easier to gain the painful inch when no one is talking about the grandiose but vacuous mile.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Apr. 15, 1960]

THE BERLIN TUG-OF-WAR

Four weeks before the long-prepared summit conference at Paris, it is becoming pretty clear that ideas haven't changed much in either camp during the 17 months since Nikita Khrushchev prodded the diplomats into motion by his sudden threat against West Berlin.

The West wants Germany (including both Berlins) united and free. The East wants Germany (including both Berlins) united and Communist. Obviously neither side can achieve its whole desire without a shooting war. Both sides are on record as saying war is "unthinkable" in an atom-armed age: Therefore, all the threats and counterthreats really constitute a verbal tug-of-war over half-measures, with each side hoping to get a slightly bigger share of the whole cake neither can have.

In this tug-of-war, the West has been, and remains, on the defensive, chiefly because Khrushchev had the advantage of the first tug: His November 1958 threat to absorb West Berlin into the embrace of the East German Communist satellite which surrounds it. Geography makes it almost impossible for the West to overcome this disadvantage. Firm and oft-stated resolve to keep Berlin free may prompt Khrushchev to slacken his grasp from time to time, but there is no conveniently surrounded chunk of Communist real estate where the West can begin a retaliatory tension.

Thus Khrushchev retains the initiative as the summit comes into view, despite commendable declarations of united determination such as those issued by the Western foreign ministers during their Washington strategy talks this week.

He retains it for two other reasons, in addition to his geographic advantage at Berlin. One is that Western experts, even the most veteran Soviet specialists like State Department Adviser Charles Bohlen, frankly can't predict what issue the bouncy Kremlin leader will pounce upon next, either as a surprise threat or as a surprise conciliation toward the outside world. The second is that the West's own leaders—being human and not always agreeing on everything, and sometimes distracted by such influences as public opinion and oncoming elections—take a painfully long path toward any policy-testing occasion such as the summit.

This doesn't mean Khrushchev is foredestined to win at Paris. There is a too-common habit of talking about these international negotiations as if they were a baseball game, with each side scoring a certain number of runs in succeeding innings. Nobody is going to win at this summit, or probably at any of the many summits which seem likely to follow. For Khrushchev has been convincingly warned that such a prize as Berlin is not available for winning at any debating contest, and cannot be won by force except at the penalty of global nuclear war.

These basic facts are the rigid limitations within which all the East-West negotiations must maneuver, so long as the Western experts are right in their assumption that the Soviet Union—unlike Hitler's Germany—is not willing to go to war to achieve its most coveted ambitions.

[From the Journal American, Apr. 15, 1960]

FREE CHOICE

The Foreign Ministers of the Western Allies have agreed on strategy for the German questions to be taken up at the summit.

While seeking a stopgap settlement on sensitive Berlin, they have decided to make no concessions which would weaken Allied rights in that city or that would imperil the eventual goal of a united, democratic Germany. The solid front does not promise to make matters easy for the Soviet.

Neither does the Allied decision to challenge the Russians to allow all Germans to vote on the question of a peace treaty.

The Allies want a peace treaty to await the reunification of democratic West Germany and Communist East Germany. Khrushchev is demanding separate treaties now.

The Hearst newspapers have consistently advocated letting the German people themselves decide their future. To let them vote—all 70 million of them—on the question of separate or joint peace treaties is a step in that direction.

But the right of free choice for the Germans must be really free.

[From the New York Mirror, Apr. 15, 1960]

GERMANY AFTER 15 YEARS

The central issue of international relations at the present time is Germany. The summit conference in May will deal with it first. The foreign ministers conference which has been meeting in Washington dealt principally with the German question.

It is impossible to separate Berlin from Germany, which is what Soviet Russia is really trying to do.

West Germany was represented at the Washington meeting by its Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, who is adamant that Berlin should not become absorbed among satellites of Soviet Russia.

He is fighting the policy of Great Britain, which is one of opportunistic appeasement. If West Germany is to be betrayed at the summit conference, West Germany will take steps not to be reduced to a Soviet satellite. In this, West Germany will be supported by France.

Thus 15 years after the end of World War II, the wheel of history has turned and the United States is now no longer the enemy of Germany but the friend and supporter. True, West Germany has engaged not only in a brilliant reconstruction of its economy and its industry, but has conducted a worldwide political propaganda, the best example of which was the recent meeting in New York between Chancellor Adenauer and Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel.

This meeting brought to a close the Hitler era. It was an open assertion that nazism as a racial doctrine was offensive to West Germany and that the West German Government opposes any recurrence of antisemitism. The importance of this is that it is widely believed that the recent attacks on Jews throughout the world were Communist inspired.

Von Brentano, in his address before a group of United States Senators, restated West Germany's position, the essence of which is:

1. West Germany favors the unification of Germany, but not as a Soviet satellite.

2. West Germany insists that Berlin should not be absorbed by Communist East Germany which is a satellite of Soviet Russia.

3. West Germany is not to be sacrificed to appease the imperialistic ambitions of the Kremlin.

The policy of the United States has been to build up West Germany as a modern state, associated with France in the Common Market, and as a bulwark against further aggression in Europe by Soviet Russia.

This was the Dulles-Adenauer line which has proven to be historically correct. Any other position imperils France and can lead either to the reduction of Western Europe to a satellite of Soviet Russia, or to forcing West Germany into some kind of an understanding with Soviet Russia which would imperial our economic position in Europe.

The queer thing about all this is that while the United States is wobbling between the British policy of appeasement and the Adenauer-Dulles policy of insistence upon maintaining the right of Germany to its own existence, it is West Germany which is really maintaining the position that the fundamental rights of the United States as the victor in a war be fully respected.

The question is: Do we have to lose everything we fought for in World War II? Does Soviet Rusisa have to have all the gains from World War II? President Eisenhower will have to answer at the summit conference.

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 15, 1960]

A SHOWDOWN WITH KHRUSHCHEV

It is cheering to hear, from the Western foreign ministers who finished their presummit meeting in Washington yesterday, that they have united on a plan for German reunification to be offered to Nikita Khrushchev at the Paris meeting next month.

The reason we consider this encouraging is not that we expect Khrushchev to accept the plan; it is because the plan is right and reasonable and Khrushchev, in rejecting it, will have to accept the position of being wrong and unreasonable.

The West's proposal would give the 17 million Germans living under Russian Communist rule in East Germany an opportunity to vote, in an election to be held under international control, on the question whether they prefer to reunite with West Germany, as the West advocates, or to sign a separate peace treaty with Russia and remain under Communist rule, which is Khrushchev's plan for them.

If Khrushchev actually believed in self-determination for all peoples, as he is always saying he does in his propaganda speeches, he would readily agree to this plebiscite. But as the record in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Baltic States makes clear, Khrushchev believes in conquest and suppression, not in self-determination.

Within the last 2 years he has observed, in moments of angry candor, that East Germany never will cease to be Communist territory and that if Germany ever is unified it will be done by converting West Germany to communism, too.

We hope President Eisenhower, President de Gaulle, and Prime Minister Macmillan will present their East German plebiscite plan as soon as possible after the summit meeting opens May 16. Khrushchev's answer will reveal whether he wants to use the summit meeting to improve international rela-

tionships or just to take the West for another dizzy propaganda ride.

In agreeing to confront Khrushchev with a challenge he will have to meet, Secretary of State Herter, British Foreign Minister Lloyd, French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville, and West German Foreign Minister von Brentano have acted to keep Khrushchev from taking charge of the summit meeting and running it for his own purposes. That is intelligent and decisive diplomacy, the kind the West hasn't practiced too regularly.

A Dangerous Excursion Into State Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANDALL S. HARMON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to my colleagues for perusal, the following editorial from the Muncie Star, Muncie, Ind., April 16, 1960. This editorial aptly points out some ramifications of the civil rights bill which, in my opinion, need to be given contemplative deliberation:

A DANGEROUS EXCURSION

Indications are growing in the U.S. Senate that the fight over a civil rights bill is far from over. The latest report is that Senators are considering at least one major revision in a proposed law which was passed by the House a few days ago. Should this occur, the process of finding common agreement between the Representatives and Senators may take even more time.

The belief that this law will apply only in the South, and only in the parts of the South where Negroes have not been allowed to vote, is not so. Provisions of this plan would make themselves felt at once in Indiana. They would also have direct application in many other States.

Title II of the House proposal makes flight to avoid prosecution for bombing "any building, structure, facility, vehicle, dwelling house, synagogue, church, religious center or educational institution, public, or private," a Federal crime. Under the civil rights law these local incidents could come under Federal police jurisdiction and punishment.

Title III of the proposed law requires voting records and papers to be kept for a period of 2 years. Only a few months ago, an elderly janitor burned ballots in an election in Logansport where fraud was alleged. Such an act could become a Federal offense under the new civil rights plan.

The House bill provides under title I that the obstruction of court orders regarding public schools shall be a Federal offense. An effort will likely be made to include all Federal court orders under this part of the new law, since it may be logically argued that every order should be equally supported by statute.

This would strike hard in the field of organized labor and labor disputes. The section says that any person who "willfully prevents, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with * * * the due exercise of rights * * * under any order, judgment, or decree of a court of the United States * * * shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 60 days, or both." The impact of such a law is obvious.

The previous, which would set up voting referee procedures, are equally open to question. These referees would be given broad powers in the dual capacities of judge and jury. In addition, the courts are directed by this law to act with speed at all times. The speediest action is not always the best in a court of law.

In its entirety, this law represents a dangerous invasion of many areas of life which have nothing to do with the popular concept of civil rights. The application of such a law might be even more of a shock outside the South than in those States toward which this statute is aimed.

Where citizens of any State are being denied the right to vote, they should look to the State laws and courts for relief. A more lasting adjustment of any inequities will come from local action than from Federal intervention.

The civil rights law as it is now proposed represents a dangerous expansion of Federal police power. Certainly it must be revised in order to protect millions of citizens who have not grasped the full meaning of this excursion into State sovereignty.

Democracy in Venezuela: President Betancourt's First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Venezuela's great President, Rómulo Betancourt, made a report to his constituents on February 13, 1960, marking the first anniversary of his inauguration of President.

Today, with pure republican joy—

Said Betancourt—

Venezuela is celebrating the first year of her constitutional government, the government that she herself built with the mortar of her votes. Now the child is no longer kicking in his cradle; he is precociously adult and walks along, placing his feet firmly on the Venezuelan land.

Venezuela is our friend. Venezuela provides an example for many nations who want both freedom and economic development. The Castro government could, if it only would, learn much from Betancourt and his associates.

Next Tuesday Venezuela celebrates the 150th anniversary of its existence. She has suffered through many dark days of tyranny but a brighter day has at last dawned.

Under consent previously granted I am including the entire text of President Betancourt's notable report to the people:

A YEAR OF GOVERNMENT

(By Rómulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela)

(A report to the people on the first anniversary of his Presidential Inauguration, Caracas, February 13, 1960.)

On other occasions I have spoken to the people of Caracas, and over the microphones to the people of Venezuela, as a militant member, a representative, and a candidate of a political party; but today I have come to speak as the director of a coalition government and as President of all Venezuelans. I shall speak to the nation and not just to the political party that I helped to organize and that put forward my candidacy for the Presidency, because as Chief of State I do not belong to any political party but rather to all Venezuelans of all political camps and to those who are not active in any party.

Today, with pure republican joy, Venezuela is celebrating the completion of the first year of her Constitutional Government, the Government that she herself built with the mortar of her votes. Now the child is no longer kicking in his cradle; he is precociously adult and walks along, placing his feet firmly on the Venezuelan land, and he will continue to roam it until April 19, 1964. The celebration of a first anniversary of a constitutional government in a country with a normal republic in existence, where the institutions of government are consolidated, is something that has no special importance, but it certainly has unusual significance in a country like ours, in which most of the governments have been self-elected and very few have reached the Presidential Palace raised up by the only legitimate source of power within the democratic system of government, which is the completely free will of the people expressed in elections.

I find myself among those Venezuelans who are least surprised that the Constitutional Government should have reached its first anniversary, having had to face only passing hours of emergency, because I always had faith that the government that I headed was founded upon bases of granite. Of these granite foundations, the fundamental one has been and will continue to be the decision of 7 million Venezuelans to eradicate forever from our country systems of force and arbitrary action, to be governed by regimes of law within the boundaries set by the inexorable standards of the laws. Moreover, I had faith that this was going to be a government not born under the sign of partisan sectarianism but under that of national unity, represented by the three great parties of the coalition: by Acción Democrática, by Copei, and by the U.R.D., and by the vast majority of Venezuelans who do not belong to any political party and know that they are properly represented within the Cabinet, the State governments, and the Autonomous Institutes, by partyless citizens, politically independent, but who are a guarantee of good service to the Republic.

The Communist Party has been excluded, and will be excluded for the remaining 4 years of my government, from this coalition, and no one can be surprised by this, because that party was implicity excluded from possible cooperation in the Government when the Pact of the National Organization was signed on October 31, 1958. And in this very spot, from this same platform, on December 5, I said that if I came out elected by the vote of the Venezuelans, my government would respect the right of the Communists to act as a party in national life; but that they would not be called upon to collaborate in the Government, nor would they have any influence on the decisions of the Government, because their philosophy is incompatible with the democratic philosophy of the Venezuelan state, and because their position in international politics not only fails to coincide with, but actually runs counter to, clashes with, and struggles against the best national interests of Venezuela.

When Abbé Sieyes, one of the authors of the Declaration of the Rights of Man in the French Revolution, suddenly appeared on the streets of Paris after the days of the Jacobin terror, he was asked what he had been doing during those long months in which the guillotine had functioned so efficiently; he replied ironically: "I survived." This government not only has guaranteed the exercise of the basic freedom, not only

has respected the rights of political and union organizations—700 more unions have been given legal status, and during its time in office the Confederation of Workers of Venezuela and the Farm Workers Confederation of Venezuela have been created—not only has it guaranteed freedom of the press and of broadcast or written information; not only has it eliminated from Venezuela the nightmare of midnight assaults by the National Security Police; not only has it freed the country from fear of the government, for it can be criticized and is criticized openly and freely, every day, in the pages of the press. This Government has done more than all that, which in itself is important. It has also undertaken a fiscal and administrative task, directed not only toward putting an end to the disorder left by 10 years of misgovernment but also toward laying the foundations for a new Venezuela, who will be the master of her own fate.

I shall not tire you now with a mass of figures, for that would be an abuse. The patient parliamentarians, the Honorable Senators and Deputies of the Republic will have the opportunity, on April 19, to listen to that succession of figures that reveal how, in this year of government, a fundamental impetus has been given to the economy, to production, to education, to housing in this country. At the same time a 4-year plan, a coordinated plan of achievements down to 1964, will be submitted to Congress for consideration. This plan has in large part already been drawn up. It will be discussed beforehand by the State Governors in the convention we shall hold on February 22. It will be discussed with the political parties, with the workers, with the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Production, with the Banking Association, with everyone who has a word to say and an opinion to contribute. Because this is a Government not of introspective egocentrics but of people who seek and listen to the reactions of public opinion. This Government bears no man's first name or surname. This is a coalition government, and its success and mistakes are not successes and mistakes of the President of the Republic but successes and mistakes of the cabinet team, on which there are men from Acción Democrática (the Democratic Action Party), from Copei (the Social Christian Party) and from the U.R.D. (the Republican Democratic Union), and politically independent citizens. They are successes and mistakes of a coalition that is not a temporary arrangement but one that we must keep and maintain; for if there is one thing that has done harm to this country, which throughout its sorrowful republican history has been governed most often by imperious and arbitrary despots, it is that, in the limited moments of regimes of law, the political forces have become factions engaged in bitter, cannibalistic, and aggressive controversy. We must call a halt to interparty discord; we men of all political camps and politically independent citizens must all strive to lift Venezuela up, and not go on leaning on the wall of laments for what we have not done for Venezuela.

I have here in my hands the proof that it is possible, through the route of discussion and agreement, and as long as the understanding and agreement among the great national parties is maintained, to reach solutions that are favorable for the Republic. I have here a report that tonight the contract between the oil companies and the Fedepetrol (the oil workers union) will be signed. This contract means a raise in wages, salaries, and social benefits for the workers of the black gold, estimated at 330 million bolívares. And this was reached through the normal system of bargaining between the parties and without the foundations of the national economy being shaken by a strike such as that which went on for so many months between the steel companies and workers in the United States. This agreement shows the truth of the thesis maintained by the Government I head, that there are two ways of showing nationalism: the demagogic, loquacious, shouting nationalism; or the nationalism that, defending the interests of Venezuela and its workers, is not importing from abroad what has been well defined as "strategic hatred."

This leads me directly to state our position in regard to foreign capital. Our policy is well defined. We consider that we cannot fully develop our sources of wealth with Venezuelan savings alone, and that this is particularly dangerous, because with the advances of modern technology, riches that are not developed today may within a few years be obsolete (to use a word for which people have poked fun at me). But our position is well defined: foreign capital will come to Venezuela, not to aspire to special privileges or to expect that we should behave like the ingenuous aborigines of the 15th century who exchanged their gold for glass necklaces. We are aware of the value of our riches and we are not inclined to surrender them to the first bidder at whatever price he offers.

The second thesis is that we shall guide everyone who wants to invest money in Venezuela toward those branches of production in which there is no native Venezuelan development of our own; and in any case we shall establish as a necessary condition that he endeavor to associate himself with Venezuelan capital. But at the same time we are not adopting an attitude of unbending and aggressive xenophobic zeal, because if we did we would end up isolated in a world in which the underdeveloped, or insufficiently developed countries are seeking the cooperation of foreign capital to develop their own sources of wealth. We have a very well defined and very clear position toward the oil companies; they are here; they have more than $2 billion invested in this country's basic industry; they are paying high taxes, the taxes established by a decree that did honor to the Provisional Junta of Government; they are paying their workers high wages; they will have no further concessions in Venezuela, because so long as I govern not one centimeter of Venezuelan territory * * * (applause drowned out the end of the sentence).

We are going to establish the national petroleum enterprise, which is already being studied by the National Energy Commission created by the Government to coordinate all aspects of the production of energy in the country. The national petroleum company is going to act as an explorer and refiner of the black oil, for, 30 years after the establishment of the oil industry in this country, it is a shame for Venezuelans that we do not directly manage any part of the production. Every time that the stability of petroleum prices, and simultaneously the income of the Venezuelan nation, has been threatened, we have acted with decision. Thus we presented a carefully thought-out critical memorandum to the Government of Great Britain, when a company connected with the Crown lowered prices; and thus we went, without consulting any foreign ministry or any oil company, to the Pan-Arab Congress of the Middle East, which met in Egypt, to try to work out a front of the producing countries in order to maintain a high, stable price for the crude oil that both the Middle Eastern countries and we produce.

That is our nationalism, a nationalism that serves the interests of Venezuela and not the interests of a power that is not Venezuelan. The decision made by the Government of Venezuela, with the support of the parties of the coalition, to contract for a loan of some $200 million in the United States, is no deviation from that nationalistic line. The origin of this loan is very clear, fellow countrymen. We inherited from the dictatorship some very high budgets that were not in line with the real revenues of the country. The deficits of those budgets, which in part went to the private pockets and accounts of the beneficiaries of the regime, were covered by the system of debts, of invisible debts, which amounted to almost 5 billion bolívares, and which the provisional government and ours have had to pay. The country was told that part of the 1959–60 budget was to be covered by an internal loan; but the contraction of banking activity came along, not as a result of a bankers' conspiracy, but because the banks, in 1959, lent 1 billion bolívares more than in 1958. So the internal loan was no longer possible. And there are a number of basic works in progress that cannot be halted. Money must be given to the development corporation so that it will help to give impetus to the accelerated industrial development of the country, accelerated to the extent that last year 50 million bolívares more than in 1958 were invested in industry, and industrial jobs increased by 126,000. Money must be given to the Workers' Bank, so that it can continue to carry out its plan all over the Republic—a 260 million bolívares investment plan already underway—through loans and building, not only in Caracas with apartment houses, but in 80 towns distributed all over the Republic. Money must be given to the National Agrarian Institute, because the day after tomorrow the agrarian reform law will be promulgated by Congress and in the evening of the same day in which it is promulgated, in a solemn act at Miraflores Palace, it will receive the Presidential order that it be put into effect, as we thus fulfill one of the forgotten codicils of the agrarian testament of Simón Bolívar. And this money is needed to continue useful works, because we are not building more cable cars or more Guaicamacuto Hotels here now; instead, schools are being built; hospitals are being built; aqueducts and dams, highways and local roads are being built.

Under these circumstances, it will be necessary to take this loan which will be the first and last short-term loan that will be taken under the Government that I head, and which will be paid in full on April 1, 1964. We are not alienating our sovereignty, any more than Nehru's India is alienating her sovereignty when, as it has been reported, it has arranged a loan of 360 million rubles from Russia. We do not make arrangements for loan in rubles, because the ruble lacks purchasing power in the dollar area, which is the area in which we operate. But neither Nehru's India nor our Venezuela is mortgaging its sovereignty by making use of credit. More than this, fellow countrymen. In the 4-year plan to be presented to the National Congress on April 19, a minimum program is foreseen, that can be carried out with national resources, in three areas—electrification, irrigation, and telecommunications. But we have begun conversations with international agencies (not private banks) to see whether it is possible for us to carry out national electrification more rapidly, to carry out a program of damming water more rapidly, because in this country there cannot be really developed agriculture and cattleraising so long as we have barely 20,000 hectares with permanent irrigation and we are subject to the alternatives of drought and rains. And finally, a telecommunications plan that would let us maintain communication with each other in this immense geographic area of 1 million square kilometers. If it is possible it finance the execution of more aggressive plans of electrification, irrigation, and telecommunications in the next 4 years through the International Bank, I shall be most willing

to tell the country that we are contracting for a large loan to be paid in 25 years, but that the present generations will already begin to benefit from a powerful resulting advance in economic development and general welfare.

This would make it possible for ordinary expenditures that were to be devoted to electrification, dams, and telecommunications to be invested in agrarian reform; in the housing program; in increasing the number of hospital beds, because we have an extraordinary shortage of them; in giving drinking water to the hundreds of towns and thousands of villages of Venezuela that are dying of thirst. And all this can be put before you, before the Venezuelan nation, because there may be doubts about the purposes toward which the money from a loan is to be applied, but the people of Venezuela have no doubt about the honesty of those who are now managing the taxpayers' money. On October 18, 1946, then as President of a de facto government, before an enormous crowd similarly assembled in El Silencio, I said something that I want to repeat here now: that I, and my cabinet ministers, and my closest collaborators, can show our hands for you to see whether there is on them the mark of 1 single misappropriated bolivar.

It is rumored in the centers of street gossip, that percentages are still being taken, that there are Government officials who are profiting from trade in influence; but I want to say here, publicly, to 7 million Venezuelans, that if administrative immorality still survives (to a much smaller degree than formerly) it is due to lack of decision by the Venezuelan people themselves. A tribunal on illicit enrichment is operating, to which anyone can go to denounce any official, whatever his rank and position, whatever the political party in which he is active, who has suggested a dishonest deal to him. We do not have a radar system in Miraflores that will reach throughout the Republic to locate which official is dishonest or venal; but the thousand eyes of Argus of the Venezuelan people must point out and single out whoever is not meeting the inflexible standards of administrative morality that we are obliged to observe, because this was a promise of all the parties, because it is the vehement desire of all the Venezuelans, because it is an indispensable necessity of public morality and administrative health.

Fellow citizens, I have been talking a long time. I would like to refer to what our foreign policy has been. This foreign policy has been identified with a sense of national responsibility and of respect for the very profound and vehement desire of our people for the solidarity of the Americas. In foreign policy, in the United Nations, we have vigorously supported the longings for self-government and freedom of the Asian and African peoples who are still under the domination of European nations, and in this we are loyally following the tradition that was bequeathed to us by the anticolonial generation of 1810. At an appropriate time, because the instrument involved must still be drawn up, we are going to present in the United Nations a proposal for a convention under which money embezzled from peoples by their unscrupulous rulers might be pursued wherever they may have deposited it. We maintain relations of cordial friendship with the democratic governments of America, a position of discreet diplomatic coolness toward certain dictatorships, and a definitely belligerent attitude toward the one that is the shame of America and a mockery of the regional juridical system. We have rendered a great service to America by submitting to the Council of the Organization of American States a denunciation of the violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic, and we shall not let up until that Government shall be eradicated from an Organization that, according to its Charter, is composed only (or should be composed only) of governments born of direct, universal, and secret voting, of governments that respect human rights.

Our international relations are also directed toward seeking agreements and understandings in the economic field with the countries of our own race and language. Let us remember the still-valid precept of Simón Bolivar: "Only the union of the Latin peoples of America will make them great and respectable in the eyes of other nations." Faithful to that line of thought, we have established mixed commissions, with the Governments of Colombia, Ecuador, and Panama, that are studying agreements of a commercial and a cultural nature. In my conversations with the President of Mexico, there was nothing frivolous or trivial; and we reached basic agreements that will permit a greater flow of economic relations between Mexico and Venezuela.

Fellow citizens, I do not wish to say (because it is not my custom to use the platform to utter falsehoods) that the problems of Venezuela have been solved in this year of government. Today a newspaperman asked me what was the most moving moment for me during this year of government, and I added that, in addition to that unforgettable, stellar moment in which I received the tricolor sash (of the Presidency) from my good friend Dr. Raúl Leoni, emotional moments recurred every time that, in my frequent contact with the people of Caracas and the interior of the Republic, I was surrounded by the fervent cordiality of my fellow citizens, even though they knew that their problems had not been solved. We have not been able to put an end to unemployment, for a problem dating from so many years cannot be solved in 12 months; but those who say there is more unemployment now than on February 13, 1959, are lying. The unemployment has not been absorbed, but we are painstakingly endeavoring to absorb it. The principal unemployment in Caracas is of construction workers, and we are giving indorsements and direct loans to a series of enterprises so that they will take in workers. We are discussing with the Construction Industry Chamber the possibility of beginning some large works on deferred payment, to absorb unemployment. And the Government has engaged in long discussions about the rents law before presenting it to the Congress, because we are seeking a formula that will at the same time guarantee a logical and fair rent reduction and a stimulus to private initiative in the construction industry.

The price of medicines has already been lowered, and in the last few weeks we have been carrying on an allout battle against speculation and profiteering, to prevent speculation in essential items. Although we are convinced that we can put an end to the chronic calamity of the high cost of living in Venezuela only with vigorous development of agricultural and livestock production, there are palliatives that can be applied, and they are being applied. But the success achieved in the campaign against profiteering and speculation underlines the fact that the instruments and resources of the Government are not sufficient to meet the problem alone. The whole community must cooperate and collaborate with the Government. Those one thousand women who assembled at a Caracas radio station to offer themselves as volunteer, unpaid inspectors in the fight against profiteering and speculation in essential items, the efforts already seen for the formation of consumers' cooperatives, all these things show that the Venezuelan citizenry is convinced that the Government alone, with only its own resources, cannot solve all the problems. And I must say here that this struggle against speculation and profiteering will never lead the Government to the sale of articles below their reasonable cost, because we do not want to ruin small business, the retail trade, in which there are some speculators and profiteers, but the vast majority of whose members are earning their living honorably behind the counter of a grocery shop.

Fellow countrymen, A few words on a problem that has arisen and that cannot be evaded. I have seen with alarm the emergence of a certain aggressiveness or xenophobia toward the immigrant. The Government is enforcing, and will continue to enforce, strictly, the provisions regarding the percentage of Venezuelans there must be in every establishment, whether of construction, commercial, or industrial, in the country. But this does not mean that anxiety is being sown in Venezuela, an open and hospitable country, about people who live here, have their families here, and have children who were born in Venezuela and are, therefore, themselves Venezuelans. Therefore I wish to call upon the people of Venezuela to adopt an attitude of understanding and welcome toward the hard-working immigrant; because we have quietly been sending the gamblers (the Bureau of Foreigners is already taking care of them) out of the country by dozens, because we do not need them here.

I would like to pay tribute here publicly to a Yugoslav with a complicated name, who is known in the plains of Portuguesa simply as "Mitar." He has won the prize for conservation of renewable natural resources. This Yugoslav has reforested 500 hectares of lands along the banks and headwaters of the Araure River, and now abundant water is assured for the aqueducts of Araure and Acarigua. He has been a guide in a job that we are carrying out all over the country, a silent work, a work that is not seen by the tourist's passing glance, a work that is not so spectacular as the cablecars. There are 5 million for this work in the special budget, and perhaps there will be 15 in the next one. Fellow countrymen, the task is to reforest the headwaters of the rivers, to reforest the headwaters of the Tuy River, the Tocuyo River, the Andean Rivers. The inexorable, merciless, and criminal cutting of the forests is one of the reasons, along with the administrative irresponsibility of the dictatorship, why Caracas is suffering from the present water shortage. Incidentally, I wish to tell you that there will also be restrictions on water consumption in the coming year, but in 1962, when we will have completed a large dam, the sufferings of the population of Caracas in regard to water will end.

Before concluding, I want to mention one institution and three men. That institution is the armed forces. I said on December 5, 1958, in this same place, that if I were elected by the people of Venezuela I would have the support of the country and of the armed forces. I repeated this systematically each time that one of those regrettable outbreaks of street disturbances occurred, which it was necessary to repress, because under my government, today and tomorrow and until 1964, there will be democracy and public freedoms, but not riots and anarchy. I said that I had confidence in the apolitical and obedient attitude of the armed forces, and that the civil power and my position (inherent in the rank of chief of state) of commander in chief of the armed forces would be respected by them. I have no reason to regret those words, spoken on various occasions. Events have shown that only a very small number of members of the armed forces have lent themselves to conspiratorial intrigue, and those who have done so have received the disciplinary punishment the laws of Venezuela provide. At the same time that I say this, I want to call upon Venezuelans once more, so that, as we have eradicated interparty acrimony in political controversies, we may make that absurd division between military men and civilians become less noticeable every day. We are

all Venezuelans, with a single commitment and a single obligation. And the professor who teaches his anatomy course at Central University, the worker in the Matanzas steel mill, or the industrialist who is running his factory is just as worthy of respect as the aviator, the sailor, the infantry officer who is working every day to prepare competent armed forces that will guarantee the borders of Venezuela against any foreign aggression and the democratic public order that the people of Venezuela have given themselves.

I am also going to make a public eulogy of the leaders of the three parties of the coalition, in whom I have found efficient collaborators and men of good faith, as eager as I to push Venezuela along the road of institutional stability. They are: Dr. Jóvito Villalba, leader of the Unión Republicana Democrática, whom I sent as my personal representative on a journey of rapprochement and unity with the peoples of South America; Dr. Rafael Caldera, leader of the Copei Party and president of the Chamber of Deputies; and Dr. Raúl Leoni, president of the Senate and leader of Acción Democrática Party.

Fellow citizens, on April 19 of this year we shall celebrate the 150th anniversary of the first day of the movement for the emancipation of our América. It is a time for reflection, for examination of our consciences, to ask ourselves whether it is enough for the Venezuelans of today to hold great patriotic festivals and make speeches recalling Bolívar, Salias, and Emparan; to speak once again of the reveilles of Carabobo, Pantano de Vargas, and Ayacucho; whether this is the time to continue inebriating ourselves with the heady liquor of the Epic, and, as a people, living on the interest from the deeds performed by the heroes of yesterday; or whether it is time for us, the Venezuelans of today, to offer our own lives to carry out our own crusade, a crusade without martial fanfare, which is the collective enterprise of creative action, the collective enterprise of constructive work. This enterprise requires us to begin by recognizing that this people cannot achieve the return of its destiny if we do not cease to be such nouveaux riches and such a mining country, a people that becomes so alarmed because a tax is levied on foreign liquors and luxury articles; a people that is classed as one of those in the world where the people buy most new automobiles; a people in which it is often supposed that democracy is only a matter of rights, and not of corresponding duties. I want to make here a call to work, to creative work. Let us put aside goldbricking, frivolity, spendthrift nouveau-richisme. Let us realize that we need to build a fatherland, and that we have the qualities and abilities to do it. We have extraordinary resources. Our present monetary and fiscal resources are such that our international reserves amount to 2 billion bolívares—$700 million—which is larger than those of Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico. We have a budget of 5 to 6 billion bolívares, which is double the budget of Mexico. We have extraordinary resources of wealth: there is our Guayana, which is going to be, as I once said right here, the Pittsburgh or the Ruhr of Venezuela. There has just been discovered, located, an iron hill belonging to the nation, that has twice the amount of iron that Cerro Bolívar has, 360 million tons of iron. We will have the capacity, within a few years, to produce up to 5 billion kilowatts of electricity at a price of less than 1 céntimo of a bolívar per kilowatt-hour. But to attain the development of this potential wealth, and for us to use and transform this potential wealth with our own efforts, we must put aside frivolity; we must demand less of the Government and give more to Venezuela; let us remember the generation of the liberators, which followed Simón Bolívar, abandoning families and interests, giving their very lives for a great Venezuelan ideal.

Fellow citizens, at one of the most emotionally charged moments in my life, when I met the Venezuelan people once more after 9 years of exile, I said on this spot that there are stellar moments in the lives of peoples, moments in which they keep a date with their own destiny. This is one of the stellar moments of Venezuela, one of the moments in which it keeps a date with its own destiny: 150 years after the shout of 1810, let us Venezuelans be capable of being consistent and loyal to the obligating heritage left us by the generation that was sacrificed.

Home of Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the genius of Thomas Alva Edison has been a force for the betterment of the lives of people throughout the world. Through his efforts, a new way of life was hastened into being; his gift for invention gave us new light for the world, new enjoyment of our leisure time, and new methods of doing things better than they had been done before.

We of New Jersey are proud that the Wizard of Menlo Park worked so long and so productively at laboratories in our State, and we are particularly happy, I believe, that the National Park Service is preparing Edison's home at West Orange, N.J., for its opening this summer as a museum. His home will be a constant reminder to all Americans of his part in the history of progress.

An article by George Cable Wright in the April 17 issue of the New York Times tells of the preparations now underway at the Edison Home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDISON HOME IN JERSEY TO OPEN AS A MUSEUM—WEST ORANGE MANSION LITTLE CHANGED IN YEARS SINCE INVENTOR'S DEATH

(By George Cable Wright)

WEST ORANGE, N.J.—Rising majestically on an attractive hillside in Llewellyn Park here is an imposing mansion of red brick and clapboard. Secluded by tall pines, and a profusion of shrubbery, the dwelling is barely visible as the visitor enters the winding, tree-studded lane that leads from Park Avenue.

The many gabled, gray slate roof and towering brick chimneys—some rise more than 12 feet above the highest gable—provide the first glimpse of the 23-room Victorian mansion. Its graveled drive snakes impressively across a wide expanse of green lawn to a portico that shields the cut-stone front steps.

These lead to a porch with ornamental tile flooring and walls of molded brick and, beyond, to a massive front door of solid oak.

This is the estate called Glenmont, the home in which Thomas Alva Edison lived from 1886 until his death on October 18, 1931, and which he presented to Mina Miller, his second wife, as a wedding gift.

EIGHTY-EIGHT-YEAR-OLD HOME

This 88-year-old residence is an outstanding example of gracious living in the Victorian era. The Edison family has donated the home to the Federal Government, and it is now being restored by the National Park Service as a memorial museum and monument to the inventor. The Service hopes to be able to open it to the public early this summer.

A recent tour of the mansion showed that little has been changed since the death of Mr. Edison. Hardly a book, knick-knack, memento or treasured possession of the inventor has been disturbed. The home itself has been meticulously cared for by servants of the Edison family; in fact, it is difficult to believe that it is occupied only by caretakers.

The front door leads into a large, L-shaped entrance hall. In one of the hall's oak walls is a glittering fireplace of brass and French mosaic tiles; above the fireplace is a large oak relief depicting the full battle regalia of a medieval knight. At either side of this, resting on the broad mantel, are hand-painted oriental vases that were presented to Mr. Edison by the Japanese Government many years ago.

From one side of the hall rises the broad staircase of red mahogany. This leads to the bedrooms on the second and third floors. The staircase landing is lighted by an oversized stained-glass window bearing the figure of a peasant woman weaving multicolored yarn. Large oil portraits of Mr. Edison and his son, Charles, a former Governor of New Jersey, hang in the hall.

On the right side of the entrance hall is a small library. The original portieres of brown velvet still hang at either side of the archway leading to this room, just as they have since 1886. Shiny brass andirons, embossed with lions, jut from the library's hearth of blue tile, and bookcases line the walls. This room is furnished in the Victorian manner.

To the left of the hall is a reception room that contains the rosewood organ Mr. Edison enjoyed playing even though he was deaf. This room also has Victorian furniture.

The massive drawing room is furnished in hand-carved ornate rosewood and its walls are blanketed in gold brocade. The dining room is furnished in Victorian mahogany. In a glass case in the dining room is a porcelain incense burner that was presented to Mr. Edison by the King of Siam. The china cabinet is filled with a collection of glassware from all parts of the world.

DEN IS LARGE

The largest room on the first floor is the den. Its walls are of green plaster and are paneled in oak. On a small table at one side of the room is a piece of the original Atlantic cable laid by Cyrus Field and a brass desk set presented to Mr. Edison by the Krupp Munitions Works in Germany. The inkwell is a miniature cannon, and the pen holders are encased in shells.

On another table lies a large album of photographs taken by Mr. and Mrs. Edison on a visit to Hungary in 1911. An interesting feature of this room, in which the Edisons did most of their entertaining, is a 200-year-old megalethoscope. This is a kind of stereoscope with a large magnifying lens. The megalethoscope is equipped with colored slides and is still in working order. Near it stand marble and bronze statues of Cossack soldiers, a gift from Czar Nicholas II of Russia.

On the second floor, the large center hall leads to five-family bedrooms and another living room. The main bedroom has plaster walls colored in a soft tan and a plaster ceil-

ing decorated with flower buds. Hanging from the ceiling is a crystal chandelier. Again, the furniture is Victorian. A full-length mirror centered between marble-top tables served as Mrs. Edison's dressing table. Carpeting of a dark plum hue covers the floor.

"THOUGHT DESK"

The second-floor living room contains Mr. Edison's oak-topped desk, which he often described as his "thought desk." It was while sitting in his overstuffed gold and russet chair here that he conceived many inventions.

The shelves on the wall behind Mr. Edison's desk are filled with scientific books, many of them containing his marginal notes. On his desk is a plaster of Paris cast of his hand and a brass inkwell.

Mrs. Edison's desk is just across the room. Nearby are her bookshelves containing biographies and works on nature and music.

The 13-acre estate is less than a quarter-mile from the Edison Laboratories and Museum on Main Street. Also on the premises are a six-car garage and a greenhouse.

The New York Times and Irresponsible Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Monday, April 18, I called the attention of the House to two articles which appeared in the New York Times on April 12 and 13, written by one Harrison E. Salisbury, which purported to give an accurate account of the race situation in Birmingham, Ala., my district. These articles are, in fact, among the most vicious slanders of a community of decent people that have ever come to my attention.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another editorial from the Birmingham Post-Herald, this one of Saturday, April 16, 1960, dealing with the irresponsible conduct of Mr. Salisbury and the New York Times in running these biased, distorted, and bigoted articles. The editorial is entitled "Who Will Protest?" and is as follows:

WHO WILL PROTEST?

There are many citizens in our community in a position to refute the charges brought against it in the articles which appeared this week in the New York Times under the byline of Harrison Salisbury. Among them are many reputable Negro citizens who know that the picture painted by Mr. Salisbury is a distortion of the truth and a gross slander.

Certainly many white citizens, outraged by the Times' irresponsibility, will write in protest to its publisher, Arthur Hayes Sulzberger. But is it too much to expect some of our responsible Negro leaders to do likewise?

Mr. Sulzberger and the Times will have done a great disservice to newspapers and newspaper people in general if the Salisbury slanders against Birmingham are left uncorrected.

What Mr. Salisbury seems irked about is what the people of Alabama have done to meet the challenge hurled at them and the problems created by vote-hungry politicians and a Supreme Court which ignores both the Constitution and the law.

If the majority of the people of Alabama find it serves the public welfare to abolish certain counties and create new ones, is that not the business of the people of Alabama?

If as a last resort against an integrated school system the people themselves decide to abolish the public schools and to establish a new system of education, is that not the business of the people of Alabama?

The Supreme Court may in time rule otherwise. If it should and if the people of the United States show no more concern than they have over the tortured 1954 decision then we might as well forget about States rights?

Mr. Salisbury is a very clever writer. He knew what he was looking for and he knows how to bend and to twist facts so as to leave the impression he wants to leave.

He cites John Crommelin to prove the prevalence of prejudice, bigotry, and hate. He is careful to cover himself by pointing out that the Crommelin viewpoint is "deplored by many violent segregationists." But then he adds that its acceptance, however, is far wider than will be publicly admitted.

What Mr. Salisbury didn't tell his New York Times readers was that Crommelin in his race for Governor in 1958, the last time he sought public support, polled 218 votes in Jefferson County and in the State as a whole less than 2,300 votes out of a total of 618,000.

That in Mr. Salisbury's book we suppose is "wide acceptance" because it suits his purpose.

It is typical of his whole report.

Reluctantly, one begins to wonder whether it is typical of the Times.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the United Mine Workers Journal of April 15, 1960, contains an excellent editorial emphasizing that the real struggle between our democratic society and the Communist system is a struggle to preserve and protect human dignity and freedom.

In language as strong and vigorous as the United Mine Workers of America's own record of leadership to strengthen the freedom and dignity of America's mineworkers, the editorial explains the meaning of loyalty and freedom for every American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "May 1 Is Loyalty Day in America, So What Are We Loyal to and Why?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1 IS LOYALTY DAY IN AMERICA; SO WHAT ARE WE LOYAL TO AND WHY?

May 1 now has a special meaning for Americans. For a long time now this day has been thought of only as a Communist holiday. But, thanks to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, May 1, in this country, officially became Loyalty Day 2 years ago.

Loyalty to what?

The simplest way to express it is that loyalty means freedom.

And freedom is not just a word to the United Mine Workers of America and other American workers.

Loyalty and freedom to American coal miners are very real things. They are things that had to be fought for by individual mineworkers through the collective strength of the United Mine Workers of America.

Without loyalty to our American institutions we would not have freedom to join together to battle for high wages, better working conditions, safety, pensions, medical care, and all the other things that American coal miners enjoy.

These are hard-won privileges and the fight for even better conditions will go on. But it can go on only if we stay loyal to our free institutions so that we may continue to enjoy the rights of free men.

The occasion of Loyalty Day is an excellent time to ask ourselves what men have in the other part of the world—the Communist part.

COMMUNIST MENACE EXPOSED IN 1920'S

Long ago, because of the wisdom of the leadership of the United Mine Workers of America, Communists and communism were denounced and officially outlawed in our organization. The UMWA took an official stand in opposition to communism back in the 1920's and was the first organization in America—labor or otherwise—to expose this menace to freedom and to individual human dignity.

Our union has been kept clear of these destroyers of human freedom. But, though they were, long ago, unable to capture the minds of American coal miners or win any permanent power in American labor, the Communists still work hard at the business of preaching disloyalty to American ideals and institutions.

May 1 in many countries is a so-called workers' holiday that has been captured by the Communists and used as the occasion to propagandize their diabolical work.

This year, except for Moscow, probably the largest Communist demonstration will be held in Havana, Cuba, with the approval of the Castro government.

"Delegates" will descend on Havana from all parts of the Communist world, sent there by Communist organizations, we suppose, as part of the "deal" engineered by Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan during his visit to Cuba.

The "delegates'" rallying cry will be based on the phony mouthings of Khrushchev that "The workers of all countries and nations are brothers, linked by bonds of class solidarity. They are the powerful army of the world proletariat, endowed with the great historic mission of leading mankind to communism."

Now, there's nothing wrong with the idea that workers are brothers. It sounds nice. But the rest of that statement is a great big Communist lie and typical of the Communist propaganda technique.

The proletariat, which is a fancy Marxian word for working people, do not rule the Soviet Union and they never have. The Soviet Union is ruled by a political bureaucracy of bully boys—the biggest one the world ever has known.

And the first thing the Communist bullies do when they take over is smash the free labor unions and replace them with company unions, loyal only to the bureaucrats.

And thus the great privilege of free men to protest against intolerable working conditions was taken from them.

SOVIET STATE CREATED NEW CLASS OF OPPRESSORS

Under the Communist system an entire new class has emerged, composed of party members, the secret police, and the dictatorial bureaucrats. The new class constitutes the Communist state, and thus makes the state, to quote Karl Marx, "* * * an organ of class domination, an organ of oppression of one class by another."

There is nothing more alien to American ideals and to the workingman's own fundamental belief in himself and his own dignity and his privileges as a freeman than such a system.

But that is what Comrade K. and the Communists want to sell us and other free peoples.

The downfall of our system of free enterprise, prophesied by Marx and his collaborator Frederich Engels nearly 100 years ago, has not happened. And there is no evidence that it will happen. Free enterprise has not collapsed in the countries communism has taken over; rather, the Communists have seized power by military force.

The nations of the free world continue to live in peaceful competition with one another—in denial of the theories of Marx.

But the Communist leaders continue to deceive people with the big lie that capitalism will destroy itself despite the living proof of its healthy existence. That is not to say that our system does not have problems and probably always will have.

But as long as the people have freedom to work for the solution of these problems through democratic procedures there is hope for solutions.

Communist leaders preach that capitalism will disintegrate; that this system has within the seeds of its own destruction.

But the Communist leaders themselves do not believe this. They have refuted the theories of Karl Marx time and time again. They provide incentive wages, for example, to encourage and develop specialists. Well, the free enterprise countries sort of invented this one and good wages and working conditions have helped to make America the great industrial Nation it is.

The bullies in the Kremlin, zealots that they are, have taken unto themselves the role of dictators of mankind's destiny without having found solutions to their own pressing problems.

As a matter of fact many of the economic problems of the Communist countries have been solved by engineers and technicians from the capitalist countries who were paid good, high salaries to do the job.

Of course, the Communists lie about it and claim they invented or perfected these things.

The attempted speedup of productivity in coal mining in the Soviet Union—which hasn't worked very well so far—was to be an example for other industrial workers to follow. The equipment used was designed by Americans or patterned after American equipment.

Unlike American coal miners, Russian coal miners have no right to demand through their "union" that the benefits of the increased productivity of the mechanized equipment be shared by the workers. The Russian coal miner, if he objects to inhuman speedup, cannot protest. At least he'd better not try. His so-called "union" certainly isn't about to go to bat for him. The Communist bureaucrats—the bosses, in other words—decide the wages and working conditions and safety standards and hours of work and rate of production and all the other matters. In America, these vital matters are decided by free men through collective bargaining.

The leaders of the so-called labor unions in the Soviet Union are the bosses of the Communist Party. They are not interested in the human needs and problems of coal miners or other workers.

In America our union leaders are coal miners such as John L. Lewis, Thomas Kennedy, Tony Boyle and John Owens. Their jobs are to better the conditions of the miners not the interests of some political party. Where is there a union man in a Communist country comparable to John L. Lewis?

The Russian coal miner is living in a "company town," buying his grub from a "company store" and obeying the dictates of the company bosses without question, because in Russia the Communist Party is the company.

The only way the Russian coal miner can dig himself out of this morass is to become a big wheel in the Communist Party—a nobleman in the new aristocracy of Russia.

So, American coal miners can say with pride: "We are loyal to America and its institutions because loyalty means freedom."

Address by George Killion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks a speech made recently in Denver, Colo., by my good friend, George Killion, president of the American President Lines and chairman of the committee of American steamship lines.

George Killion has made a great contribution to the maritime industry of the United States. He appreciates its importance to our economy and to our national defense. He has not been silent in his efforts to educate the people of this country to the necessity for an adequate and efficient merchant marine.

Here is Mr. Killion's speech. From his long experience he gives us the benefit of his thinking as well as that of his colleagues who are all doing so much to maintain the security of our country and to foster and increase our foreign exports—without them we could not live:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman ROGERS, and so forth, being here in Denver for this 2-day meeting sponsored by your very effective chamber of commerce has—in addition to the many benefits of the meeting itself—a very personal reward for me. That is the pleasure of a homecoming. Congratulations on the fine weather—like San Francisco.

Coming home is something all of us who venture forth to seek new horizons should do more often—for horizons begin at home, and it is good for us to return to our starting point, our old stamping grounds—to reevaluate in the light of experience our early ambitions and our efforts to make those ambitions come true.

I am very proud to be a native Coloradoan, and I always look back with great pleasure to my childhood days in this State. I only hope all of you have as happy memories of your early years on this planet as I do.

They started for me up at Steamboat Springs, in Routt County. Later, at Grand Valley, I used to punch cattle on my father's ranch. And although those early cattle trails turned into roads of international travel for me, my affection for this vigorous, beautiful Rocky Mountain empire has never lessened.

Yes, it is, indeed, good to come back to this land where men are men and women, thank Heaven, are still women.

I find a special pleasure in returning this time because I am in the company of my associate in the steamship industry. Why should a group of steamship men gather in Denver? No cargo ships tie up at the foot of Lookout Mountain. No cruise ships call at the Garden of the Gods. But the products of your farms and your ranches, your plants and factories and mines do go down to the sea in ships just as surely as do those from the great coastal areas of this Nation.

Just as my personal horizon began at home here in Colorado, so do the horizons of Denver and the State, and all this fast growing area, stretch far beyond the Rockies, far beyond the Great Plains, into the exotic reaches of the many seas.

During 1958 one-twelfth of all the movable goods produced in the United States was exported. Colorado's estimated share of that foreign trade was $85 million. For example, you sent to foreign markets an estimated $46 million worth of processed foods, aircraft, machinery, primary metals, chemicals, and fabricated metals. Your farmers exported some $29 million worth of wheat, barley, and corn. Your miners exported approximately $10 million worth of molybdenum ore.

About 35 percent of the Gardiner-Denver Co. production is shipped abroad. Gates Rubber Co.—Denver's largest employer—siphons from 1 to 2 month's production into export channels each year.

Land levelers go out to the world from Eversman Manufacturing Co. Mobile shovels from Quick Way Truck Shovel Co. are just one of the lines in Rocky Mountain Export Co.'s annual $3 million export business.

Swayder luggage, Superior honey, Franklin cattle serum, Band-It pressure clamps, and Frankel typewriter ribbons are found on farms, in factories, and in homes around the world.

Frankly, I suspect that you agree with me that statistics too many times can be little more than static. But these statistics are alive. They are part of the lifeblood of this, one of the fastest growing areas in the Nation. They live not only in the ledgers of the exporters involved, they live also in the paychecks of some 138,000 of their employees, and in the paychecks of many other thousands of workers in supporting industries and trades.

Yes, we shipping men have a reason for being here in Denver other than the exhilarating one of breathing your mile-high air and revelling in your majestic mountains. We have a good solid business reason. We want this region, and all inland regions to profit with us from an increased foreign trade, and we have the organization, the informational service, the contacts to help you share in that increase.

Moreover, we have a patriotic reason for discussing foreign trade with you. It has been said before, but it can't be said too often—the merchant marine of these United States is the fourth arm of our national defense. In the Seaboard States we live daily with this truth. It is no less a truth in the teeming, productive inland areas of this beautiful country of ours.

Singularly blessed as this Nation is in natural resources, it no longer is completely self-sufficient—certainly not if we cherish a standard of living unmatched anywhere else in the world. In 1950 we reached for the first time the point where our consumption of raw materials exceeded our production. Just as our increasingly productive economy needs the evergrowing

markets of the world, so do we need the products available to us in those markets.

On our ability to participate in the commerce of the world depends, to a very great extent, this Nation's future as the warm fortress of freedom in a world chilled by the winds of a calculatingly cruel cold war.

On our ability to keep a favorable balance between foreign aid and our own economy, between our merchant marine and the ships flying foreign flags, between the controlled economy of the iron curtained East and the free economy of the West, depends our very survival.

We didn't have that ability during World War I. To "save the world for democracy", as we said then, we had to call upon Britain and all of our Allies to furnish the ships that would transport our troops and supplies—at tremendous cost. Again in World War II, and in the Korean tragedy, we saw the necessity for having always ready and active a well established merchant marine.

There is more, indeed, than just economic self-interest expressed in those slogans: "Buy American," "Sell American," "Ship American." There is good, common logistical sense; an understanding of the realities of world commerce.

If Nikita Khrushchev's unforgettable visit taught us nothing more, it should have made clear to all of us that the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is out to take us by economic means if possible, by military means if necessary.

We can't afford to take lightly the words from the Kremlin. We laughed at "Mein Kampf", and Adolph Hitler danced a Satanic jig over fallen France.

Now Comrade K. taunts us with his intent to bury us under an avalanche of trade—an economic funeral that would be just as final as a military ceremony.

Of the truth of Khrushchev's claims as to his nuclear stockpile, we can only guess. More tangible is the evidence that Russia is building a mighty merchant fleet of the most modern design—much of it nuclear powered. Ready to protect this merchant armada, and a fast-growing powerful navy are some 500 submarines, now roaming the seas of the world—at least 150 of them in the Pacific Ocean.

This merchant fleet, and its protective underwater escort, is out to capture an ever larger portion of the trade between free as well as satellite nations. It would be as foolish for us to close our eyes to this steadily increasing Russian invasion of the world of trade as it would be to try to wish away their superiority in the fantastic new arena of space.

Nor, unfortunately, can we afford to ignore the more peacefully motivated competition for world trade that is being offered by other nations of the world.

Consider Japan. Today that island nation has one of the greatest merchant fleets of the world—built entirely since the war. And Japan has plans for new ships that will exceed all present U.S. tonnage within the next 5 years.

Germany, like Japan a defeated nation only a few years ago, is building ships at a faster rate than any country in Europe except Great Britain.

In the Pacific, the British—traditionally our vital and friendly maritime competitors—are building large and speedy liners to give my company and other American lines an even more rigorous run for our money.

In the Atlantic and the gulf, American lines are faced with an even greater problem, as the European economy—nurtured on American aid—comes into its own. Great new ships, built and operated at costs much lower than American ships can be, are about to be launched. Others still on the planning boards or on the shipyard ways soon will be competing with American-flag ships for your trade and your business.

This, then, is the competition we face—warlike and peaceful. Our role as the strong guardian of freedom is challenged, as is the economic strength upon which rests our hope for survival and the hope for survival of the free world.

Are we facing up to that double challenge; are we doing anything to meet it?

I am constitutionally unable to be a prophet of gloom and doom, so with pride in my country I am glad that I can answer with a firm "Yes."

I can say yes because after years of confusion and neglect this Nation's determination to have a stable, long-range national maritime policy is bearing fruit. Inspired by the tragic lessons of World War I, our present policy was formulated by Congress in 1936. Since then its essential wisdom has been clearly demonstrated by the tests of World War II, Korea, and scattered military emergencies, as well as by the changing patterns of our Nation's vital foreign trade.

This maritime policy is very simple. Embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it recognizes the need for a strong and active American-flag merchant fleet built, manned, and supplied by American citizens at U.S. standard and wage scales, and operated with efficiency and reliability.

To assure the execution of this policy, the act says, in effect, to the steamship lines: If you will make scheduled sailings on an essential trade route whether or not you make a profit, if you will agree to restrictions on your operations and your financial structure that are determined by Congress to be in the national interest, and if you will build ships in American shipyards that meet our defense standards and will provide funds for the periodic replacement of your ships with new, fast, efficient tonnage, then the Government will make up some of the cost differences between U.S.- and foreign-flag operations of similar ships.

Actually, I should explain here, the cost differential between building a ship in America against low-cost foreign construction goes to offset the wage differential in U.S. shipyards. It does not go to the shipyard stockholders or to operating companies. The operators are on their own as to making a profit. Furthermore, if we do realize a profit we must, when it reaches a certain percentage of our investment, return to the Government at stipulated intervals up to the full amount of the differential payments we have received.

The 1936 act has served the Nation well and it continues to do so. Today, the lines having contracts are engaged in a great shipbuilding program to replace the fine U.S.-flag fleet that was built largely during World War II.

The total cost of this program involving the 14 lines here today will be $4,600 million—to be shared by them and by Government. Thirty-four ships are under construction today, and another 250 or so will be built within 12 to 15 years.

It is ironic that for years the United States—the greatest nation in history—was limping along the trade routes of the world in ships that had been built hurriedly, under pressure, for two World Wars, ships that already were outmoded and obsolete insofar as competitive commercial use was concerned.

Only recently have American shipping companies been able to actually develop a tailormade fleet.

Under the able leadership of Clarence Morse, the present Maritime Board has developed the multi-billion-dollar-shipbuilding program I mentioned a moment ago.

This program continues at a pace commensurate with the need. Matson Navigation Co. has within the past 3 years inaugurated service to the South Pacific with two ships converted for that purpose, the *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*, and doubled their service to Hawaii by remodeling and refurbishing the *Matsonia*, at a cost of $20 million, to sail with the *Lurline*.

Just a year ago Moore-McCormack launched the second of two sisterships, the SS *Argentina*, to run in service to South America. Grace Line last year introduced two new passenger liners—the SS *Santa Rosa* and the SS *Santa Paula*—the first ships built under the Government and maritime industry's fleet replacement program. At American President Lines, plans are well underway for a superliner, the SS *President Washington*, to enter the transpacific service. Two large cargoliners even now are under construction in San Francisco.

Yes, gentlemen, we are meeting the economic challenge of the rest of the world. Our American merchant marine is a tangible symbol of our growing strength in foreign commerce. But it is more than that. Because it competes for the commerce of the world on all the earth's seas, it also is a good barometer by which we can read the pressures of the rising power of the other great maritime nations and through them the temper and the stirrings of their neighbors.

We spend billions through the Marshall and Truman plans to strengthen our allies and bolster our friends, and achieve only a temporary semblance of solidarity and security.

We debate the problems of our feverish struggle to keep abreast of Russia's scientific progress. But while we talk—and talk, gentlemen, doesn't always come cheap; in this case its price may be our freedom. While we talk, Russia puts its hammer and sickle on the moon.

We teach underprivileged areas of the world the principles of democracy and see their surging expression of nationalism often tragically turned against us.

We stand hesitant and perplexed in the face of our problems of survival perhaps because we have not yet fully learned the hazards, as well as the strengths, of the world position we do in truth occupy.

As in the earliest days of our Nation, America stands virtually alone as a bulwark of freedom—a bulwark between the free nations and the slave nations.

The concept of our Founding Fathers that all men are created equal, with freedom and self-determination as their birthright, has evolved into the greatest system of government ever conceived in the mind of man. It has created the mightiest and most prosperous Nation in this history of the world.

Being mighty, and being prosperous, we are a natural target to be shot at and torn down—a target for the arrows of contempt and challenge hurled so regularly by the disciples of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and now most brazenly by Khrushchev himself.

That is why America—and when I say America, I mean all the Americas, plus Canada, which make up the Western Hemisphere—must remain the bulwark against this powerful thrust at world domination by Communist Russia.

We must, at all costs, maintain not only our military position as the "arsenal of democracy," but also our position in world trade, if we are to keep our own and the free world's economy in proper balance.

It is apparent that for the Communists there is no effort, no sacrifice too great if it will help the Communist Party and the Soviet society realize its goals. There is no corner of humanity that can be a matter of indifference to the Communists. To them, the entire human race is to become one big brotherhood—under the stern sheltering wing of Marxist philosophy.

Every day we see new evidence of this continuing Russian thrust for power and conquest. Our lifeline between the Atlantic

and Pacific—the Panama Canal, is the scene of rioting. Not far off Florida, Fidel Castro rants his way through a consolidation of gains achieved in what is now conceded even by some earlier optimists to be a Communist inspired revolution.

Part of Russia's thrust for world domination is based simply on the need for more foreign trade. Part of it is fear, the search for security through friends and captive satellite communities. But the dominant motivation is the historical centrifugal forces in Russia that have been pressing outward for 100 years—into the Balkans, the Middle East, and throughout the Pacific. The important thing to remember is that the Soviets believe in their truth, as we of the Western World believe in ours. The Russians, not we, are firing the shots that are now heard around the world and around the moon.

This summary of Russia's objectives should be frightening only if we let it be frightening, and fail to do anything about it while there is still time. Our foolish languor and false feeling of superiority have been shaken, if not shattered. We are now more inclined to examine ourselves and our record and it is a privilege of our society that every citizen should make his own inquiry. The urgent thing, as I see it, is to feel the need for rethinking, for setting to work the ultimate energies of our free society. We cannot do this by fiat of government. We can do it only through understanding—understanding of ourselves, and understanding of our relationship to the world. We cannot afford the luxury of myopia.

In one of his most brilliant speeches—and he has delivered many telling and effective speeches—Adlai Stevenson discussed in Washington earlier this year the subject of "The Political Relevance of Moral Principle." He said that "Today, when the threat and challenge to free society seem more total and powerful than ever before, it is not a political luxury or fruitless pedantry to reexamine our fundamental principles. I think it more likely to be the condition of survival."

Mr. Stevenson thinks that too many of us "rely on some mythical God-given superiority of the white Western World to save us," adding that "there is more evidence that the Communists accept the reality of the human condition than we do."

Fortunately, there is a new force rising in the land today, a force which, if it continues, can perhaps do more than anything else to bring understanding and strength of purpose in shaping the destiny of this great Nation of ours.

This new force is the growing political consciousness of businessmen and responsible citizens generally through the country. Your chamber of commerce is behind such a program. In almost every State outstanding businessmen are moving out of executive suites and into important political positions. Such men as Averell Harriman, Nelson Rockefeller, Senator Capehart, of Indiana, Mr. Stevenson, and many others, gave up lucrative business and professional commitments to serve their country with distinction.

You are fortunate in the great State of Colorado to be so ably represented by Gov. Steve McNichols and in the Halls of Congress by Senators ALLOTT and CARROLL, and Representatives ASPINALL, CHENOWETH, JOHNSON, and ROGERS—all men of outstanding ability. They will endorse, I am sure, your efforts to take a greater part in the conduct of your Government. They know from experience that their constructive work depends in large measure on an interested, informed, and active electorate.

So here we are today, businessmen face to face with the problems of building our Nation's great economic strength; representatives of the merchant marine of this still most powerful Nation on earth, face to face with the problems of etxending and nurturing that economy through the world—Nikita Khrushchev notwithstanding.

We have a common purpose, one we can help achieve in our daily business and personal lives. America is the pilot light of freedom throughout a troubled world. We Americans must keep that light ever bright, as a beacon of hope to the frightened, to the underprivileged nations now bowed beneath the Communist yoke.

So long as that pilot light of freedom burns bright in America, and in the hearts of our own people, the world cannot, and will not be plunged into the darkness of red slavery.

It has been a source of great inner strength to see these mountains of Colorado again. They are symbolic of the strength and vigor of this great country of ours. It has brought back to me many of the dreams of my youth. But perhaps the greatest inspiration comes from meeting and talking with men who have their faith, their destinies, their hopes, linked with the destiny of this great State of Colorado.

May we all meet again.

Thank you.

Scientific Program for Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we from New Jersey like to comment about the achievements of our young people and about the widespread scientific interest expressed in our schools, our centers of research, and among our citizens.

An article in the Newark (N.J.) News of April 17 discusses one manifestation of that interest. Reporter George Kentera tells how the interest of a South Orange boy in science has resulted in the creation of "an imaginative national program to attract bright youngsters to careers in science." The story tells how New Jersey scientists and businessmen have joined with leaders from other States to create this program.

Mr. President, we in this Nation should welcome all efforts to enrich our scientific understanding and our supply of trained scientists. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISLE TO BE LAB FOR TALENTED—CURIOSITY OF BOY SPAWNED IDEA—JERSEYAN LEADS YOUTH PROJECT

(By George Kentera)

WASHINGTON.—An imaginative national program to attract bright youngsters to careers in science is underway because a science-minded South Orange boy, late in 1956, horrified the family housekeeper by dissecting a frog.

The housekeeper complained to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as well as to her employer and the boy's father, David L. Lukens of 227 Conway Court, South Orange, who is president of D. L. Lukens Co., an industrial merchandising and consulting firm in Newark.

"That incident set me to thinking there ought to be a place where youngsters with talent and ability could have a wholesome outlet, under supervision, for their talent," says Lukens.

NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION

The result is the National Youth Science Center, a nonprofit organization with a Maine island for a laboratory, the backing of some of the Nation's most eminent scientists and businessmen, and a history of strong support from New Jersey.

Lukens has purchased the island, which is just offshore from Portland, and renamed it Science Island.

Last week, the National Science Foundation, a Government agency, made an $18,000 grant to Nasson College in Springvale, Maine, administrator of the program. The grant will allow 50 youngsters between 12 and 17 years of age to participate in a "trial run" 6-week session beginning July 5.

Lukens and his associates intend that the center become self-supporting, with most of its income derived from "campships" sponsored by industry, labor, civic groups, and individuals. The New Jerseyan says he has already contacted 100 "blue chip" industries and found enthusiasm high for the project.

After Lukens' son Jeffrey, now 16 and a student at Columbia High School, started the idea in his father's mind, Lukens consulted with and was encouraged by two men—Dr. Vannevar Bush, board chairman emeritus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and board chairman of Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, and Dr. Mervin J. Kelly of Short Hills, a member of the MIT board and retired chairman of Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Lukens went ahead and bought four-fifths or 125 acres of the island—then known as Cushing's Island, which had been used as a harbor defense post during both World Wars and which included 31 buildings.

In the 3 years of work that followed, the 46-year-old Lukens, a widower with 8-year-old twin sons—Steve and Ira—besides Jeffrey, got encouragement and development funds from a small founding group of executives.

BACKERS

They were Charles Shipman Payson, board chairman of Vitro Industries in West Orange; William C. Jordon, of Maplewood, vice president of the Maplewood Bank & Trust Co.; George L. Pew, a Sun Oil Co. executive, and his wife; Dr. E. Gifford Upjohn, president of the Upjohn Co.; Carl Gilbert, board chairman of the Gillette Co., and Malcolm C. Stewart, vice president and treasurer of Gillette.

As a result, Lukens was encouraged by such people as Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director, and Dr. Harry C. Kelly, associate director of the National Science Foundation, and Dr. George P. Sutton, chief scientist of the Government's Advanced Research Projects Administration.

The national program will provide informal instruction to the youngsters chosen. They will engage in projects of their own selection and will benefit from visits by well-known scientists. A camping program for physical development and a program to promote civic responsibility will be included.

Letters are now going out to science teachers, museums, and directors of science fairs to locate participants. Nasson College will select the final 50. In the future, however, applicants will be screened by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton; no applicant will be accepted on any basis other than ability.

This year's program will use the facilities of Nasson, which was suggested as program administrator by Representative JAMES C. OLIVER, Democrat, of Maine. The project will move to Science Island as facilities and additional funds become available.

As for campships, Lukens says one providing 4 weeks for a youngster will cost

between $375 and $400, and one for an 8-week session will run to about $750.

CENTER'S BOARD

The center's board of directors so far includes Dr. Kelly and four past winners of Nobel prizes—Dr. Edward C. Kendall, of Princeton, biochemist, associated with the Forrestal Research Center; Prof. Percy W. Bridgman, Harvard University physicist; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, medical director of the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons; and Dr. John H. Northrop, department of chemistry, University of California.

The young people who will benefit from their experience will be the most capable, Lukens says, those with drive and inclination and not necessarily with highest school marks.

Rural Development—Unemployment in Farming Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in recent sessions of the Congress about the plight of jobless people in the Nation's depressed urban areas. This situation has received deserved recognition, and several bills have been introduced to help these jobless people get back to work again and become producing members of our society, a society which, I need not remind you, needs every last bit of its production and enterprise to counter the mammoth thrust of the Soviet Union.

However, at this time I should like to call attention to the fact that our Nation is also gravely weakened in its economic struggle with the Soviet Union by the existence of certain depressed rural areas around the country.

Let us squarely face the fact that whether rural or urban the problem is the same—a great many people who can not find full-time work. This simple fact is very clearly brought out in a recent publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "Employment and Underemployment of Rural People, a Study of Low-Income Groups in Arkansas, Maryland, and West Virginia." The accompanying release summarizes this report very concisely with the statement, "The basic economic problem in hundreds of rural communities is the same as that in depressed urban areas—a surplus of labor for the jobs available."

In view of the timeliness of this report and its importance in evaluating the problem facing many of our rural communities, I amplify my remarks by inserting the release describing it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

USDA PUBLICATION REPORTS ON RURAL UNDEREMPLOYMENT

A report on manpower in low-income farming areas of three representative States indicates the basic economic problem in hundreds of rural communities is the same as that in depressed urban areas—a surplus of labor for the jobs available.

Entitled "Employment and Underemployment of Rural People," the report released today was authored by Nelson LeRay, an economist with the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

His report is an analysis based on recent studies of farm families in selected areas of Arkansas, Maryland, and West Virginia.

These areas are typical of low-income farming areas in all regions of the Nation with large numbers of farm and rural people living on small units, a lack of full-time employment, and generally inadequate levels of living on many farms.

"A surplus labor force exists in each of the low income areas studied," Mr. LeRay states. "A large proportion of individuals available for work expressed a preference for nonfarm employment. A majority of these individuals were young men and women."

Observing that many farm enterprises studied were too small to provide sufficient employment and income, the ARS economist states that by industrial standards, people living on such farms "were employed only two thirds of their total work time."

"The remaining one-third of the time," he comments, "represents a loss to the workers in income and standards of living and to the community and the Nation in reduced purchasing power and volume of economic activity."

Solutions to the problem in the areas studied, as well as farm areas with similar conditions, will require a threefold approach, Mr. LeRay observes:

Increasing efficiency of operations on small farms.

Increasing nonfarm job opportunities in the area.

Promoting job mobility of younger people living on small farms and in rural residences.

The final objective of programs like these, according to the ARS study, should be to develop and conserve both the human and natural resources of the area. "The rural development program are offers a promising approach to the development and conservation of resources in the low-income areas studied," its author concludes.

The three-State area studies analyzed in Mr. LeRay's report are part of a broader research project in which the Agricultural Research Service is cooperating with agricultural experiment stations in 22 States. Aim of the project is to develop information on farmland, labor, and capital resources in specific low-income farming areas around the country.

The cooperative project, a major economic research effort of the Agricultural Research Service, is going forward in connection with the national rural development program.

Studies already issued for areas in Arkansas, Missouri, Georgia, Maryland, West Virginia, and Florida are being used in planning rural development work in these States.

A copy of "Employment and Underemployment of Rural People," ARS 43-109, may be obtained from Press Service, Office of Information, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C.

Lowell Mason's Grace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for 24 years Lowell Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, has been host at a luncheon on the opening day of the baseball season. At the luncheon on yesterday were members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

Mr. Mason, as usual, opened the luncheon with a grace that was an inspiration to all of those present. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Oh God teach us to repay our debt to Thee by the quality of our lives not by the quality of our words.

Grant us such a measure of Thy spirit, that the fellowship of man one with another (at this luncheon, the baseball game and all places where we gather together in comradeship) may be an echo of the fellowship of the spirit Thou hast taught us in the quiet of cathedrals, the solitude of woods, and the majesty of sea and mountain.

Here in the Capital (the busy marketplace of ideas) where men seek the greatest good for the greatest number,

Teach us, oh God, to respect the feelings of others more than our own rights and the rights of others more than our own feelings.

Teach us to differ without anger, to know the best not just the good; to know that it is better to earn liberty than to praise it. Amen.

Single Chief of Staff—Another Life Magazine Hallucination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an article by Anthony Harrigan, noted writer for the Charleston News and Courier, titled "Life Magazine Urges U.S. Defense Czar," which appeared in the April 10 issue of the News and Courier, the Nation's most outspoken newspaper.

There is so much good sense in this article that it should be read by every American citizen. At the very least, those who read Life magazine owe it to themselves to read this article and learn the facts.

Life magazine, apparently, has taken it upon itself to become the military expert of the Nation. It follows that anyone who can sell advertising and run a magazine must know more about the military structure than those who have given their lives to this, the most important business in the United States. At least this appears to be Life's justification for now becoming experts in the field of national defense. When the facts do not support the case, pound the table. Life is certainly very good at pounding the table.

Fortunately for the Nation, there are countless people who do not subscribe to Life or at least do not subscribe to Life's

editorial policies or concur in all of the articles written for Life magazine.

The dangers of a single Chief of Staff are so grave for the welfare of the Nation, even an individual without military training can understand them. From the time of childhood, one learns the expression "two heads are better than one." This is true for everyone except Life magazine. They subscribe to the theory apparently that a little knowledge is a wonderful thing if you can put it in a magazine and sell it to a gullible public. Its concept of national defense is simply give the defense of the Nation to one man, take the Congress out of the picture except for appropriating enough money for whatever purpose that one man proposes to do, and then everyone can go down to the farm or to the beach or to the mountains and have a lovely weekend. Everyone can stop worrying. We will get more defense for less and all we need is a single supergiant to run the entire armed services. What a lovely, beautiful nightmare this would produce. However, if it means selling more magazines, Life will keep up this prattle from here on out. Perhaps Life would like to make one intelligent public gesture on this point. Perhaps it would be magnanimous enough—if it is truly interested in the Nation's military well being—to publish Anthony Harrigan's response as conspicuously as it printed the propaganda contained in the April 4 issue:

LIFE MAGAZINE URGES U.S. DEFENSE CZAR

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Anyone interested in how the Luce magazines trifle with the truth will do well to examine the article Shameful Strife in the Pentagon published in the April 4 issue of Life.

The article deserves attention on several counts. It is a slur on the integrity of the Nation's military leaders. It suggests that they put the Nation last when the interests of their respective services are involved. It distorts the question of decisionmaking in the Defense Establishment. It recommends that Congress be denied its present authority over military spending. And it endorses a plan that would create a defense dictator who would be able to suppress the kind of independent thought in the armed services that is their strength.

Life's goal as stated in the article is fourfold: It seeks: (1) Appointment of a single all-powerful military chief; (2) an end to the Joint Chiefs of Staff authority over their respective services; (3) transfer from Congress to the Secretary of Defense of control over all funds appropriated for national defense, and (4) elimination of the service secretaries and their replacement with officials wholly responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

Life moves toward this goal by scare talk, loaded language, omission of facts that don't fit its case, and downright distortion.

The article begins with the assertion that a seemingly unquenchable fire of interservice rivalry is out of control and endangers the national security. It says that Gen. Nathan F. Twining, USAF, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "inadvertently presented an appalling case against the present system" when he disclosed that the JCS were unable to reach agreement on the following questions:

Whether or not the Army air defense missile should be developed at full speed.

Whether or not the budget should provide more money for Polaris missiles and submarines.

Whether or not Polaris missiles should be mounted on surface ships.

Whether or not the ground forces are getting enough modern equipment fast enough.

Whether or not the Air Force should be allowed to develop a new bomber.

Readers of Life are supposed to scan this catalog and say: "Gosh, the country's defenses are in a devil of a mess. If the Joint Chiefs can't make up their minds, the President ought to kick them out and name one good man to be defense czar.

Though defense matters are complicated, Americans should not be fooled by Life's scare trick—not if they read the catalog carefully. The big undecided issues are issues that can't be decided as fast as a soldier pulls a trigger or Life shoots off its mouth. The decisions for or against the various weapons systems involve not tens but hundreds of billions of dollars.

If one man had the authority to say yes or no on each one of these items, he would have it in his power to make the biggest boondoggle in history and to bankrupt the United States.

Suppose Life's defense dictator had been approved 2 years ago? He might have ordered to Charleston and other American cities the Bomarc air defense missiles that one Pentagon group thought was the answer to Red attack. Billions would have been committed to a program that now is recognized as unnecessary. Bomarc didn't get the green light on a crash basis because of a disagreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The slowdown, which is what Life considers interservice rivalry, worked for the advantage of the country.

Consider the Army-Air Force competition in missile building. If all missile work had been assigned to one agency with one boss, the United States might be way behind where it is now. Former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, who shared Life's belief in centralization, wanted to shut down the Army's missile-development program. But the Army missile became the Nation's first reliable rocket weapon and satellite launcher.

If the Air Force had had its way in the late 1940's, the Nation's defense forces would have been restricted to long-range bombers. If the Air Force weren't aggressive in pushing its weapons, the Navy might be putting all its money in aircraft carriers and starving the rest of the fleet.

Despite what Life says, the committee system and the pulling and tugging between the services produces a variety of weapons and a reasonable balance in the Nation's Armed Forces. If the rivalry becomes somewhat excessive at times, it's simply because there isn't enough money to go around. Creating a defense dictator wouldn't solve the money shortage.

Life casts aspersions on the generals and admirals when it says "issues of the most vital concern to the Nation can be and sometimes are raised, debated, and resolved—or not resolved—more on the basis of service advantage or disadvantage than on their actual merits." This implies that the Nation's military leaders are more interested in building up service empires than in strengthening the United States. This is a calumny that persons familiar with the records of the splendid men who head the services must repudiate.

No citizen should assume Henry Luce and his editors have more patriotism than the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the officers who serve under them.

"A typical issue of this kind," says Life, "is whether the increasing variety of strategic weapons systems—SAC bombers, missiles launched from land or sea—requires that they be placed under a single command." Life says that when the SAC commander recommended this be done last year, the Navy "instantly interpreted his proposal as a petty grab for its promising Polaris missile and the submarines from which it will be launched. It added that Adm. Arleigh A. Burke quickly came up with a series of proposals to install Polaris on surface ships as well as submarines."

Life dismisses out of hand the integrity of Admiral Burke, a man who has devoted a lifetime to serving his country and who based his rejection of the SAC proposal on the ground that it makes no sense. Admiral Burke is viewed by Life, as a mere partisan. Actually, SAC's proposal for command of Polaris submarines failed to take in account the missile-firing subs antisubmarine role and their relation to other fleet units. The idea that combined air, ground and sea forces can be lumped together into functions ignores the fact that a destroyer, for example, may fire a missile, search for subs, stops a merchantman, rescue U.S. citizens from trouble spots, or bombard an island. Ships can't be restricted to one strategic job.

Life also distorts the character of Admiral Burke's response by ignoring the fact that Adm. Charles Brown, U.S. Navy, former 6th Fleet commander, endorsed Polaris missiles on surface ships as far back in 1957.

Another one of Life's reportorial sins is its failure to stress in the article the great successes achieved by the armed services under the existing organization. For example the Polaris missile system, which Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS told Charlestonians on April 3 is 3 years ahead of schedule, typifies things done without a defense czar. This and other military successes show that the Luce prescription for U.S. defense is bad medicine.

Debate among the services is not, as Life terms it "a cancer," but a necessary discussion and appeal for public understanding. If discussion were ruled out of order and Congress were denied the right to allot money to the separate services, decisions affecting the future of the American people would be made by a handful of people and without public knowledge of the issues involved. The existing military setup at times may be noisy, but it's healthy.

Bascom Timmons, Nationally Famed Journalist From Texas, Has Reported National Affairs Nearly Half a Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently some 400 friends attended a reception at the National Press Club honoring Bascom N. Timmons, noted Washington News Bureau director and columnist. It was a fitting tribute to one of the Nation's top journalists of the past three decades.

Mr. Timmons is a Texan, although he has reported the national scene for nearly a half century. Few men have had the view and grasp of history in the making that he has had in his adult lifetime. But what is more important, almost none have equaled him in graphically, faith-

fully, and seemingly tirelessly reporting important events of the day to his millions of readers.

It was my pleasure to become acquainted with Mr. Timmons in 1937, when I made a trip to Washington while serving as a State district judge. It was an acquaintance which I treasured from the first, and which has continued over the years. Texas is proud of Bascom Timmons' success in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Houston Chronicle entitled "B. N. Timmons, Capital Writer, Is Honored on 70th Birthday."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

B. N. TIMMONS, CAPITAL WRITER, IS HONORED ON 70TH BIRTHDAY

Bascom N. Timmons, chief Washington correspondent for the Chronicle, was 70 years of age Thursday and the occasion was celebrated with a reception at the National Press Club attended by more than 400 friends.

Timmons, an indestructible newspaperman who still writes several columns of news and comment each week in addition to operating his news bureau for which several other writers work, has been reporting the national scene for nearly half a century.

That "nearly half a century" phrase turns up again and again in Timmons' career. He has been friend of Presidents and other powerful figures for as long. He has reported virtually every Democratic and Republican national convention during the same period.

Timmons, a Texan by birth, went to Washington as a very young man. While he has written primarily of national affairs ever since, he remains a Texan to the core and when some story involving Texas interest or Texans breaks, he usually takes over and handles it himself.

Two of the closest friendships of his life have been with Texans, the late Jesse H. Jones, publisher of the Chronicle and Secretary of Commerce, and John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, former Vice President and longtime Congressman. Timmons has written biographies of both: "Jesse H. Jones, the Man and the Statesman," and "Garner of Texas." He also is author of a biography of Charles G. Dawes.

Report to the South Carolina Congressional Delegation on the Federal Aid Highway Program in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by the chief highway commissioner for South Carolina, Mr. C. R. McMillan, to the congressional delegation from South Carolina at their annual meeting in Columbia on November 20, 1959.

I especially would like for the Members of the House to read this item since the majority of the statement is in connection with the superhighway construction program. The records show that South Carolina is second to the State of Texas in building these new superhighways at the lowest cost to the taxpayer.

The South Carolina State Highway Department has bypassed all the cities in the State and where it is necessary for one of the superhighways to enter the city limits the highway department uses the 50–50 Federal aid highway program rather than the 90–10.

I am certain that if all the States would use the 90–10 programs as we are using it in South Carolina in connection with the superhighway program, it would not be necessary for us to continue to increase gasoline and other taxes to pay for this roadbuilding program which is progressing so well in our State.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the State highway department officials in South Carolina for the progress they have made in connection with the entire Federal aid highway construction program.

The statement follows:

REPORT TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN SOUTH CAROLINA

It is a pleasure to report to you again this year on the progress of the Federal aid highway program in South Carolina. You may recall that in my appearances before several committees of Congress when the 1956 Federal aid legislation was being considered, I strongly advocated adequate safeguards to assure that the respective States would be enabled to carry out a balanced highway program, rather than neglect for the next decade or so our primary and secondary system programs through putting everything into the new Interstate program. I am glad this thinking was embodied in the legislation as finally enacted and that South Carolina, along with other States, has been able to keep her regular programs moving ahead and, at the same time, given needed emphasis to the Interstate highways.

In South Carolina, in the nearly 3½ years since enactment of the far-reaching act of 1956, we have placed under contract 288 miles of Interstate System Highways. A small portion of this mileage has been opened to limited use by traffic and very soon we hope to open additional sections as construction nears the final phases of completion.

Obviously much work is required before we are able to award contracts; for example, a great amount of traffic engineering, drawing of plans, location surveys, and right-of-way acquirement. Including mileage under contract, we have completed surveys on 338 miles of Interstate Highways, or just about half the total of 680 miles to be embraced by the four Interstate routes to be constructed in this State.

Recently when Federal highways trust funds were nearing exhaustion, Federal authorities set up contract controls which, in effect, placed the Federal-aid highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis. This movement was viewed by authorities in many States as undesirable and as placing unnecessary controls on the individual State highway programs. I did not interpret the ruling in that way, but took the position that only through the Bureau of Public Roads' exercise of such controls could we effectively operate the highway program in line with the Byrd amendment to the 1956 Federal-Aid Act. Having operated in South Carolina on a pay-as-you-go basis, and being limited in highway spending by earmarked revenues and Federal aid, I felt that the practical effect of the controls set up by Congress on Federal spending for highways would be to bring Federal operations in line with the highway laws and administrative practices in South Carolina. This may not be the case, however, in all the States.

Under the contract control system, the States will have to schedule contracts at a lower rate during the first half of the current fiscal year than during the last half. Furthermore, under the new schedule, total obligations which may be incurred during the fiscal year 1960, for all the States, have been set at $2.7 billion, compared to $3.4 billion as originally apportioned.

Under the contract control procedure, funds available for obligation will accumulate at a predetermined rate beginning on July 1. Applied to South Carolina, the new ruling gives the State an allowance of $5,075,000 available for obligation through October 31. The State will then receive an allowance of $2,943,000 through December 31; $8,879,000 through March 31; and a like amount through June 30. This will give South Carolina a grand total of $25,776,000 for fiscal 1960.

Our total original 1960 apportionment was $31.8 million. As of July 1 we had obligated about $6.6 million of these funds. Therefore, under the formula worked out by the Bureau of Public Roads, we can still obligate, during the current fiscal year, an amount of funds equal to our unobligated 1960 apportionment, on July 1, 1959, of $25 million. All the States will not find themselves so fortunate, but it so happens that the advanced status of South Carolina's program places us in this favorable position.

On October 8 the Bureau of Public Roads apportioned 1961 funds to the States totaling $1.8 billion for the Interstate program and $925 million for ABC programs, giving South Carolina $14,683,680 for the Interstate System and $11,571,897 for the ABC program. Under the contract control procedure, however, we cannot actually obligate or let any of that money to contract until next year. The apportioning of the money at this time, however, enables us to go ahead and plan our work, submit projects for program approval, and so forth.

During the past fiscal year, South Carolina awarded construction contracts totaling about $81 million. This year we will have Federal and State funds for work totaling about $59 million, including amounts obligated for rights-of-way, engineering and related expenses. We expect highway expenditures for all purposes this year to pass the $100 million mark for the first time in the history of the South Carolina Highway Department. Last year, in fiscal 1958–59, we paid out for all purposes, construction, maintenance, patrol, etc., approximately $96 million.

It was somewhat unfortunate that it became necessary for the Federal Government to institute an investigation of Federal-aid highway spending in the respective States. However, during my appearances before various committees of Congress which were concerned with appropriations for highway work, I could see that such investigations might eventually come about. In the first place, I could appreciate, from questions asked, that some committee members knew very little of the operations of the highway departments in their home States and what was going on there. Secondly, after rumors were circulated in some of the States that there existed improper spending of highway funds, it then became necessary to have an investigation to determine to the public's satisfaction whether such rumors were true or false. The public has a right to know where its tax money is being used, and to be assured it is being properly expended.

When the question arose as to providing additional funds for the exhausted Federal highway trust fund, I took the position that the then existing Federal tax levies were adequate to meet highway needs, provided all such revenues collected were placed in

the fund. The President and those responsible for drawing up the Federal budget were not willing to have all highway user revenues go into the trust fund, but insisted instead on additional motor fuel levies. With this situation prevailing, and the threat of a costly highway construction moratorium hanging over the Nation, Congress had but one alternative, that of providing such additional revenues as required to keep the program moving. I commend each of you for the support you gave in providing needed revenue, which was the only thing to do under the circumstances.

The interstate highway program is unquestionably the most vital of any of the highway programs now being developed, both from the standpoint of ordinary traffic needs and the national defense. I have been conscious of some agitation for amending the formula under which funds are provided for this essential highway work. Presently 90 percent of the cost is borne by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the respective States, with the States also to bear all costs of maintenance and traffic law enforcement. It has been proposed that the Federal Government's part be reduced and that the State's contribution be increased, a step which obviously would mean an increase in State taxes. I am convinced that any such action would seriously retard development of the Interstate System of modern, safe and efficient highways. I can well imagine that such additional State tax money as voted to make up the deficiency in Federal funds would result in a general public demand that it be expended on local projects. This would be ony a natural development which could be expected to result from any change in the existing plan of finance.

In this connection it may be of interest that the Federal Government's relatively high contribution to the interstate program can be justified more and more as time passes, as exemplified by the recent change in minimum design standards to meet national defense requirements. This was an increase from 14 to 17 feet in vertical clearances at bridges, a change which obviously increases the cost of approach road work as well as that of the structures themselves. Any upsetting of the already proven formula for financing this program would be detrimental to essential interstate highway development, and I urge you to resist any movements to change it.

In South Carolina, in laying out our portion of the interstate highways, we have attempted to locate them so as to best serve the highway user and, at the same time, do the least damage to property, thereby meeting a third objective of avoiding excessive costs. Wherever possible we have avoided direct through-city locations, but are developing adequate urban connections of either high type controlled-access facilities or improved primary and secondary routes, depending on needs as indicated by engineering studies. In this way both our local and through traffic needs are being served, as well as the additional highway needs imposed by construction of the interstate roads.

Through the development of our State secondary system program, financed entirely with State funds, we have been able to do more street paving work in our cities than have many other States. This, coupled with the Federal-aid secondary and Federal-aid urban and primary programs, has enabled us to gradually improve the streets that are in the respective highway systems. Much remains to be done, however, which we hope to accomplish as the coordinated program of work develops and additional funds become available.

There is one other matter which I feel compelled to include in this report. It pertains to the proposed new bridge over the Inland Waterway on U.S. Route 501, between Myrtle Beach and Conway. U.S. 501 was recently developed into a fine four-lane divided highway between the popular beach resort and Conway, with a new bridge having been constructed across the Waccamaw River. Before starting the road improvement we petitioned the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for authority to construct a modern fixed high-type bridge, eliminating need for a movable span. We proposed to provide a vertical clearance of 55 feet above the elevation of mean high tide. The War Department many years ago established a minimum vertical clearance of 80 feet, which places an unreasonable burden on land transportation. Adherence to this standard would force us to build another bridge, with a movable span, at the location.

The Army engineers, following a hearing, denied our petition, and at the same time requested we supply them with extensive data in addition to that already furnished to substantiate our claims that a bridge of the vertical clearance specified could not be justified. This is being done.

There are now before Congress at least two bills which, if enacted, would enable us to build a structure suitable for land transportation while at the same time meeting the needs of water navigation. One is H.R. 1483, introduced by Congressman McMULLAN, giving specific authority to construct the bridge needed on U.S. 501. There is also a bill by Senator CASE of South Dakota, S. 1126, proposing to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946, which would, therefore, have national application. To the best of my knowledge, no action has been taken on either of these measures and we are still without authority to proceed with plans for the type structure we feel is badly needed on U.S. 501.

I greatly appreciate the oportunity you have given me to report to you on the South Carolina highway program. I am grateful for the many courtesies you have shown me and for the help you have given me in all phases of my administration.

Settlement Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the observance of Settlement Week recently served to focus attention on the tremendous contributions made by settlement houses and neighborhood centers to the building of a finer America. The dedicated work of those who man these institutions deserves the commendation and recognition of all of us.

More often than not, the selfless activities of settlement leaders have not gained the public acclaim they deserve. It is doubly fitting, therefore, that all of us have our attention drawn to the very vital manner in which Jane Addams and all her associates on down through the years have played their part in making our cities better places in which to live.

The integral part neighborhood centers have played in the development of my home city of Rochester, N.Y., was recently outlined in an editorial in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. Just as this city has been blessed with tireless leaders in this cause, so other urban centers all across America have become more livable places because of such people. Although Settlement Week has now passed, it is important for all of us to recall its message and its meaning, and I ask unanimous consent to have this fine editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTLEMENT HOUSES A TOP RESOURCE

Settlement Week now being observed in Rochester prompts a reflection that settlement houses and neighborhood centers have completed a cycle in their service to Americans at the grassroots level.

Since Jane Addams founded the settlement movement with her Chicago Hull House in 1889, this technique in dealing with economic and social problems has grown to 289 members of the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

Refinements have been added but essentially this approach has been to battle on the frontline for better social conditions for low-income families. In the early days this was the only practical attack on the headaches of the less privileged. Now with population spiraling and city residential areas growing more compact, social workers are realizing as never before the efficacy of settlement houses in reaching these people.

Rochester is favored in having five of these institutions—Baden Street Settlement, Charles Settlement House, Genesee Settlement House, Lewis Street Center, and Montgomery Neighborhood Center. It would be impossible to tell how many lives have been straightened out, or to put a cold money value on their 59 years of dedicated service. There is no question that they have made Rochester a more livable city.

Economic Moth Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 853 which would increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25.

In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the script of a WCBS, New York, radio editorial as it was broadcast on April 13, 1960:

ECONOMIC MOTH HOLES

When the New York State Legislature came out in favor of the $1 minimum wage for intrastate industry last month, a member of the State Senate was overheard to say: "This is a short step in the right direction."

"Short" is right—and shortsighted, too.

For some time now, the Wagner administration has been calling for a Federal and State minimum wage of $1.25 an hour. In Washington this week, a House Labor subcommittee heard David Dubinsky of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union say that such a raise in the minimum wage would "help stop the spread of unfair competition in terms of human misery." In the Senate, a subcommittee of the Labor and Welfare Committee has already recommended the $1.25 figure. So the Federal

minimum wage may be about to graduate from the school of starvation.

And yet, there is no unanimity of opinion today that a minimum hourly wage of $1.25 is essential for survival in the New York area. The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, spelled out its sentiments like this a few weeks ago:

"The trouble is that most of these people (i.e., people who earn less than the present minimum wage), do not have the skills which would enable them to earn a living wage. Efforts to force employers to pay them higher wages than their abilities warrant can only result in no jobs at all for many of them and no earnings. Then the entire burden of their support will fall on the taxpayers."

This 19th century methodology is expounded despite a recent estimate by New York City Welfare Commissioner James Dumpson. He told the city council that a Federal-State minimum wage of $1.25 an hour would save the city at least $1 million a year in welfare costs. The commissioner explained that of the more than 61,000 people now getting home relief, 44 percent were in families whose wages are being supplemented by the welfare department.

There are 700,000 wage earners in the State of New York today who are getting less than $1 an hour. Of these, 375,000 work in the city of New York. They make up the low-wage pockets which spawn substandard living conditions and crime. No matter how you slice a family budget for 2, $1 an hour for a 40-hour week means $12 less than the amount required under minimal welfare standards. For a family of 3, $23 less. For a family of 4, $34 less.

The NAM ends its analysis of the low-wage problem by saying: "From every standpoint—economic, sociological, or humanitarian—even a low wage is better than no wage at all."

This, of course, is the vine of logic to which many of those who are submerged in profit columns have constantly clung.

WCBS, however, is convinced that a wage of $1 an hour, as outlined in the bill now awaiting the signature of Governor Rockefeller, constitutes the barest minimum essential to survival in the metropolitan area. Anything less can only result in the kind of abject poverty which leads to a loss of dignity.

Let us establish a Federal-State minimum wage which is truly minimum.

Let us wipe out the economic hangover that offers a man a job and then forces him to ask for supplementary welfare assistance.

The theory that a low wage is better than no wage at all may have been indisputable in a long bygone era.

In the spring of 1960, its moth holes are showing.

Philadelphia Apartment House Saves in Fuel Costs by Converting to Anthracite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Friday, April 15, 1960:

APARTMENT SAVES IN CONVERSION TO COAL

Typical of savings being made by users of automatic anthracite in commercial investment property is that of the Lakeside Apartments in Philadelphia.

In 2 previous years the annual fuel oil costs were $16,000 and $19,000 respectively. The first complete year with EFM Automatic Anthracite Fire-jet burners the fuel costs added up to $13,300. This means that anthracite saved this apartment house an average of $4,300 a year over the previous 2-year average with oil.

Compared with the high average oil year it saved $5,800. In addition, the management reported, "We have maintained steady heat in all apartments 24 hours a day and an inexhaustible supply of domestic hot water. These conditions did not exist before, and last winter was a much colder winter."

The management further maintains that the use of anthracite entailed no more labor than that previously required when oil heating was in operation.

This installation has become a "showcase" in Philadelphia and the Lakeside management has invited other commercial management companies to visit the premises and inspect this cost-saving equipment.

Because of the results attained from the anthracite unit, the Lakeside management indicated that it will install EFM Eire-jet equipment in other new projects under their jurisdiction.

Pan American Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Times paid its respects to Pan American Week in an editorial which appeared on April 18. The editorial discussed the difficulties facing this Nation and fellow nations of the Americas during the next year, and it gave good reasons on why this week should be "a week of dedication to the ideals of democracy and social reform in the Western Hemisphere."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN AMERICAN WEEK

Pan American Week begins today. Each year at this time the nations of Latin America and the United States commemorate the first official International Conference of American States held in Washington in 1889–90. This is being counted as the 70th anniversary. In any event, anniversaries are always useful milestones at which one looks back over the stretch of road just traveled and ahead into the unknown.

The Latin-American scene was dominated in the past year by the Cuban revolution and its leader, Fidel Castro. All indications point to the coming year being similarly dominated. The impact of Cuba's revolution has been hemispheric, and in this respect it is proving even more influential than the Mexican Revolution of 1910–20.

One reason for this is that the Cuban revolution, whatever one feels about it, does embody many of the major aspirations of the Latin-American peoples. As President Lleras Camargo of Columbia sees it, the next 10 or 15 years will witness a struggle for social justice that will end in totalitarianism if democratic processes do not provide land, jobs and a decent standard of living for all peoples. The race is between evolution and revolution, but evolution cannot be the long, slow process we followed in the United States. The underdeveloped peoples of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia are impatient. They are being wooed, in the form of communism, by an alternate system of life and economy which has proved that backward countries can raise their standards and can industrialize without foreign investments.

At the heart of the demand for social justice in Latin America is agrarian reform, and here, again, one must recognize the appeal of the Cuban revolution. As a general rule there is a striking imbalance between the few wealthy and the poor masses, the city and the country, the big landowner and the landless peasant. This gap has to be closed. The Cuban answer is revolution; the others want evolution. At least, their governments want it that way. No statesman would care to see a Castro-type revolution in his country, and this explains the general hostility to Cuba on the governmental and ruling-class level in Latin America.

The point that President Lleras Camargo of Colombia constantly made during his recent sojourn here was that the Latin-American countries could not have their agrarian reform or industrialization without development loans from public institutions. The alternative, he warned, would be a repudiation of the democratic process and "a historical disaster."

Latin America is entering a period of crisis. The old policies will not suffice. This is a week for ceremony and celebration, but it should also be a week for dedication to the ideals of democracy and social reform in the Western Hemisphere.

Surplus Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a letter sent to me by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, making certain suggestions and amendments in relation to Public Law 480, and the manner in which Public Law 480 might become more effective, particularly in certain landlocked countries.

There is no person in connection with the carrying out of Public Law 480, who is more experienced and whose views are worthy of more profound consideration, than Monsignor Swanstrom. His views and suggestions, as contained in his letter to me, are worthy of deep consideration by appropriate committees of both branches of the Congress.

The letter follows:

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N.Y., March 30, 1960.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Majority floor leader,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: The problem of mounting stores of surplus farm

commodities is one that I know is of great concern to all the Members of Congress and the officials of various departments of our Government.

Through Public Law 480, you have given the American voluntary relief agencies a wonderful opportunity to accomplish great good amongst the poor and distressed in all quarters of need throughout the world. All of us have made an effort to make the fullest and most effective use of this opportunity.

From time to time the directors of the other voluntary agencies and myself are asked for suggestions for the better use and distribution of these commodities.

We have found by years of experience that there are various factors that seriously impair the efficiency and extent of the programs that our agencies are carrying on overseas on behalf of the needy in which we use title III U.S. Government food supplies. It seems that some of this could be resolved through proper action on the part of Congress.

The purpose of this letter is to lay these problems before you and the members of congressional committees concerned in the hope that all or some may be resolved.

They are as follows:

1. The problem of landlocked countries. Such countries as Laos, Paraguay, and Bolivia, among others, have no seaports to which our food supplies can be shipped. These countries are, of course, very poor ones and in great need of the supplies that we could make available to them under a title III program in larger quantities were ocean freight funds utilizable to the point of entry of these countries. At the present time we can only ship these supplies to a seaport in a neighboring country. The problem of overland transportation of the supplies from such a port to the point of entry of the countries concerned might be resolved by an expression of intent of Congress concerning the use of the ocean freight funds. Government lawyers have already decided that their interpretation of the use of these funds limits them to what is strictly ocean freight. This, of course, works a hardship both on the agencies carrying out programs in landlocked countries and on the landlocked countries themselves.

2. According to present understanding of Public Law 480, all food supplies used by voluntary agencies under title III must be distributed to the needy without exacting any form of recompense from them. This, in effect, means that these foods cannot be used to pay workers who might be engaged in community-effort activities. Many agencies are interested in projects of public-interest nature, such as the building of schools, small roads, drainage ditches, dikes, bridges, etc. Very often the people of underdeveloped countries could be induced to engage in community efforts of this kind if title III foodstuffs could be used as a recompense for their labors in behalf of a community project. Such a use of these foods would have important social as well as economic benefits, since community spirit would be fostered thereby and the value of cooperative effort for social betterment would be made known.

3. According to the present regulations under which we operate, food must be distributed as it is received, or its conversion into other end products must be paid for by some source other than the recipient. The food itself cannot be used in any case to pay for its own conversion into other end products. In effect, this means that the lack of adequate resources on the part of the voluntary agency operating the program or on the part of local groups cooperating with the program limits the amount of wheat flour that could be converted into bread or noodles, for example. This, in turn, limits the usefulness of the supplies. In occupied areas around the world after the last war the Army used a part of these supplies to pay for their conversion. Also, title I and title II supplies are sold in a variety of manners. It would be a great help to the efficiency of the operations of title III programs if the actual work of converting the supplies into other end-use products could be paid for with a part of the supplies themselves. Specifically, bakers could be paid in flour for the baking of bread or the making of noodles. The end result of such a possibility would be to give the poor items that could be used immediately and to familiarize them with new types of food that would be much more beneficial to them than some of those that they are presently using.

4. The use of corn for animal fodder. The people of Asia need meat and are particularly fond of pork in most countries. If corn could be used as food for animals it would be possible to convert large quantities of our surpluses into meat. The details of this would have to be worked out very carefully, of course, in order that the meat go to needy people. Something that might be considered would be, for example, the supplying of corn to people who would raise pigs under contract with us to return to us a pound of pork for a set quantity of corn delivered to them. This may seem like an almost impossible thing to attain, but we should remember that at one time it was illegal to purchase American surplus in the United States for use as animal fodder. At a later date this procedure was made legal. If it could be made legal overseas also, I am sure that we could do a great deal of good in many countries with the resultant product.

Over the past few years representatives of some of the other agencies and myself have offered these suggestions in whole or in part at various hearings on the mutual aid and agricultural bills. I hope that by presenting them to you and some of the other leaders of Congress in this form they may be of some further help to Congress in its deliberations on these matters.

With a word of kindest personal regard, I am

Sincerely yours,
Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

Birmingham City Commissioners To Sue New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the reaction in my district to the articles by Harrison Salisbury, which appeared in the New York Times on April 12 and 13 regarding Birmingham, has been tremendous. The people of my district, so intimately familiar with and so well aware of the true situation, are protesting vigorously about this dreadful example of irresponsible journalism by one of the nation's top-ranking newspapers and best-known reporters. On Saturday, April 16, 1960, the Birmingham City Commissioners announced that they were taking steps to file suit against the New York Times on the ground that the articles by Mr. Salisbury slander them as officials of the city and as individuals. Under leave heretofore granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD newspaper articles from the Birmingham Post-Herald and the Birmingham News, in which the announcement of the intention of the Birmingham City Commissioners appears. The articles by Mr. Salisbury, to my mind, represent the most vicious slander of a community of decent people which has ever appeared in any of our daily press. I endorse the action of the Birmingham City Commission.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald]

COMMISSIONERS TO SUE NEW YORK TIMES

(By Bill Mobley)

The three Birmingham city commissioners have employed a local law firm to sue the New York Times for recent newspaper articles, which they contend, slanders them as officials and individuals.

At a meeting yesterday, Mayor James W. Morgan, and associate commissioners, J. T. Waggoner and Eugene Connor entered into an agreement with Attorneys James A. Simpson and William L. Clark to start preliminary groundwork for the suit.

The statements to which commissioners object appeared in the New York newspaper under the byline of Harrison E. Salisbury who wrote two long articles concerning racial conditions in Birmingham.

The commissioners said they have been advised that they possibly may recover punitive damages because they are elected to uphold Birmingham laws which the articles intimated had not been enforced.

EMPLOY LAW FIRM

Mayor Morgan stated: "We have employed the law firm of Lange, Simpson, Robinson, and Somerville to represent us as individuals in a damage suit against the New York Times.

"The cost will be borne by us as individuals.

"We think the stories were so unfair, and untrue, in so many respects that they were a reflection against the people of Birmingham, both white and black.

"I'm sure they are resented by both races."

Mayor Morgan said no figure has been set as to damages to be sought but it was agreed that if the case is lost the three commissioners will pay court costs.

AMOUNT SECONDARY

The attorneys said "the amount to be named is of secondary importance."

It was agreed that the case will be filed in circuit court on the basis that the employee of the newspaper who wrote the articles in question visited in Birmingham.

The attorneys said the first steps in the suit will be to demand apologies and retractions regarding the so-called libelous statements, and then proceed as the situation calls for.

[From the Birmingham News]

SUIT PLANNED BY COMMISSION AGAINST TIMES

(By Bud Gordon)

City commission will sue the New York Times for publishing articles criticizing and slandering Birmingham, the commission and the State.

Mayor James W. Morgan said the law firm of Lange, Simpson, Robinson & Somerville was told Friday to start legal proceedings against the Times immediately.

Morgan said the suit will be filed by the three commissioners as individuals, since the city cannot legally file a slander suit.

The suit was prompted by two articles which appeared in the Times this week under the byline of Harrison E. Salisbury.

The two-part story painted Birmingham as a city where the "emotional dynamite of racism" is enforced by violence. The story

described Birmingham as a city where telephones are tapped, mail is intercepted and opened and where the "eavesdropper, the informer, the spy, have become a fact of life."

Commissioner Eugene Connor Friday branded the stories as "cheap attempts to smear our city and State." He said the story very plainly indicates that "the mighty Times wears only the mask of fair news reporting; that the face behind the mask is one of bigotry and hate."

Morgan, Connor and Commissioner J. T. Waggoner said they decided to file suit following a meeting with Attorneys James A. Simpson and William L. Clark.

"It is our impression," Simpson told the commisisoners, "that while the city has no cause of action, itself, the city commissioners, as such, do have. The article reflects on them as responsible persons for keeping law, order and tolerable living conditions in Birmingham.

"The imputation that they have not done so is a personal criticism of them."

Simpson reminded all three commissioners that the legal costs of the suit would have to be paid by them personally. He also told the commission it would have to demand a retraction of the paper before it can recover punitive damages.

Simpson said the suit will be filed in State court by him and Clark, as soon as the groundwork has been laid.

"We think the stories were so unfair and untrue in so many respects," Morgan said, "that they were a reflection against the people of Birmingham, both black and white.

"I'm sure they are resented by both races."

Neither the commission nor the attorneys would say what amount they intended to seek in damages.

"The amount isn't important," Connor said, "its just high time someone put a stop to irresponsible Yankee journalism."

Giovanni Verrazzano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, April 17 is a day of importance for all Americans, for on this day we honor Giovanni Verrazzano, the courageous explorer of the American Continent. Verrazzano Day has a grand significance, which only recently has begun to receive the recognition it deserves.

It was Giovanni Verrazzano who, in 1522, convinced Francis I of France that he should make an expedition to America. By 1524 he succeeded in landing on the coast of North America, possibly off the coast of what is now North Carolina; from there he traveled to Newfoundland, discovering en route the Hudson River and Manhattan Island. Verrazzano returned to France the same year and the account of his discoveries is the first description of the northeast coast of North America.

For some reason these glorious exploits remained in comparative obscurity until very recently. Today, however, the tide has been turned. Largely due to the dedicated efforts of such groups as the Italian Historical Society of America and the newspaper Il Progresso Italo-Americano we are beginning to recognize Giovanni Verrazzano's magnificent achievement. On April 17, 1958, for example, Governor Harriman, of New York, calling Verrazzano the first European to step foot on our New York shores, issued a proclamation hailing the Florentine navigator for having sailed into New York Harbor on April 17, 1524. And in the New York State Museum a plaque formally honoring Verrazzano was formally installed in the Hall of History.

Indeed, as recently as March 9, 1960, a bill to name the proposed bridge between Brooklyn and Staten Island in Verrazzano's honor was signed into law by the present Governor of New York.

The honor accorded Giovanni Verrazzano is a symbol, not only of the greatness of this explorer, but of all the Italian explorers to whose daring and courage America owes so much. On April 17 we salute Giovanni Verrazzano, one of the first of these great sailors, and we pay tribute to his great and glorious voyage.

Work Not Play Held Youth's Big Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "Work Not Play Held Youth's Big Need," which appeared in the April 14, 1960, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

WORK NOT PLAY HELD YOUTH'S BIG NEED

For a number of years we have heard the cry that healthy recreation is the one and only cure for the emotional disturbances of youth—the disturbances which in some cases lead to juvenile delinquency, to use again that well-worn phrase.

Well, managed play entered the picture, sort of regimenting our youth and telling them when to play, when to sing and when to smile, and while a lot of big claims have been made for it, the conviction is growing among serious-minded people that it hasn't worked too well.

A few timid voices were raised in suggestions that work facilities for kids would reduce juvenile delinquency far more effectively than planned play and recreational facilities. There were shrieks of anguish at the idea, and some who advanced the thought were condemned by the planners and the labor folks as being advocates of child labor.

One shrieker to high heaven who was carried away by his indignation at the thought of youngsters working went so far as to revive that old quatrain about child labor, used effectively in former years, which went like this:

> The golf links lay beside the mill,
> And almost every day,
> The toiling children could look out
> And see the men at play.

Well, anyway, there comes now into the picture the celebrated Judge Philip P. Gilliam of Denver, a nationally known juvenile judge who is listened to with a vast deal of respect in various parts of the country. Judge Gilliam makes his point most eloquently. Some people in the youth management business, who have made it quite a profession, will think the judge's declaration is brutally frank, but there will be some millions of others who think it is well worth reading by every parent and by every boy in his teens.

Said the noted Judge Gilliam:

Always we hear the plaintive cry of the teenager: What can we do? Where can we go?

The answer is go home. Hang the storm windows, paint the woodwork. Rake the leaves, how the lawn, shovel the walk. Wash the car, learn to cook, scrub the floors. Repair the sink, build a boat, get a job. Help the minister, priest, rabbi, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army.

Visit the sick, assist the poor, study your lessons, and then when you are through—and not too tired—read a book.

Your parents do not owe you entertainment. Your city or village does not owe you recreational facilities. The world does not owe you a living. You owe the world something. You owe it your time and energy and your talents so that no one will be at war or in poverty or sick and lonely again.

In plain, simple words "grow up," quit being a cry baby. Get out of your dream world and develop a backbone, not a wishbone, and start acting like a man.

You're supposed to be mature enough to accept some of the responsibility your parents have carried for years. They have nursed, protected, helped, appealed, begged, excused, tolerated, and denied themselves needed comforts so that you could have every benefit.

This they have done gladly, for you are their dearest treasure. But now you have no right to expect them to bow to every whim and fancy just because selfish ego instead of commonsense dominates your personality, thinking and requests.

In Heaven's name, grow up and go home.

Evidently Judge Gilliam out Denver way has been doing a lot of thinking about this youth business, and has come to the conclusion that a lot of people are working the wrong end of the street. He must brace himself for a lot of howls of indignation about "work facilities" for youngsters, but he is on the right track.

Presently, it is criminal for kids to work. The reformers made it so, swinging the pendulum too far in the other direction in an effort to curb exploitation of the Nation's kids in the sweatshops of an earlier day.

Letters Critical of New York Times Appear in Birmingham Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert several letters which appeared in the "Letters to the Editor Column" of the Birmingham Post-Herald on Saturday, April 16, 1960. These letters refer to two articles written by one Harrison Salisbury, which appeared in the New York Times on April 12 and 13. These articles, which were highly critical of Birmingham and its present race conditions, were gross distortions and amazing recitals of untruths and semi-truths. I don't believe there has ever

been a worse example of journalistic irresponsibility ever presented to the American people. The letters which follow point up the reaction of the people of my district to the New York Times newspaper articles:

WHY THE NEW YORK TIMES DOESN'T NEED COMICS

Now I know why the New York Times doesn't carry comic strips. Their hysterical diatribe about Birmingham has the verity of Alley Oop, the objectivity of Bugs Bunny and the humor of Orphan Annie.

The New York Times must be trying to steal the circulation from Pravda.

FORD M. MACELVAIN.

GROVE HILL.

MATERIAL PRINTED WITHOUT INVESTIGATION

The Salisbury articles can authentically be described as yellow journalism or propaganda.

The writer does not give any names of those "quotes," indicating it was what is internationally known as weasel writing.

It is surprising to see a newspaper of the reputation of the New York Times printing this material without investigation.

May I suggest the local chamber of commerce give a paid trip to our city for 1 week to the editor of that paper for him to write his own series.

Frankly it is going to do a great deal of damage toward trusting what I read in any newspaper hereafter.

Is the Scripps-Howard chain up east carrying similar articles?

BOB THOMPSON.

BIRMINGHAM.

SLOGAN SUGGESTED FOR NEW YORK TIMES

Thank you very much for this morning's lead editorial, "Another Slander," and the hard, decent punch minus the minute details.

Some men will do almost anything for the mighty dollar, even to hitting below the belt. One thing I feel sure of Mr. Salisbury and that is he isn't on speaking terms with God. In a way I feel sorry for Mr. Salisbury, coming all the way to the ugly South for ugly news. Perhaps his own city could use a new broom.

Thanks, too, for our decent, honest, southern reporters. If there's a mistake, there is always a retraction.

I believe Mr. Salisbury and the New York Times could use our slogan: "Give light and the people will find their own way."

Mrs. R. C. WHEELER.

ENSLEY.

Educational Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, has been deeply involved for many months in the study of our public school needs and the role which Congress can perform to help meet these needs. I expect that in the very near future this House will have the opportunity to debate and vote upon measures which the committee has proposed. In anticipation of early deliberation, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the April 14, 1960, issue of the New York Times which discusses the question of Federal financial aid for our schools. The editorial, "Educational Rights," follows:

EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS

After acting on the voting-rights bill, it is important that the House turn its attention to another kind of civil-rights measure. This is what might well be called an educational-rights bill, one that would recognize the Federal Government's inescapable responsibility in the present crisis in American schools.

Early in February the Senate passed a bill providing $1.8 billion on a matching basis over a 2-year period for teachers' salaries or school construction or both. One of the great advantages of this measure is that it gives the individual States a choice in spending the money; one of its great disadvantages is that in the light of the administration's narrow view of school needs the President would be almost sure to veto it. To avoid such a fate, the House Education and Labor Committee last month reported a bill providing half the amount of the Senate proposal, stretching it out over a 3-year period, and limiting it to matching grants for school construction only, with an administration-approved bond-retirement plan thrown in for good measure.

The administration, backed by the usual conservative Republican, southern Democratic coalition, has shown so little grasp of the magnitude and the urgency of the school problem in the United States that even if Congress grants any aid at all, it is likely to be inadequate. Yet is is difficult to believe that this issue can once again be shoved aside, as it has been for nearly a decade. It ranks in importance with civil rights and national defense—in fact it is part of national defense.

"The public schools in the United States * * * are ill-staffed, ill-equipped, and ill-housed to provide the kind of excellence in education which the era demands * * *," said the public education association of this city in a recent statement. The nationwide shortage of public school teachers is 135,000 (average annual salary $5,160); the nationwide shortage of classrooms is about 130,000; within the decade, school enrollments will increase by 25 percent, and expenditures "sufficient merely to maintain existing standards" will jump even more sharply. It is no longer simply to improve the quality of education that Federal support is vital; it is necessary to prevent a decline—and it is necessary now.

The Air Force Manual Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under *leave to extend my remarks, I include* therein a letter from the St. Paul Council of Churches.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this letter better expresses than I could the *sentiments of the Council of Churches in* my district, and better expresses the feeling of those many thousands who are members of the Protestant and Orthodox churches. *Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is* indeed a sad day, when one of the military services of our Nation imputes, by indirection or otherwise, or implies there is disloyalty originating within many of the great churches of our land. At this point I do not really know who the "scare" hunters are, but whomever they be, I hope the Air Force will take appropriate action. Perhaps if they spent some of this time and money on missiles and defense, we would be in a much more favorable position from a national security standpoint, then we are.

I am opposed to communism wherever it exists, but to cast the shadow of guilt by association, is returning to the sad days of "McCarthyism."

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

ST. PAUL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Saint Paul, Minn., April 13, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KARTH: I am writing to you at the request of our pastors and the board of directors of the St. Paul Area Council of Churches. We are deeply concerned, as are church members in all parts of the country, over the recent statements incorporated in an Air Force manual. You will recall that in this manual the Air Force took it upon itself to warn young recruits in that branch of the armed services to be very critical in their judgment of churchmen and of churches as such. The assumption seems to have been that in the minds of those responsible for the manual the churches of this country are infiltrated with Communist sympathizers, and that therefore they may be a threat to the national security.

This, I am sure, you do not believe any more than I do. When one considers the millions of people represented in the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., even if the charges were true that there are a few individuals within these churches who are misled, this in itself does not pose any threat. I am sure you will agree that if there is one institution more than another that can be depended upon to uphold the democratic way of life which we cherish in this country, it is the Protestant and orthodox churches. If these tens of thousands of churches are not to be trusted, then this country is in a very bad way.

It is a most disturbing thought that men high in the ranks of the armed services should take unto themselves the right to sit in judgment upon the churches and upon their leaders. Furthermore, one cannot help being frightened when these gentlemen insinuate that the American people are not to be entrusted with the truth, and that those in the armed services are to be the guardians of what they think and say.

Here in the Twin Cities area there has been an attempt by some people to use the so-called Air Force Manual Issues as a means of undermining the confidence of our people in their churches. We have tried to be discreet and have hesitated to openly rebuke these misguided souls who would sow mistrust among us. You should know that a Minneapolis newspaper editorial took a very strong stand in this matter, as did also station WCCO–TV, and for these outspoken positions the churches are grateful.

May I therefore suggest that you inform yourself as to who these people are, who nationally seeking to poison the minds of our people? In every case they are people who are on the fringe of the church and who in *no way represent the mind of the church.* In fact, they do not know enough about the church at large to be justified in making such statements, even if they thought them to be true. It is obvious that these people have managed to catch the ear of many prominent people in our Federal Government.

We count on you, then, as our representative, to protect the good name of the

church and to refuse to accept at face value the statements of these so-called apostles of discord.

Bear in mind, please, that an attack on the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is an attack on the churches themselves. The national council is the official agency of the 33 denominations that comprise it. It does not have any separate existence. It is wholly responsible to its member bodies and to them alone.

Sincerely,

H. C. BRADSHAW,
Executive Secretary.

His 50th Easter at the Organ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article by Mr. Lou Rauscher which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent on April 17, 1960, the subject of the article being Mr. Zygmunt Brodzinski who last Sunday celebrated his 50th anniversary as organist at Holy Family Church in Sugar Notch, near Wilkes-Barre:

HIS 50TH EASTER AT THE ORGAN

(By Lou Rauscher)

Playing the organ for Easter Sunday is nothing new for Zygmunt Brodzinski. Today is the 50th time he is cast in such a role.

"Some youngsters dream of becoming a policeman, fireman, or truckdriver. Others want to join the Marines while still others may even want to become newspapermen. I've never wanted to be anything but an organist."

That's how Mr. Brodzinski sums up his continuous service at Holy Family Church in Sugar Notch for the past half century.

And, just to show that he has not been taken for granted, friends and parishioners will mark his prolonged and faithful service with a special testimonial banquet on May 1.

Zygmunt's tenure as organist ranges from his sandwiching time to play at mass during his shift as an employee for the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. to his present unaccelerated pace wherein he plays the organ daily in a semi-retired setting.

LABOR OF LOVE

Looking back on his stay in the choir loft. Mr. Brodzinski terms it "a labor of love. Times have changed somewhat. Younger people nowadays aren't interested in singing in a choir as was the case when I first began playing."

He was invited to play the church organ at Holy Family by Rev. S. A. Dreier, pastor in 1909. Young Zig was about 18 at the time and had already been exposed to the machinations of handling the organ as his dad had one in the family home.

He accepted Father Drier's invitation and started his daily routine "thanks to an understanding mine foreman." Young Brodzinski was supply clerk at the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. workings in Warrior Run. He managed to get to his organ each morning after tending the logistic wants of the miners. Then, after playing for the mass, he would return to the minesite to complete his shift.

STUDIED MUSIC ONE YEAR

The following year he was sent to brush up on liturgical music at Pio Nono College in St. Francis, Wis. After a course in organ and music theory, Brodzinski returned to Holy Family where he has been organist ever since.

He can't recall having missed a single Sunday during one span stretching from 1910 to 1942. And then he missed only two in 1942 due to a visit he and his wife made to their son Leonard's Air Force base in Florida.

PLAYS TWICE DAILY

Save for a brief respite because of a slight heart attack, Mr. Brodzinski has been playing for two masses daily for the greater portion of his years as organist.

"I've always wanted to be an organ player. I get a sense of satisfaction out of providing the accompaniment for the sacred liturgy. No organist is in business for the monetary advantages—at least none that I know of."

Mr. Brodzinski, who with his wife, the former Pauline (Morris) Mroziewski, lives in a neat home at 805 Main Street, Sugar Notch, currently is serving as secretary of the Luzerne County School Board and is also a member of the Sugar Notch School Board. He is a member of the advisory board of the Ashley branch of Miners National Bank.

ANNIVERSARY COMING UP

He and Mrs. Brodzinski will observe their golden wedding anniversary next year. They were married in 1911 in St. Mary's Church of the Maternity, in Wilkes-Barre, "because Holy Family was being rebuilt after having been struck by lightning."

Mr. Brodzinski was born in Nanticoke, lived for a short time in Warrior Run, and then came to Sugar Notch in 1911. He has supplemented his organist's tenure by working in various business enterprises of his father-in-law and ran his own shoe store in Nanticoke for 22 years. It was known as the Keystone Shoe Store.

Zygmunt's dad, the third Pole to settle in Sugar Notch, spent most of his working years in the mines. He himself volunteered to serve as a coal property guard for the Government during World War I, stationing himself nightly in the vicinity of the ventilation fan at No. 9 colliery of the then Lehigh & Wilkes-Barre Coal Co.

Despite the multiplicity of his interests, Mr. Brodzinski still found time to take care of his daily organist duties. Once, with the business pressures of his shoe store taking up most of his time, he tried to retire but was talked out of it.

He is a member of Musicians Union of Wilkes-Barre, Local 140 A.F.M., the Holy Name Society, Polish National Alliance, Polish Union of Wilkes-Barre, and has been secretary of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of Chicago, Group No. 1173, for the past 30 years.

PLAYED WITH RILEY TROUPE

His musical career includes stints with the noted James Riley Orchestra and the Sugar Notch Community Band. He was active in various minstrel organizations and spent a good portion of his earlier years as a music teacher.

Mr. and Mrs. Brodzinski are parents of five children and seven grandchildren. The children are Mrs. Peter Fedock, Elmhurst, Long Island; Mrs. Joseph Kane, Elmont, Long Island; Leonard, Flushing, Long Island; Mrs. Raymond McGowan, Phoenixville, Pa.; and Cecilia at home.

Cecilia and Mrs. Brodzinski are also organists of the accomplished variety. All the children have at one time taken music lessons.

Mr. Brodzinski, who currently plays for four masses each Sunday, was asked whether he intended to continue playing indefinitely. He said, "I am getting to the point where I would like to retire." A check with some of his friends and Holy Family parishioners revealed that it's not likely that they'll let him.

An Untenable Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, National Commander Charles A. McCarthy of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., recently testified before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to explain the legislative objectives of that organization. He and his associates made an excellent impression upon the committee. The officer responsible for the legislative program is Mr. F. B. Taylor, executive director of the National Executive Legislative Committee and he has been most cooperative with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Mr. LeRoy Chittenden is the editor of the National News and in the April 1960 issue wrote an editorial entitled "An Untenable Position" concerning non-service-connected pensions. Under leave to extent my remarks I include the text of that editorial:

AN UNTENABLE POSITION

The editor of the National News in this issue of the paper proposes to set forth in type his views on the pension program of the Veterans of World War I. It should be carefully noted that the sentiments expressed represent only his thinking and he does not in any manner want to infer or imply that his views are shared by any of the national officers of the organization.

The Louisville mandate on pension legislation is unrealistic, unworkable, and threatens the prestige of the Veterans of World War I which has taken years to build.

The mandate completely ignores the advice of experienced congressional leaders who have the best interests of the veterans at heart. It proposes a pension of $100 per month for all veterans of World War I regardless of length of service or present income.

Every pension law on the statute books was initiated with small monthly awards and then the amounts were increased over the years. The first Civil War pension law provided for payments of $6 to $12 per month if the veteran served 90 days or more. These rates were gradually increased so that by 1947 the amount payable was $90 per month.

The first provision of pensions for those men who served in the war with Spain was adopted June 5, 1920, and the amounts were set at $12 to $20 per month depending upon disability. Increases over the years brought the amount payable to the present rate of $101.59.

This was the formula recommended to the delegates to the Louisville convention but unfortunately they were confused and ill-informed when the resolution was brought up for a vote and the present mandate was adopted to the extreme regret of many delegates who had serious doubts as to the logic of endeavoring to push such a proposal through Congress.

Now it is apparent that their misgivings were well-founded. It is rare indeed that a Member of Congress can be found who will make a forthright statement that he will vote and work for a pension of $100 per month for every veteran of World War I, regardless of length of service or income. Chairman TEAGUE at the hearings on March 15 warned that a measure of this description faced a long and rocky road in the Congress.

Other Congressmen have not hesitated to express their opposition to this type of legislation. They resent being asked to sponsor such legislation and have been honest and frank in advising the leaders of the Veterans of World War I that a measure of this description can be enacted into law.

Your national commander faces a momentous decision. Should he adhere strictly to the Louisville mandate which he has been informed has absolutely no chance of passage or should he endeavor to secure some benefits for our aging buddies and later seek liberalizing amendments that would ultimately bring us in sight of our goal. The writer prefers the latter course.

First Prize—Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an essay written by Miss Gail Marie Chadwell of Reno, Nev. Miss Chadwell's essay won first place in the 1960 National Essay Contest sponsored by the President's Committee and cooperating State Governor's Committees on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Her essay follows:

FIRST PRIZE—JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY

(By Gail Marie Chadwell, Reno High School, Reno, Nev.)

"In these demanding times, the labor force of our Nation is our most precious asset. Working shoulder to shoulder, the handicapped can add spirit and power to America as we seek to promote the strength of the whole free world." With these words President Dwight D. Eisenhower urged the American people to extend to the handicapped that equality of opportunity which Americans believe to be the inherent right of all individuals. Although the handicapped may be limited in physical capacities, they are not disabled in mind and spirit. Their capabilities can add power to our Nation.

Because, as our President indicates, the times are demanding and because we must safeguard our basic rights, we must both utilize the potential of all individuals and extend to them the equality of opportunity which we so esteem as Americans. Specialized areas of labor can utilize the skills of the handicapped. Given the opportunity to prove their worth, the handicapped can acquire their rightful status in our society. From a sense of security and belief in his own worth the handicapped individual acquires the dignity which is his right.

Because the population is growing rapidly and because the lifespan of human beings is longer, the number of handicapped individuals is growing proportionately. Therefore, the problem of finding jobs for the handicapped looms larger. However, this problem exists only because the handicapped are thought by some to be incapable or inferior. It is often forgotten that the ability of a person constitutes his potential for employment rather than his disability. Employers are often afraid to hire the handicapped because they believe that the impaired workers are prone to injury and will therefore boost insurance rates. Surveys show that the safety records of the handicapped equal or exceed those of the nonhandicapped. Many States have "second injury" funds which protect the employer from having to pay total disability compensation for injuries to impaired workers. Furthermore, tests and research have repeatedly disproved the idea that the handicapped are not good workers.

Today many tax-supported rehabilitation centers exist throughout the United States. At these centers the disabled individual is given therapeutic aid and psychological support. He is offered psychotherapy so that he may regain his perspective and reestablish himself in society. A guidance counselor gives him advice and helps him find the type of work for which he is best suited. Having been given excellent training in his specialized fields, he is thoroughly trained in a trade which permits him to compete with able-bodied workers.

When he is prepared both physically and vocationally to make himself self-supporting, he must have a job. His next step is to utilize his training and prove that his work is equal to that of an able-bodied worker. Too many times he is not given this opportunity to prove himself. Prospective employers fail to realize that it is not logical to differentiate between the handicapped and the nonhandicapped. Every individual is handicapped to some degree in some field or another; he may be entirely untrained in or incapable of carrying out certain tasks whether they be physical or mental tasks. In order to ascertain that which a person can do best, an individual's personality, education, experience, interest, and motivation must be matched to the requirements of a particular job. The handicapped individual is not asking for sympathy, pity, or charity. He is asking only for the opportunity to prove that he is capable of fulfilling the essential jobs. He prefers to be hired on his merits and asks for the opportunity to sell himself on the basis of his ability. An employer need not hire a person because he is handicapped; he is obligated to hire the best qualified person without favoritism or discrimination; and frequently that person may be handicapped, but in a way which does not affect the job at hand.

After the prejudice of the employer is overcome and the handicapped individual is given the opportunity to prove himself, the disabled worker usually has no trouble proving that his work is equal to that of an able-bodied person. In the complex world of industry, in the burgeoning field of science myriad jobs exist. With training the handicapped can fill some of those jobs.

Because of increased incentive in trying to prove their worth and ability, the handicapped are frequently better workers than the able-bodied. Some employers have found that the handicapped are better workers than they were before they were injured. Statistics from a recent survey published in "Hire the Handicapped," a pamphlet prepared by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, show that handicapped employees revealed greater capacity for training and adjusted more readily to jobs than did other employees. Their attendance and safety records were superior; employee turnover was lessened. These facts are corroborated by many other statistics. For example, the December 7, 1959 issue of Business Week presents a joint survey compiled by the Labor Department and the Veterans' Administration showing that the production rate of the handicapped is slightly higher than that of unimpaired workers. Furthermore, the handicapped have proved to be morale-builders as well as pace setters.

What the handicapped are capable of doing is attested to by a thriving business in Albertson, Long Island, known as Abilities Inc., founded by Henry Viscardi, Jr., who is physically handicapped. Its employees are recruited from those who are handicapped. Although the business was started as late as 1952, today it is a million dollar concern with 421 employees. Its purpose is to train, give employment to, and transfer to private industry skilled employees who have previously been regarded as disabled. The work of Abilities Inc. proves that dignity can be restored to the handicapped individual and that he can lead a normal and productive life.

The mitigation of the increasing problem of finding jobs for and restoring dignity to the handicapped must begin in the community. Each citizen must rid himself of his prejudices against the handicapped and accept him on a par with the nonhandicapped. Employers can contribute to the program of aiding the handicapped by hiring such individuals whenever possible. They should remember that the handicapped do not want sympathy, pity, or charity but opportunity. Citizens may be of service in aiding the handicapped by helping them to rehabilitate themselves. Providing help for the handicapped may be a passport to dignity not only for the handicapped, but for the citizens aiding them.

"Give me the man with determination, for he is a doer. No physical handicap will deter a man who believes he can learn to do a job safely and well and is determined to prove it," said Philip D. Reed of the General Electric Co. Men like Mr. Reed possess dignity which stems from sensitivity to the problems of others. By helping the handicapped to restore their dignity, we as Americans are but reiterating our belief in the intrinsic worth of the individual, our belief that every individual must have the freedom to develop to the ultimate his potential for securing life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As we practice real democracy, we help to secure our democracy. Thus we enhance the inherent dignity of man.

Charleston News and Courier Defends Birmingham, Ala., Against Libelous Attack by the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial by America's most outspoken newspaper, the Charleston News and Courier. The editorial is entitled "New York Times Libels Birmingham, Ala., in Picturing City of Race Terror." Mr. Speaker, this timely editorial appeared in Charleston on Saturday, April 16. It is a well-tempered, intelligent response concerning the libels printed about the city of Birmingham, Ala., by the New York Times.

My colleagues of the Congress, if ever there was a time when reason and self-control was demanded of all persons in positions of responsibility, that time is now. I am not alone in stating that I regret that I, along with millions of

others, am a witness to the decline and fall of a once great newspaper, the New York Times. What a crash its fall has made in the lordly forest of metropolitan newspapers, "leaving a lonesome place against the sky." I do not know why this newspaper, once an important fountainhead of intelligent editorial policy, has sunken to an editorial nadir that could be compared only with the pulp magazine industry which has given the Post Office Department so much trouble.

It would seem that the New York Times would have enough to do in explaining to the world the conditions that exist in the jungle of the city of New York without going all the way to Birmingham, Ala., to spread its venom and unjustified condemnation. We in the South long ago have adopted a policy of live and let live but maintaining our historic policy of benevolent neutrality is difficult when a newspaper, misguided, misled, and miseditorialized leaves its own territory and besmirches one of the great, thriving, and tranquil cities of our Nation.

I do not propose to condemn the New York Times as a newspaper because the libel it has printed about Birmingham, Ala., is sufficient condemnation. But, I will say this to the New York Times: "Remove the mote from thine own eye."

N.Y. TIMES LIBELS BIRMINGHAM, ALA., IN PICTURING CITY OF RACE TERROR

In two articles on Birmingham, Ala., the New York Times has plumbed new depths of reportorial unfairness. The articles, written by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter Harrison E. Salisbury, represent a shocking departure from journalistic objectivity.

Citizens of Birmingham, we are told, are aroused and indignant at the defamation of their city. Well might they be, for the articles present the big Alabama steel city as worse than any of the Soviet cities Mr. Salisbury wrote about when he was Moscow correspondent for the Times.

According to Mr. Salisbury, Birmingham is a city where "every reasoned approach" to the race problem "has been fragmented by the emotional dynamite of racism, reinforced by the whip, the razor, the gun, the bomb, the torch, the club, the knife, the mob, the police, and many branches of the State's apparatus." He said that "the eavesdropper, the informer, the spy have become a fact of life." Birmingham police are represented as a terrorist group ruled by race hatred. The Ku Klux Klan is depicted as riding high, so much so that suburbanites know which of their neighbors belong to the KKK.

In short, Mr. Salisbury's articles present Birmingham as a hideous community of lawlessness, terror, and injustice. He found somebody who called it the Johannesburg of the United States and gleefully passed on the phrase.

John Temple Graves, distinguished southern newspaper writer who lives in Birmingham, informs us that the Salisbury articles are completely without foundation. Birmingham's police chief, he said, is tough in his handling of all groups fomenting riots, "but he is determined to be as fair as he is tough."

Mr. Graves also pointed out that the Salisbury articles failed to mention that five Klan members, who attacked and mutilated a Negro last year, were convicted in a Birmingham court and sentenced to 20-year jail sentences.

"Not even Atlanta," he said, "with all its talk of liberalism, has been as summary in its punishment of lawbreakers."

Terming the Salisbury articles "an arrant lie," Mr. Graves said that the New York Times reporter, to the best of his knowledge, did not talk with prominent white leaders. The Birmingham Post-Herald disclosed in an editorial Thursday that Mr. Salisbury had not discussed racial conditions in Birmingham with newspapermen in that city.

Granting his skill in the use of words, we find Mr. Salisbury's approach to race relations in the South more like the propagandist's than the objective reporter's. If the Times is intent on stirring revolution in the South, as it did with its promotional articles on Fidel Castro in Cuba, it is going about its business with determination and skill.

Such distorted pictures of the South do the American Republic no good in the eyes of the world. They may bring suffering to peaceful citizens of both races in the South.

Falsehood and the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 16, 1960, Mr. John Temple Graves, well known editorialist of the Birmingham Post-Herald, penned a vigorous protest to the two articles by one Harrison Salisbury, which appeared in the New York Times on April 12 and 13. These articles purported to be an accurate statement of the current race situation in Birmingham, Ala., my district. Mr. Graves very forcefully states the viewpoint of all citizens of my district, white and colored, in their reaction to the type of irresponsible journalism practiced by Mr. Salisbury. With the thought that the article by Mr. Graves would be of benefit to the Members of Congress in acquainting them with the true situation in Birmingham, I insert Mr. Graves' article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith under leave heretofore granted:

ALMOST TOTAL LIE FROM THE TIMES

(By John Temple Graves)

"That all should cry, 'beware, beware!
His flashing eye, his floating hair.'"

If reporter Harrison Salisbury could be psychoanalized for his Alabama pieces in the New York Times, the monstrosity of them might be traced back to his birth, upbringing and education in Minnesota, most south-hating of the States.

The Times must have known this. Only in malice could it have picked him.

A few weeks ago this column was praising Mr. Salisbury for an impressive and possibly historymaking piece in the Saturday Evening Post on the menace of Red China, comparing it with the confirmatory stories of Scripps-Howard's Roy Howard.

The objectivity and calm of his piece gave it extra impact, identified the true professional.

But now this madness in Alabama.

This almost total lie from a man alien to lies.

This throwback to tooth-and-claw hate.

You can guess only that in middle age (52) some horrid childhood image has interrupted all he is and does, that some prejudice gathered in streets or behind barns, some forgotten excess of elders has come flooding back at him with bigotries shaming all that is ordinarily civilized, objective and fair.

It may be significant that he writes of TCI President Wiebel as Arthur "Weible." It isn't like a first class reporter to get so familiar and important a name wrong. He gives many other evidences of having come here with only half an attention, with a story subconsciously already written and in a psychopathic passion blind even to spelling.

For bitter hurt to race relations blessedly better here than in other parts of the South and infinitely better than in New York, for an evil and libelous name given our eager city, and for a cruel—and subtle—body-blow to Birmingham-Southern College and President Stanford, God may forgive him but we never shall.

His pep talk to Dr. Stanford would be amusing if it were not tragic, a light touch in the dark and depravity.

Writing as if our fine Birmingham southern president had somehow defied a sea of southern prejudice and invited persecution from hosts of enemies of God and man, Mr. Salisbury imagines Dr. Stanford talking to himself: "You weigh the situation. You listen to the voices which say don't rock the boat. But finally the time comes when a man has to stand up and be counted."

Dr. Stanford has stood up and been counted all right. But not for any of the things Harrison Salisbury fancies in throwback.

He has stood up for the right of a comparative handful of his students, coaxed by a well-meaning, little half-time student, one-time minister with a messiah complex (many of these students only half noting what the thing was) to petition the Governor in behalf of nine Negro students expelled from Alabama State College for leading a Montgomery sit-in demonstration.

Dr. Stanford stood up and was counted for academic liberty—and aren't we all. Many here support his stand, including this column, regretting only that he expressed no opinion of his own.

True, he was not counted for libertarian sentimentality in behalf of centrally organized and directed lawbreaking and the most dangerous disturbances since the Civil War.

He was not counted for the damnable hypocrisy of CORE, NAACP, and Martin Luther King as they misled these young colored people into aggressions in the name of passive resistance or what the U.S. News better calls "passive insistence."

He was not counted for blasphemous, Bible-reading, hymn-singing, God-saying, America talk in every course of assailing the foundations of America.

No friend of the South—ever—is the New York Times. But it has on its staff men who don't go berserk. Our people should make the Times' incoming mail department miserable with letters now, not hot letters but cool, coolly asking that a newspaper with so great a name right some of the wrong it has done by sending here for a second and more rational look such men as Arthur Krock, or even James Reston (who lectures here Tuesday evening).

They say hell has no fury like a woman scorned. A comparable fury is that of a good man gone wrong with suddenly uncontrollable prejudice, bigotries and illiteracies flooding out of his past.

There is nothing, by and large, of which Birmingham—and the South—can be more proud than the behavior of its police and its people in the situation brought about by the Supreme Court's virulent, witless and unconstitutional interruption of the true advancement of colored people here.

Even with the interruption, there are things in Birmingham which a Harrison Salisbury in right reportial mind would have mentioned.

He would have mentioned the white men now serving 20 years in prison for mutila-

tion of a Negro whose only sin was being a Negro. New York could never have disposed of that crime as eagerly as we did here.

He could have mentioned the fight of white people here in cooperation with colored people to save from destruction the Negro community of Rosedale.

He could even have mentioned the metamorphosis of our much-mooted police commissioner—tough as ever but hell bent to be fair and on the scene.

It would have been too much to expect, of course, that he would mention something that concerns our critics not at all, the fact that trespass is illegal aggression and that when done to the tune of organized agitation it is more than any community can tolerate at an intense time like this.

What Easter Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Independent, Apr. 17, 1960]

WHAT EASTER IS

(By Rev. Burke Rivers)

It is strange that after 20 centuries, Christian people as well as non-Christians and semi-Christians should need to be told what Easter is. But it is so.

In our time Easter has become only our version of the ancient festivals which celebrated the return of spring. The new life rising out of the dead earth stirs our hearts with a suggestion that immortality is a kind of built-in feature of human nature. The message we hear—which is not necessarily the message which is preached from our pulpits—is essentially that of the song, "There Is No Death"—which is a manifest absurdity.

At least it is absurd for Christians who have shared the Passion on Good Friday and known the desolation of Holy Saturday. Death is both real and everywhere present in life as we know it. Even the Son of God—so we believe, endured the pangs of death, real death.

But if death is real, so is the Resurrection from the dead which Easter celebrates and affirms. The Christian Easter has never claimed to be a part of the natural order, as it would be if it only asserted that man is born to everlasting life. The Christian Easter frankly proclaims a miracle, an event which is the act of God above and beyond the natural order of things as they are. "Now is Christ risen from the dead!" In St. Paul's words, this is what Easter says, and it bids us wonder, marvel, and rejoice. Easter really says very little about man, but it says a great deal about God.

WE HAVE TO ACCEPT IT

Christians have never "explained" the Resurrection. All they have done is to relate it to the love of God who would not be defeated by the sinful stupidity of men even when they raised the Cross on Calvary. We don't have to "explain" it, but unless we want to fly in the face of history, we do have to accept it as something that really happened and let our lives be shaped by it as, in some measure, they are shaped by every other historical event. Any man who takes history seriously is bound to accept the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

But what does this mean for the shaping of our lives? It means first that we need no longer be prisoners of despair, doomed to find nothing at the end of days but the darkness of the grave. We can now live in hope of a new life beyond death which will be ours, not by some inborn right of our own, but as the gift of God.

It means also that this hope rests upon a firm foundation, and not upon some desperate longing that death should not be what it obviously is. That foundation is our knowledge of Him who was seen by many witnesses on Easter morning, and has been known in the power of His Spirit by countless multitudes ever since.

NOT TO BE AFRAID

And it means that from this hope we draw courage to face all life's difficulties and problems. The first words of Easter, spoken to the women by an angel, are "Do not be afraid!" Christians are those who know how not to be afraid, no matter what may happen to them.

But above all it means that these life-shaping gifts of hope and courage are given to those who know the Christ as Lord and Saviour, who having given their hearts and lives to Him, have received at His hand newness of life in the power of His Resurrection and so have found peace.

This, then, is what Easter is and it can never be understood as anything else: The Feast of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. And what it says to the world today is just what was said long ago in the words of the old carol—

"O sons and daughters, let us sing!
The King of heav'n, the glorious King,
O'er death today rose triumphing.
Alleluia!
On this most holy day of days,
To God your hearts and voices raise,
In laud, and jubilee, and praise.
Alleluia!"

Giovanni Da Verrazzano Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Verrazzano was a famous Italian navigator and explorer early in the 16th century. He is remembered and honored for many of his discoveries and exploits. On April 17, we honor his memory with the 436th anniversary celebration of his discovery of New York Bay.

This adventurous son of Italy was born in a village near Florence in about 1485. As the son of a family famous as spice merchants, Verrazzano sailed to many lands and lived in some of them. In 1521 he entered the services of the king of France, and as a French corsair became a veritable terror to Spanish sailors carrying consignments of gold from the West Indies and Mexico to Spain. Two years later the king gave his permission to find a new route to Cathay, China. Late in December of 1523 Verrazzano set sail in search of a new route to Cathay, but by early March of 1524 he was in sight of South Carolina shores. Then sailing north, in mid-April he and his companions were in the vicinity of New York, in sight of the New York Bay. This discovery by Verrazzano climaxed his career, and a few years later he died.

On April 17, the 436th anniversary celebration of his discovery of the New York Bay, on this Verrazzano Day, we honor the memory of this great and gifted explorer.

This Man Knows Why Forand Bill Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the East Bay Labor Journal recently published an article entitled "This Man Knows Why Forand Bill Needed." It was based on a letter received from Philip Ickler of 4201 East 16th Street, Oakland, Calif., a very old friend of mine. Philip Ickler has had a varied experience. At one time he was very successfully engaged in the real estate business in Florida.

When he came to the Pacific coast, he renewed his activities in the labor movement as a member of the Painters Union and he has been active every since.

Philip Ickler has been in the forefront of every liberal fight that we have had in Alameda County. He is a fine organizer and reflects the thinking of the man on the street.

I think that, in his own way, he points out conclusively why we need the Forand bill.

The article follows:

[From the East Bay Labor Journal, Feb. 26, 1960]

THIS MAN KNOWS WHY FORAND BILL NEEDED

Philip Ickler, 4201 East 16th Street, Oakland, who informs us that he has been a member of organized labor for 58 years, having joined the Painters Union in 1902, sends in the following plea for the Forand bill:

"There is a health and hospital bill, now before the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C., the Forand bill, which is very badly needed right now. We have many health and hospital insurance companies here in the United States of America, but they are raising their prices most every year. We have 16 million elderly people on the social security old age pension, and they cannot afford these high premium prices.

"About 6 years ago I joined a health and hospital insurance company; at that time I had to pay $3 a month premium, with my wife included. This company raised their price every 2 years. The last 3 years, I had to pay $7 for me alone, because my wife had died in 1954. Now last year, 1959, on July 1 they raised my premium price to $9 a month. I am 75 years of age with very little income, but I cannot drop this health and hospital insurance now, because no other health and hospital insurance would take me, because I am too old already. Then I would be without any protection in case of sickness.

"Now there are millions of working people who are in the same predicament. We have 16 million elderly people on the social security old age pension; they cannot afford such

high prices for health and hospital insurance, so they have to drop out, then they would not have protection at all; then many of them have to go on county or State relief, which is not very nice. We have about 6 million union members who are on social security old age pension, and they cannot afford such high prices for the health and hospital insurance.

"I had the privilege to be the first member of organized labor who introduced a Government health and hospital resolution, at the national convention of the Painters and Decorators at Buffalo, N.Y. My resolution was discussed and was then unanimously adopted, September 1937 at Buffalo, N.Y. This same resolution was also unanimously adopted at the national convention of the American Federation of Labor in October, also in 1937.

"Then the Honorable Mr. DINGELL, Member of the House of Representatives introduced a health bill in the House of Representatives, in 1938, at the same time the Honorable U.S. Senator Mr. WAGNER from New York introduced this same health bill in the United States Senate, also in 1938. This health bill was before the U.S. Congress in 1938 and 1939, after debating this health bill at both sessions of Congress. This health bill was postponed for later years.

"Now, this was over 20 years ago and a few times it came before the U.S. Congress, but it always was postponed. Now this health and hospital bill, the Forand bill is now before the U.S. Congress. I sincerely appeal to all our 12 millions of union labor in the United States of America to write a few lines to their two U.S. Senators and to their Representatives in Washington, D.C. and ask them to vote and work for this Government health bill, the Forand bill. It takes many millions of letters to get action from our United States Senators and Representatives. Please do your part in this very vital and very badly needed right now Government health and hospital bill."

A Mighty Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Smithville Times, which is owned and published by Mr. C. K. Mick of Smithville, Tex., on Thursday, April 14, 1960, published a very impressive and splendid editorial pointing out that the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate and U.S. Senator from Texas, has been recognized throughout the Nation as the ablest man for the Presidency of the United States and urges that "the individual citizen—multiplied—speakes with a mighty voice" and that "it is a voice that cannot be denied." The editorial is as follows:

A MIGHTY VOICE

The office of President of the United States is both a high honor and an awesome responsibility. It is the one office above all others in our democratic system for which the people should seek the man.

Throughout our Nation, LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been singled out—by editors, by writers, by Government leaders, by the people themselves—as the ablest man of them all for the Presidency.

Since LYNDON JOHNSON is the ablest of them all, as we believe him to be, then we feel that the American people should call LYNDON JOHNSON to the Presidency. LYNDON JOHNSON is devoted to his country and to his fellowmen. He could not say no.

On May 7, every Texan will have the opportunity of announcing LYNDON JOHNSON'S candidacy for him. On that date, Democratic precinct conventions will be held in every neighborhood in the State. This is a meeting every Democrat of us should attend with our poll tax receipt stamped to show that we voted in that day's primary.

This is our chance to speak significantly to a fellow Texan who has risen to a position of international prominence through proven ability. This is our chance to say that we want the ablest man for President—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The individual citizen—multiplied—speaks with a mighty voice. It is a voice that cannot be denied.

Beardsley Ruml—Leader in the Fields of Social Science, Education, Business, and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning there died in Danbury, Conn., a man who made outstanding contributions in the fields of social science, education, business, and Government.

Beardsley Ruml was not just a theorist; he conceived goals and achieved them. The story of his career, while necessarily abbreviated, serves as a fitting tribute to his memory.

Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include an article published in today's New York Times which relates the story of Beardsley Ruml:

DANBURY, CONN., April 18.—Beardsley Ruml, who devised the pay-as-you-go plan for the payment of Federal income tax, died of a heart ailment this morning in Danbury Hospital. He was 65 years old and lived on Route 53 in West Redding.

Mr. Ruml, a man noted for his ideas, had been chairman of R. H. Macy & Co. and the Federal Reserve Board of New York and was a former professor at the University of Chicago as well as Government adviser. At his death he was a director of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., and had a desk in its offices at 342 Madison Avenue in New York.

His income-tax contribution came at a critical time in world events. Without the pay-as-you-go method of collection, the Government could not have financed from current revenue so much as it did of the terrific cost of World War II and the cold war that followed.

Essentially, the plan involved forgiving all or part of 1942 taxes in order to begin collection of 1943 taxes on a withholding basis.

For Mr. Ruml this proposal was unusual only in that he had to battle to get it accepted. First he had to arouse interest in the Treasury Department and then to convince a reluctant Congress to enact it. To those who viewed the plan as dubious fiscal sleight of hand, he offered this assurance:

"Nothing really will be lost. All you do is set your tax clock ahead a year. It's as simple as daylight saving time and there's nothing mysterious about that is there?"

Mr. Ruml had an established reputation as social scientist, educator, and businessman when he put this plan forward. He was chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York at the time, but it was as treasurer of R. H. Macy that he hatched this particular idea.

It came to him as he pondered over the difficulty that many Macy employees encountered, on retirement or entry into the armed services, in paying income tax for the previous year. Characteristically, he was relaxing aboard the Twentieth Century Limited, en route from Chicago to New York, when the idea took form. He always contended that his best ideas emerged as he lolled in a "state of dispersed attention."

"Nobody can think if he's uncomfortable," he would say as he reclined in an easy chair.

CHALLENGED THINKING

He made whipping up ideas pay. An associate at the University of Chicago said that he was "leaving ideas for notions" when he stepped down as Dean of Social Sciences to go with Macy's in 1934. But he got $70,000 a year in his new job, where Percy Strauss, then head of Macy's, said his only duty would be "to challenge our thinking."

Mr. Ruml, known as "B" to friends, did just that. He instituted the Q system, an accounting device that drove home to employees the importance of getting that little extra bit of business. His "cash-time plan" enabled Macy's to take on installment business without sacrificing the "6 percent less for cash" slogan that had built so much of its sales volume.

Born on November 5, 1894, at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Mr. Ruml early revealed an affinity for ideas. An aunt ended a visit without thinking to repay 2 cents she had borrowed from him for a stamp. At age 7, he wanted very much to collect but his parents enjoined him not to mention the matter. His next letter to his aunt, however, had the figure 2 printed in all four corners. He got his 2 cents back by return mail.

A couple of years later, his father, Wentzle Ruml, a well-known physician, offered his three sons a penny for each nail that they would pick out of the cinder driveway. His brothers went to work by hand. Beardsley dragged a large magnet on a cord.

The name Ruml is of Czech origin, brought to the United States by Mr. Ruml's paternal grandfather. Beardsley was the maiden name of his mother, Salome, whose family came from New England.

Mr. Ruml graduated from Dartmouth College in 1915 with a Bachelor of Science degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key. He returned to the Midwest to take his doctorate at the University of Chicago. His thesis: "Psychometry, the study of measuring and determining intelligence."

World War I took him from an instructorship at the Carnegie Institute of Technology to Washington, where he directed the Army's trade tests in a civilian capacity. Then he and five others formed a company to advise private industry on personnel problems.

In 1921 Dr. James R. Angell, president of the Carnegie Corp. put Mr. Ruml to work as his assistant. A year later, the young man, just 27, was drafted by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., as director of the $80 million Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

Chief monument to his 7 years' work in this capacity is the Public Administration Clearing House in Chicago, a national headquarters in the science of government. Liberal grants to improve relationships between white and Negro races also were made during this period. In 1930, Mr. Ruml became dean and professor of education at the University of Chicago.

While at Chicago, another Ruml idea, which had been at large in the public realm

since 1927, was put to work in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, enacted in the early days of the New Deal.

Three years after going to Macy's, Mr. Ruml became a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and from 1941 to 1947 he was its chairman. He became Macy's chairman in 1945 and continued in that post to 1949. He remained a director until 1951.

Mr. Ruml played a prominent role at the conference of monetary experts from 41 nations at Bretton Woods, N.H., in the summer of 1944. This conference led to the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank).

SUPPORTERS OF STEVENSON

He had been a registered Republican, but he usually voted Democratic "to balance things." He was chairman of the Democratic Finance Committee in Adlai E. Stevenson's 1952 campaign for the Presidency. A Ruml plan in that campaign produced a flood of $5 subscriptions to the Democratic cause.

In addition to the Encyclopedia Britannica, Mr. Ruml's corporate connections in later years included directorship of the Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co., the General American Investors Co., the Government Development Bank of Puerto Rico, the Market Research Corporation of America, the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Muzak Corp., and the National Securities and Research Corp.

Mr. Ruml was also an adviser to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and a trustee of Dartmouth College, Fisk University, the Committee for Economic Development, the Museum of Modern Art in New York and the National Planning Association. He also was active in the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

His clubs included The Links, Century and The Players.

Mr. Ruml is survived by his widow, the former Lois Treadwell; two sons, Treadwell of Chicago and Alvin of West Redding; a daughter, Mrs. John Doyle of Winnetka, Ill.; a sister, Mrs. W. K. Jordan of Cambridge, Mass.; a brother, Wentzle Ruml, Jr., of East Orange, N. J., and eight grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Wednesday at 3 p.m. in the Redding Federated Church.

Mayor George Christopher's Description of His Recent Trip to the Soviet Union—A Report to the People of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable George Christopher, of San Francisco, in which he tells of his recent historic trip to the Soviet Union as an official guest of the government of the Soviets. All of us in San Francisco are particularly proud of his accomplishments on this trip in assisting in the better understanding of our peoples and of his convincing demonstration of the desire of the citizens of our country for world peace. I am pleased to make this address available to my colleagues and commend it to your attention:

ADDRESS OF MAYOR GEORGE CHRISTOPHER, COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA LUNCHEON, MARCH 18, 1960

Visiting the Soviet Union was the remotest thought in my mind a few months ago. And then Mr. Khrushchev visited the United States.

During this tour, apprehensions were felt about the reception being accorded the head of a very powerful state—one whose personal decisions could weigh heavily for or against the peace of the world. By the time he reached San Francisco, relations were severely strained.

As the mayor of San Francisco, I considered it my duty to extend a sincere welcome—to make him feel at home—to send the party away feeling the warmth of our hospitality.

In these unpredictable days when a cold war is being fought on numerous fronts, I hoped we might add a grain of sand to the mountain-heap of the world's peace efforts. If we could forestall a hot war for even an hour, millions of lives might be saved.

In February the snows are high in the Soviet Union and the temperatures are low, but I had to conclude my journey before our budget hearings began in San Francisco, and so we prepared for the winter trip.

I was aware, of course, that this visit would have its political dangers. Any error of judgment, or the wrong word at the wrong time, would reflect not only upon me and on my city, but upon our national efforts for peace. And then there are the local contentions. There is the visitor who can see no good whatever in the Soviet state of affairs, and the extreme opposite faction that can see no evil at all. I consider the Soviet Union and the United States from the same critical vantage point—both have advantages and disadvantages. I have no illusions about this visit and I'm not setting myself up as an expert by virtue of a 3-week sojourn.

I spoke personally with Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Kozlov, Mr. Mikoyan, and the mayors, governors, and prime ministers of the various republics, and received some insight into their administrations.

On the way to Moscow, we stopped in Paris where I conferred with General de Gaulle. Not only General de Gaulle, but mayors and high officials in England, France, Denmark, and other countries, spoke highly of San Francisco's part in receiving Mr. Khrushchev in our city. They were in agreement that San Francisco's reception of Mr. Khrushchev was of great importance to the world's peace. These comments surprised me, for to that moment I had not considered its importance beyond our own area.

We started for Moscow on a Russian jet, but snowstorms forced us to land first in Leningrad. Finally, however, we arrived, and after plodding through several feet of snow, we were brought into a room where a battery of cameramen snapped pictures as the first round of toasts began. It was obvious that the people were friendly, and they wanted to be as hospitable as possible.

I insisted on a full-fledged program, and the itinerary we set up startled our hosts but this was to be a working session.

The next morning we met Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, and from there went to Mr. Zhukov's office for a conference. I had many projects which I wanted to bring to the attention of Soviet officials, including the release of a number of Soviet citizens to relatives in the United States, the establishment of a World Technical Information Center, the exchange of cultural exhibits, the exchange of students, a program for the exchange of athletic events, and other such projects which I deemed appropriate for the creation of better understanding between us.

Personal contacts are important, and I could see almost immediately that my own visit, despite the fact that I was a comparatively minor official, was accomplishing a great deal for the betterment of American prestige in the Soviet Union.

The top-level heads of the Soviet Union understand the importance of these personal contacts. That is why Mr. Khrushchev has made one trip after another to various lands in the interest of conveying the Soviet message. And that is why it is important that President Eisenhower be encouraged, rather than discouraged from going to various nations and portraying, as only he can, the true American spirit.

In our travels throughout the Soviet Union, we enjoyed more than just diplomatic immuntiy. Mr. Gromyko was with us at all times, and my party had automatic entrance through customs and in every other facility. This carte blanche service admittedly was a precedent and several times special phone calls were placed to Moscow to verify this unusual procedure.

I will not belabor the first impressions, such as the elderly women shoveling snow and performing other menial tasks, or the monotonous tones of the only radio station and the solitary television station. I am sure of one thing—there can be no payola there, because it isn't worth it.

In expressing some of my thoughts on these matters, I am saying only what I said quite frankly to the Soviet officials. It is not my purpose to come home and unduly criticize their efforts. Where they are performing well, I believe we should recognize it, and where they are deficient, I believe it is only fair to point out the deficiency.

In Moscow there is a tremendous housing program under construction. Under the 7-year plan, an expenditure of 500 billion rubles is called for and most of this money is going for new housing. This housing is being constructed on a mass production basis. Huge derricks are placing the prefabricated walls together, and row after row of housing is going up, although it all looks the same and is without style or architectural imagination. Usually, these structures go up to five stories, and any structure up to five stories contains no elevator. By our standards, this housing would be considered very inadequate. However, we must remember that Moscow is a city over 800 years old, and before the revolution consisted of 1⅓ million people, with 80 percent of the housing being dilapidated log cabins. Now they have 5½ million people. Moscow alone will build 91,000 flats this year, and a total of 650,000 during the 7-year plan. Despite the fact that this is comparatively new housing, the doors are warped, the fixtures are falling off, and the construction is generally poor.

In every city I asked the mayors and the governors about crime and juvenile delinquency. At first I was skeptical about their answers. They all shrugged off the extent of crime—not more than seven or eight murders per year in the large cities, they said, and juvenile delinquency is negligible because it is policed by a "people's guard." Robberies and holdups are practically nonexistent, they said. My skepticism eventually gave way as I delved into the figures in each of the cities. While I cannot believe that their murder rate, for instance, amounts to only 6 or 7 per year in a city of over 5½ million people, I am convinced that their crime rate is negligible by comparison to the major cities of America.

Their city councils are widespread in representation. Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev

have from 700 to 800 members on their city councils, which would amount to quite a debating society in our democracy.

They are proud of their Moscow University, 33 stories high, with 25,000 students—10,000 boarding on the premises at $2 per month. Education is compulsory for 11 years in the Soviet Union, and the able student has no difficulty being subsidized if he desires to continue higher studies. But entrance examinations are severe, and all students must attend classes 6 days a week. In this category the Soviet people are working hard.

After several days in Moscow, we took their crack Red Arrow train to Leningrad. Here, too, considerable housing construction is going on. They will build 40,000 flats this year. As in Kiev and Moscow, they, also, are extending their subway.

The pioneer clubs for young children are widespread. Thousands of youngsters attend these clubs and receive instruction in dancing, music, art, games, and even chess. I tried my chess hand with one of the 12-year-old boys, and I was severely trounced. These pioneer clubs are for instruction beyond the regular 6-day school schedule, so it is evident that they keep their children quite busy all during the week.

The Soviet Union is replete with museums, most of them being converted churches, 1,000 or more years old.

We insisted on attending church services one Sunday and found the church filled to capacity, mostly by very elderly women. Our guides, of course, were atheists, but Mr. Gromyko, though professing his atheism, nevertheless dutifully came in with us and stood by.

One of the most impressive museums is the Hermitage in Leningrad. It has 400 halls, and is filled with Rembrandts, Michelangelos, El Grecos, Van Dykes, and DaVinci's works. I was interested to learn that 15,000 people a day, mostly students, are escorted through the museum for educational purposes. Even members of the Soviet navy were present in large numbers though I doubt that their navy men have a different concept of culture than ours.

The Leningrad metalworks is a huge machine-tool plant, and the turbines they produce here are about three times as large as the turbines at Grand Coulee Dam. The average beginner earns about 800 rubles, or about $200 per month. They can go up to 2,500 rubles for engineers, and the top plant director receives 5,000 rubles per month, or about $1,250. A plant employing over 15,000 persons, as this one does, requires considerable responsibility. Here, I believe, talent is being used to subsidize government operations. What else can you call the difference between the frozen 5,000 rubles this director was receiving, and his actual worth under a system of free enterprise? They work 46 hours a week and settle their labor differences through a "conflict committee." The decision of the conflict committee is final—no strikes.

It is from such operations as this plant that the Soviets are able to finance major research projects as the one at Dubna, 100 miles out of Moscow, where 5,000 scientists are daily engaged in atomic research.

Generally speaking, the absence of the free enterprise system is evident to any American. There is a complete lack of imagination in their merchandising. In fact, there is no promotion, no effort at selling—no merchandising whatever.

Their newspapers are four-page publications, with no advertising, no features, no articles contradictory to their editorial policy—nothing but straight, Government-approved news. Incidentally, the newspaper Pravda which we visited, has a circulation of 6,300,000. It sells for 20 kopecks when it has four pages, and for 30 kopecks when it has six pages.

The average stores are poorly stocked by our standards. There are on institutions such as our local supermarkets. In one large Kiev market, the meat was wrapped in a newspaper and handed to the buyer half exposed. The store fronts are practically identical and the only thing that will ever change this drab situation is for two alert merchants to start competing with each other.

On the way to Kiev we saw large numbers of jet fighters on the ground.

Kiev, too, is on a housing spree. They will build 130,000 new flats in the 7-year plan.

Kiev is about ready to start construction of a subway. Since the water was turned off all over Kiev the last night we were there, indicating an inadequate water system, I wondered why their subways had a higher priority in the 7-year plan, especially since they have so few cars compared to the United States. They discounted the suggestion that the underground could have facility as a bomb shelter, as well as serving as a means of transportation.

The shopping area of Kiev resembled the other cities—hundreds of wagon stores on the sidewalks, selling every conceivable commodity, foodstuffs exposed to the elements, and a great deal of activity at every store, especially the bookstores. The Russian people evidently are thirsting for knowledge.

The dairy stores are unique. Butter is cut from an exposed cube about 1½ feet square. Cottage cheese is poured from a 10-gallon can into a paper container made into a cone right on the spot—certainly no fancy wrapping, no packaged merchandising.

The Soviet Government then provided us with a special DC–3 and we went on to Tbilisi in Georgia. Here, again, the reception was overwhelming. The townspeople knew we were coming, or if they didn't, they soon found out, with all the motorcycle escorts and the tremendous commotion that was stirred up on our arrival.

Georgia is a great wine-producing area, and we derived considerable enjoyment presenting them with casks of California wine. The spirit of friendliness ran high here and the Georgians know how to make one feel at home.

Now, let us check some of the economics. The average worker earns between 800 and 900 rubles per month. He recevies an advantage in his rent which is subsidized, costing only about $4 per month. Medicine costs nothing at all. But let us also check the daily needs of living. Shoes cost 200 to 300 rubles, or about 10 days' wages. A fair suit costs 800 to 1,000 rubles, which is a month's wages. Can you imagine an American worker being compelled to spend a month's wages on just one suit? A table model television costs about 2,500 rubles, or 3 months' wages. One shirt costs 150 rubles. A small car costs about 40,000 rubles, or about 4 years' pay for the average worker. Which American worker would like to work 46 hours a week for 4 years just to buy a car?

In the realm of producing these consumer goods, Mr. Khrushchev privately admitted to me that we are still ahead, but he emphatically states that we shall fall behind eventually. In fact, Mr. Khrushchev has told me that we would not even be second, but rather would be third behind China.

In their program of austere living, the Soviets have over 50 percent of their population living on communal agricultural farms, while America has only 12 percent of its people in agriculture. This, of course, means a more restricted life for the Soviet people.

In 1959, their national budget was 707 billion rubles, while their revenue was 724 billion rubles. They derive their major national revenue from a sales turnover tax, while their income tax maximum is only 13 percent. They can be very practical about the adjustment of their economy. In 1957, 260 billion rubles in state bonds were repudiated. I asked persistently how they could possibly justify this action and their reply was simple: Why issue new bonds to pay the old? They sold this idea of repudiating the old bonds on the basis that they would no longer issue additional bonds which theretofore have been compulsory to the workers.

In their production program under the 7-year plan, a 7 percent annual increase in production is called for everywhere, and they are meeting this increase now. If this rate of increase is maintained, and if the United States keeps its present rate of growth, which is about 3 percent annually, by 1965 they will have caught up to us in steel, aluminum, and machinery production.

I talked to some buyers of steel who had come to Russia for that purpose. These buyers were from countries not in the Soviet orbit, yet they bought Soviet steel, and they quoted me a savings of approximately $400,000 on one order of structural steel. The United States and England could not come near the Soviet prices. This means that in a fixed Socialist economy the Soviets can revise downward any competitive item and subsidize it through state control. This is, indeed, tough competition, for they have increased their steel production from 15 million tons in 1945 to over 60 million tons in 1959.

It is obvious that the aggressive growth of the U.S.S.R. will impress the peoples of the other continents, for the Soviet people have risen from one-eighth of our total production prior to the revolution to a present ratio of about one-half.

While we give them credit for their increases, we must also take into account the kind of work they are putting out. Their efficiency is poor, and cannot possibly compare with American efficiency. Their methods of production are far behind the American system of production. Their work is slipshod and inferior, and whatever the job it certainly falls far below the standards of the American worker. There is no competition to spur them on with a desire to create a superior product or facility.

In their anxiety to build fast and big, they are casting aside all semblance of good workmanship. There is one project, however, in which their construction excels. The subway in Moscow is finer and cleaner than any other subway in Europe, replete with statuary in the underground, and very imposing in every way. The escalator leading into the subway is the longest I have ever seen, and takes so long to travel that passengers even read their newspapers going up and down.

During all of our travels throughout the Soviet Union, there was one satisfaction accorded us without our asking for it. At every table occupied by our party, there was always the American flag, and there were no sneers or incidents of any kind.

Next, we went to Tashkent by way of Karshi, and the people there had a charm all their own. I visited a collective farm in that area which is supporting 2,500 workers. Ordinarily, 100 workers would be sufficient under American standards to operate this farm. They maintain their own schools and other institutions on the farm, and my best comparison of prices was to determine the price for which their milk was sold. It came to approximately 40 cents a quart, which indeed would meet with some real opposition in our country.

The hotel in Tashkent, while practically new and imposing on the outside, was in a dilapidated condition on the inside. My room number was 110, and I had a difficult time finding it, for it was on the fourth floor. They insisted on bringing a luxurious grandfather's clock into the room, which

struck the time on the hour—but you had to remember that when it struck 9 o'clock the time was really 7 o'clock. When someone wanted to contact me in my room, they did not dial 110; they had to dial 2222. To say it was confusing is putting it mildly.

I asked about the wages of teachers, because we hear about the superior rates of teachers' pay in the Soviet Union. The teachers in the elementary schools earn from 1,100 to 1,200 rubles per month. The higher classified professors can earn up to 5,000 rubles per month. Since the State must eventually hire all trained teachers, doctors, engineers and other professional people, the curriculum is set far ahead in accordance with the birth rate. Thus, they know how many school teachers, engineers and doctors they will have 25 years from today.

Their schools carry on athletic competitions, but they also carry on competitions among the cultural and scientific classes, as well. The receipt of one of the coveted medals by a student is a signal honor. One student receiving such a medal had designed a new type of helicopter. It was interesting to note that 60 percent of the Moscow University students are in scientific studies. 80 percent of the students receive subsidies ranging from 300 to 780 rubles per month, depending upon their marks.

The director of the Moscow University had visited in the University of California, and I asked him to compare the two universities. He stated that with the exception of our atomic laboratory, their university is much better equipped for new experiments and scientific research. They are very frank to claim superiority of their methods in every educational phase. They can boast of having 110,000 women scientists in the U.S.S.R., and they also claim to have over 280,000 research workers doing scientific work.

They are very proud of their Bolshoi Ballet, their circus and puppet shows, and many other forms of entertainment which they call the people's cultural shows.

Finally, we came to our meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, who had been away in Indochina. It was scheduled that I go to Mr. Zhukov's office, and that he would accompany me to the Kremlin. At 12 noon I entered Mr. Khrushchev's office. After some minutes of press review, we were left alone, and I conferred privately with Mr. Khrushchev for over an hour.

Then we left the building for another section of the Kremlin for luncheon. It was here that Mr. Khrushchev ignored his chauffeur and asked me if I would prefer to walk. I said I would, and we walked the few hundred yards down the Kremlin way to the astonishment of sightseers who now are permitted to enter the Kremlin grounds. As they saw him approaching, they applauded him, and frequently he would take me by the arm and introduce me to the crowd, whereupon the applause would begin all over again.

The luncheon was attended by Mrs. Khrushchev, Deputies Kozlov and Mikoyan, and Mr. Zhukov. We discussed a number of items, and for 2½ hours I was engaged in a very absorbing conversation. First of all, Mr. Khrushchev said he regrets very much that the United States is not ready to enter into trade relations with the U.S.S.R. He believes that trade will bring better understanding and strengthen the cause of peace. In this instance, Mr. Khrushchev ignores the fact that he can trade with the United States if he desires—provided that he pays cash and does not depend on credits. We have considerable millions of dollars due from prior sales, about $700 million, reduced from about $3 billion, and the United States is not apt to permit a recurrence of this situation.

He agreed with me that a broad scale exchange of cultural exhibitions would be good for our two countries. He specifically promised the loan of one major exhibition, and I shall be working on that in the months ahead.

Mr. Khrushchev further stated that the relationship between America and the Soviet Union had improved vastly in the past months, and he pointed out that the present improved relationship was unthinkable 1½ years ago. He believes that the tensions have been lessened considerably, and I think all of us can agree in that respect.

Mr. Khrushchev believes that President Eisenhower's visit will be of tremendous value in the cause of peace, and he is looking forward to it with great anticipation. He stated further that the main job now is to improve further our mutual relations, and believes that disarmament is a most important problem to solve. In fact, he called this the problem of problems.

In the course of this discussion, he told me that the Soviet Union is ready to destroy all nuclear weapons if everyone agrees to do likewise, and to go under a strict surveillance thereafter. What constitutes adequate inspection is another question.

And, if the Soviet Union in concert with Red China were permitted then to maintain the largest land army in the world, America certainly would be placed at a total disadvantage. It has been said that the Chinese Reds could lose 100 million men, and it would make no difference if victory were in the offing.

Mr. Khrushchev stated—and he said this very emphatically—that the U.S.S.R. will never be the aggressor, nor will they ever attack nor inspire an attack on the United States, or any other nation of the Western World. This, of course, was most reassuring to me, and I replied in kind by saying that the American people have never been aggressors in the past and certainly have no aggressive designs now. I stated that the only apprehension we feel from time to time is the political encroachment upon our governmental system, and if we can induce people throughout the world to contain themselves in their own area of political influence there should be no difficulty.

Mr. Khrushchev reiterated his appreciation for the reception given to him in San Francisco, and said he would be happy to encourage a summit conference in our city.

Alternately, Mr. Khrushchev, Kozlov, and Mikoyan would gang up on me on some economic or political problem, but I managed to divert them frequently to Mr. Mikoyan, for I perceived that Mr. Khrushchev likes to joke at Mr. Mikoyan's expense. I interpreted this only as a manifestation of affection for Mr. Mikoyan. Mr. Kozlov, on the other hand, was less expressive though he is extremely jovial and laughs heartily. In particular, we made Mr. Mikoyan the butt of our jokes by depicting him as a sharp, cunning trader. I was, as the saying goes, joking on purpose.

Once, the conversation became grimly serious. We were talking about Fidel Castro, and I said that the wholesale executions taking place in Cuba did not meet my standards of judiciousness. Mr. Mikoyan, who had just returned from a meeting with Castro, remarked that Batista had executed 10 times as many political adversaries as had Castro. "Two wrongs do not make a right," I answered. Mr. Mikoyan, to prove his point that Mr. Castro is a fine gentleman, observed that he had even permitted an opposing newspaper to remain open in Cuba. "We Americans," I replied, "are not impressed with the fact that an opposing newspaper is allowed to exist, for they are entitled to that privilege. We thrive and prosper and grow on the comments and criticisms of our newspapers, and it is upon these constructive criticisms that America has grown. "Independent, forthright newspapers are our greatest institutions."

"If I were in Castro's place," replied Mr. Mikoyan, "I would close it in a minute." His lip curled defiantly, and there was no question but that he meant it.

About 4 o'clock, we adjourned since I was to return at 5 o'clock for another meeting with him.

That night, a reception was held in the Kremlin in celebration of Women's Day. The various leaders of the women's organizations presented their reports, and all of them referred to Mr. Khrushchev as the champion of friendship and peace for the world. Regardless of what we think here, Mr. Khrushchev is to them the man who is striving to bring happiness and peace to all the peoples of the world. The reports were primarily on production, and there was loud applause when it was learned from some that they were beating the 7-year plan by 2 or 3 years.

They are proud of their production—at least, the quantity of it for they are not able, yet, to actually gage the quality of that production.

Everyone here works at something, and if one is inclined to become a drone bee he is tried in a kangaroo court by his own coworkers, and may be banished to Siberia. To indicate how employment is inspired, even a small barbershop with two chairs has a cashier—unheard of in the United States.

I inquired about the former chief of the Soviet police, Beria. Some have reported that he was shot in the back by Mr. Mikoyan, and I had the temerity to ask this very direct question. I was told simply that while Mr. Stalin was ill and failing because of his age, Mr. Beria had committed "certain injustices." What these injustices were was not explained. I was further told that a military tribunal was set up to try Mr. Beria, who was found guilty and executed by the military squad. That was all the information one could learn from the officials regarding Mr. Beria.

It is interesting to note that the people of the Soviet and the people of America have the same thought in mind with regard to peace. All throughout the Soviet Union, I was asked why we cannot work toward this common goal. In America, I am frequently asked if Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists are sincere when they say they want peace. I believe they do want peace. I believe, Mr. Khrushchev, especially, wants it, but, of course, without disturbing his measured plans. We must not forget that the Soviets lost 8 million men in the First War, and they sustained over 15 million casualties in the Second War. They were sieged at Leningrad for 900 days, and there were cataracts of blood on their soil. They have not yet erased these awful memories from their minds. If they don't want peace, they must be insane, and certainly no one has accused them of not having their full mental faculties.

The next problem posed frequently is when some Americans say there can be no peaceful coexistence between us. I am certain that the Soviets will fight to preserve their national Communist ideology. We all concur that, if necessary, we will fight to preserve our American democracy. Since both of these converse philosophies of government are equally determined to resist each other, and if there is to be no peaceful coexistence, then the objectors to such a peaceful coexistence have no alternative but war. Such an episode would be the most tragic blunder in the history of civilization.

We have licked communism before with our intelligence. We had communism at Plymouth Rock in 1620, two centuries before Karl Marx wrote his manifesto. In a pragamtic sense, we gave it up and embarked on an economic program unequaled in man's history. With the same passion for our ideals in these contemporary times, we can fulfill the ancient word that this and future generations shall not be compelled to lift their swords and learn to war.

I have perceived not superiority in the Soviet Union other than the sputniks they have placed in orbit, and of course their grim

determination to succeed by hard work. We are ahead in every category that contributes to a rich, full and happy life, but we must keep ahead.

All we need in our country is to reapply ourselves to those principles of diligence and hard work which in the first place created the great incentive system under which we operate. If we do, we have nothing to fear.

We still have time to show the spirit that prevailed when we were building our country. At Bunker Hill, many years ago, Yankee farmers stood their ground and fired rusty nails out of squirrel rifles at their opponents. That's what we Americans do when we're in a pinch, and I see no reason why we should not now get down to the same kind of perseverance and application.

Perhaps the propulsion of sputnik is the best psychological impact we've had for many, many years.

I think we should remember the words of Theodore Roosevelt, who once said that the United States of America has not the option as to whether it will or will not play a great part in the world. He said it must play a great part. All that it can decide is whether it will play that part well or badly.

I believe that the Americans have underestimated the determination of this Socialist state, but it is not too late for a reappraisal and strengthening of our own self-resolve. From a position of strength, we can assure the Russian people and all the people of the world the peace which I am sure they want more than anything else.

Let me assure you that Mr. Khrushchev is a superb salesman. I considered our trip a vital sales mission, too. With modesty, I believe that I and my party succeeded to a reasonable degree. The name of San Francisco was on every tongue in thousands of villages in Europe and in Asia. I fervently pray that the spirit of this city, in its desire for friendship and peace, will prevail amongst all the peoples of the world.

I want to thank the members of my party—Mr. George Pottorff of Pan-American, Russ Cone of the Examiner, Mel Wax of the Chronicle, Jim Leonard of the News-Call Bulletin, and George Martin and Charles Stanyan of KRON-TV. They were a part of the team, and played their parts well.

Thank you.

A Grave Disservice by the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Monday, April 18, 1960, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the Birmingham News of April 13 and the Birmingham Post-Herald of April 14, concerning the articles which Harrison E. Salisbury wrote on the race situation in Birmingham, Ala., my district, and which appeared in the New York Times on April 12 and 13. The reaction to these examples of the most reprehensible type of irresponsible journalism has been tremendous. On Friday, April 15, 1960, the Birmingham News ran a scorching editorial, highly critical of Salisbury's type of journalism. The editorial was entitled "A Grave Disservice." It is the considered opinion of the Birmingham News that the New York Times has done Birmingham and American journalism a grave disservice.

The editorial follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 15, 1960]

A GRAVE DISSERVICE

An amazing recital of untruths and semi-truths, employed to justify conclusions obviously implanted in the writer's mind before he ever crossed the Mason-Dixon line, has provided the Nation with a picture of Birmingham maliciously bigoted, noxiously false, viciously distorted.

Another journalistic or literary libel against the South is, in itself, nothing to excite great concern. Northern journalists have for generations taken great delight in labeling certain segments of our social and political life as "dirty linen," then washing it for us in public.

One more asinine "expose" of the South would not seem to matter much. But when the New York Times, with a long-standing reputation for respectability and integrity, stoops to journalistic demogoguery and South-baiting a response is required.

The Nation today has a portrait of Birmingham threatened with "civil strife," ruled by the "whip, the razor, the gun, the bomb, the torch, the club, the knife, the mob." Telephones are "tapped," mail "intercepted," the "spy" has "become a fact of life." Ridiculous? A psychotic mirage induced by self-delusion?

Nonetheless, we must remember that the Times readership is one of the most influential segments of America and that for the Times reader this noxious faleshood, couched in the most purple of phrases, is the truth. These readers do not and probably will not know that normally high journalistic standards have not been followed.

Interpretation of an isolated incident as typical of the entire region has long been a favorite instrument for libeling the South.

The New York Times sets a new standard for the anti-South propagandists to aspire to in its articles datelined "Birmingham."

A rape story from Pennsylvania creates no assumption in the South that everybody in Pennsylvania is a rapist. But the most sordid incident of violence and prejudice in the South, no matter how unusual, is immediately employed by segments of the journalistic North to indict the entire area.

The Times cites incidents which it skillfully interprets as all happening within a short time. As logical would be taking the year's record of knifings, shootings, muggings and assaults in New York City and, as the basis for a sociological survey, presenting them as a true picture of a normal day in the life of a great city.

Typical of the distorted picture of Birmingham given the Nation is the assertion that "a drive is on to forbid Negro music on white radio stations."

Basis of that statement of "fact" is, of course, a column by News TV critic Roger Thames deploring the unusual amount of vulgar rock and roll generally associated with second rate Negro music played on radio stations compared to the time given to good music, of the classical and semiclassical and popular varieties. Such is the pattern of The Times' distortion.

Race tensions exist only in the South many Northern writers would have you believe by inference. Negro and white tension in the North frequently explodes into extended violence. But there are very few "official" race conflicts in the North. If whites and Negroes clashed physically in the South, an occurrence so unusual as to defy citing, we can be assured it would be immediately labeled a "race riot."

That a shoddy, vicious type of reporting should be resorted to by the New York Times makes the artciles slandering Birmingham even more shocking for the people of this city.

It is with amazed disbelief that the community views this malicious journalistic portrait of itself.

But Birmingham, engaged in a major program of community improvements, may find itself more than shocked. Many here are asking if this type of reporting may not cause economic damage.

If the prize-winning reporter, Harrison Salisbury, can write this about Birmingham, how can we evaluate what he reported for the Times out of Moscow?

We believe the New York Times has done Birmingham and American journalism a grave disservice.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 16, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex.)

Campaign oratory produces some startling statements. Fortunately most voters make allowances for the assertions of politicians during election years. But should the voter have to adopt this "let the buyer beware" attitude toward the statements of those who hold, or aspire to, public office? Bernard Baruch once said, "Every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." Unhappily, as voters we're often aware of our own inability to test the factuality—the truth—of "campaign" statements. No matter how knowledgeable and realistic a voter may be, or try to be, he's often forced to rely on little more than instinct or intuition—on his general impression of a speaker's mannerisms or physical appearance—in exercising his political judgment.

Some current political shibboleths are worth examining closely. For instance, some would have us believe that the United States has degenerated, militarily and economically, into something of a second-class power. These fellows often call for a crash program to develop one specific weapon or another, and hang the cost. Oddly enough, it's often these same people who loudly advocate ever larger and more expensive welfare programs. Questions about deficit spending and consequent inflation are apt to be shrugged off with the observation that 60 percent of our budget is for defense, "and you can't cut that—we ought to be spending more."

Let's look at some facts: Nondefense spending in recent years has soared at twice the rate of our defense costs. Moreover, by laws already on the books, we have committed ourselves (and our children) to pay out the incredible future sum of $396 billion for programs having nothing to do with defense. This figure doesn't include any of the $290 billion in debt we've already run up. Neither are these contingent liabilities, mind you, but definite nondefense c.o.d. bills which will fall due in the future under the terms of laws already enacted.

Where is the tax money coming from to meet these bills? For a generation now, professional "do-gooders," some labor leaders,

and self-styled liberals have convinced many people that the money would come from someone else—that with our progressive tax rates their programs to help the little man would be financed by taxing the well-to-do. Well, the rich can't be soaked any more. If all incomes over $25,000 were seized outright by the Federal Government, it would only raise $1.8 billion in revenue. If all incomes over $10,000 were seized, we would only increase revenues by $5.6 billion, less than it takes to operate the Government for a month. No; the taxpayers with modest incomes must bear the burden for any Federal programs allegedly aimed at providing for his welfare. When this fact sinks in generally, pie-in-the-sky campaign promises, involving greater spending, should lose a lot of their allure for John and Jane Doe who foot the bill.

Any schoolboy can tell you that ours is a government of, by, and for the people, who enact laws through their elected representatives in Congress. Granted, this is the way it should be, but the facts are a little disconcerting. My friend JIMMIE UTT, Congressman from California, recently pointed out that there is more administrative law governing our citizens than there is statutory law enacted by Congress. Thus, regulations are drawn up by almost every board, bureau, and commission in Washington, ostensibly to implement the broad statutes authorizing them. After due publication in the Federal Register, they become part of the body of administrative law governing you and me.

Says UTT: "We are rapidly coming to a point where a complete change of elected officials, including Congress and the White House, can mean little change in policy. You are governed more and more by people for whom you have never voted, for whom you never will vote, whom you have never seen, and whom you cannot recall by your vote. They are entrenched in the boards, bureaus, and commissions, even at the policy level. For example, you may think that the Secretary of Labor sets the policy of his Department, but I know that much of the policy of that Department is set by civil service employees who have been with the Department for 20 years, and they have no intention, now or ever, of recommending to the Secretary of Labor any policy which does not fit their personal philosophy of government, and you cannot remove them or replace them by your ballot. That same situation exists in the State Department, and in fact in every bureau, board, and commission. This is a form of invisible government and can lead to the most oppressive type of tyranny.

"Congress must assume a great deal of the blame for constantly delegating powers and duties which rightly belong to Congress. These delegations of power generally take place under a temporary emergency situation and, once delegated, they are never returned."

Justice Tom C. Clark, of U.S. Supreme Court, Addresses Philadelphia Chapter, Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend a monthly meeting of the Federal Bar Association, Philadelphia chapter, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel on April 8, 1960. The main speaker on that occasion was the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Clark's speech contained such interesting historical information that I include it below and commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress:

REMARKS OF MR. JUSTICE CLARK, BEFORE THE PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, APRIL 8, 1960

It is fitting that, in this 170th year of our Supreme Court as we meet here in Philadelphia, where it sat for 10 years, we review a few of the highlights of its founding and development.

In writing article III into the Constitution, the Founding Fathers created a judicial department. That article merely says that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." While it provided that the judges were to hold office during good behavior and that the judicial power should extend to a certain class of cases, including those over which the Supreme Court had original jurisdiction, it left to the Congress not only the number of justices that should constitute the Court but also the number and character of the inferior courts in the Federal system. In addition, it left the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court up to the will of Congress, and in article II provided that the membership of the Court was subject to the appointment of the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In light of these provisions the Federal judiciary was unable to function until both the Congress and the President acted.

It will be remembered that the new government was to have begun to function on March 4, 1789—but it was not until a month and two days later that a quorum was had in each house, nor was President Washington able to take the oath of his office and enter upon his duties until April 30, 1789.

In view of the fact that the third branch of the Government, the judiciary, could not function until its machinery was provided, it was necessary that the Congress devote its attention immediately to the formulation and passage of the Judiciary Act of 1789. Under it the Congress provided that the Supreme Court should consist of one Chief Justice of the United States and five Associate Justices. It further provided that the Court should hold two sessions each year at the seat of government. Two days after President Washington approved the act, he sent to the Senate his nominations of the first Chief Justice as well as the first five Associate Justices of the Court and they were confirmed the same day. As you know, John Jay was appointed the first Chief Justice of the United States; and the President appointed John Rutledge, William Cushing, James Wilson (of Pennsylvania), John Blair, and Robert Harrison to be the first five Associate Justices.

It is interesting to note that on the opening day provided in the Judiciary Act for the convening of the Court, only three members were present for its meeting in the Exchange Building in the city of New York. Lacking a quorum, the three awaited the arrival of Associate Justice Blair from Virginia, and the first session was held February 2, 1790. The Court's Journal reflects that the only business transacted the first term was the adoption of four short rules. The first had to do with the seal of the Supreme Court and the Circuit Courts. The second fixed the qualifications for the admission of attorneys and counsellors to practice before the Court and prescribed their oath. The fourth ordered that all process of the Court should run in the name of the President of the United States. The Court adjourned with no business on its calendar, no lawyers on its rolls, and no precedents to guide its future adjudications.

The second term of the Court continued to be a bobtailed one, since Colonel Harrison declined his appointment as one of the Associate Justices and Mr. Rutledge had failed to respond. The press of the business is indicated by the Court's Journal, which has but one notation, reciting that James Iredell, who had been appointed in lieu of Harrison, had finally accepted his appointment; the appointment was read and Justice Iredell qualified according to law. The beginning of the third term found the Court sitting not in New York but in the national capital right here in Philadelphia. That was on February 7, 1791. The Court's Journal, however, indicates that a momentous event in the Court's history had occurred. Three attorneys and three counsellors were admitted to its bar, the origination of a roll which now numbers over 70,000 lawyers. The Court still had no business and so it was again adjourned sine die. The fourth term convened August 1, 1791, and the Court had two cases on its docket. The first case ever filed was *West* v. *Barnes* (2 Dallas 401). West had lost to Barnes in the Circuit Court of Rhode Island. It appears that he won in the Supreme Court on a pure technicality; namely, that his attorney had obtained the issuance of a writ of error by the Clerk of the Circuit Court, rather than the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States. As insignificant as the case was at the time, it was the forerunner of the practice which has continued ever since. The second case was *Vanstophorst* v. *State of Maryland*. To the amazement of a present-day practitioner, that term's only action in this case was the issuance of a commission to take depositions in Holland. The fifth term of the Court began in February of the next year. Some wag has said that the final disposition of the only case considered during that term indicated the lack of confidence that the lawyers then had in the Court. The style of the case was *Oswald, Administrator* v. *The State of New York*. After the Court had taken under advisement some motions to quash the writs, the attorney's voluntarily discontinued the suit.

During the sixth term, John Rutledge who had served on the circuit but never attended a session of the court, resigned to become Chief Justice of South Carolina. President Washington offered the vacancy to Rutledge's younger brother, but he declined, whereupon Thomas Johnson, of Maryland, was appointed and qualified. We therefore see that it was not until after the lapse of almost 3 years from the first meeting of the court that all six seats on its bench were occupied.

It was in its sixth term that the first case, *The State of Georgia* v. *Braislford* (2 Dallas 403), was decided by the court. Justice Johnson, of Maryland, was its author and it covers some seven pages in our reports. It appears that Georgia, "being then free, sovereign, and independent," adopted a statute reflecting certain penalties upon and providing for the confiscation of the estates of persons declared to be guilty of treason. Braislford had brought an action on the bond against the "surviving partner of Kelsell and Spalding for debt. The marshal had levied on certain moneys in satisfaction of the judgment secured by Braislford. Georgia claimed that it "was entitled to the bond" and "equally entitled to the money levied" upon. It asked through its attorney, one Dallas, who might, for all we know have been also the reporter of the court, for an injunction impounding the money in the hands of the marshal. One Randolph represented Braislford. The court issued the injunction prayed for. It is interesting to note that each of the justices wrote in the case. Mr. Justice

Wilson, of Pennsylvania, started his opinion thus: "I confess that I have not been able to form an opinion which is perfectly satisfactory to my own mind." I might add that I am sure many opinions since that time have been handed down by authors who have suffered the same difficulty. In fact, Chief Justice Jay has this opening paragraph in his opinion: "My first ideas were unfavorable to the motion; but many reasons have been urged which operated forceably to produce a change of opinion." I can further add that this also occurs many times during the deliberations of the court.

The Court continued to have its organizational problems; only 5 years after he had taken the judicial oath, Chief Justice Jay resigned in order to accept the governorship of New York. John Rutledge, the chief justice of South Carolina, about whom I have previously remarked, was given an interim appointment for this vacancy on July 1, 1795, and took his oath on August 12. However, the Senate was not pleased with this nomination and on December 15 it was rejected. Chief Justice Rutledge, however, had taken part in the Court's deliberations during this 4 months' period and is included in the 14 Chief Justices who have adorned the Court's bench since its first organization. When the Congress returned to its next session on March 4, 1796, President Washington nominated Oliver Ellsworth to be Chief Justice and he was sworn in March 8, the same year. However, his service was terminated less than 4 years later by resignation. On January 3, 1801, President Adams appointed John Marshall—then 45 years of age—to be Chief Justice of the United States. He served in that capacity until his death July 6, 1835; a period of 34 years.

In the 170 years that have elapsed since the Supreme Court of the United States first convened in New York, 14 men have served as Chief Justice of the United States. During the same period there have been 78 Associate Justices who have actually served on the Court. Six men have declined after appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate—but only one since 1837, when Senator Roscoe Conkling declined in 1883. A number of others either declined the position or were refused confirmation. Likewise I have not included in these totals 3 of the 14 men who have served as Chief Justice who had previously served the Court as Associate Justices. They were, as you know, White, Hughes, and Stone. There have been no women at all on the Court. A recent historian of the Court, commenting on this fact, said, "Think what the women have missed, when you consider the Supreme Court has the very last word." As we noted above, the Congress, under the Constitution, has the power, as well as the duty, of determining the number of Associate Justices who compose the Supreme Court. Eighteen years after the Judiciary Act of 1789 the Congress increased the number of Associate Justices from five to six, and 30 years later added two more Justices, bringing the composition to eight Associate Justices and the Chief Justice. In 1863 President Lincoln recommended, and the Congress adopted, an amendment increasing to nine the number of Associate Justices. This is the largest number of persons who ever sat together on the Court at one time. It is said that this increase was made in order to change the opinion of the Court in the Legal Tender cases. If that be true, its purpose was effected. The number 10, however, had no magic, for only 3 years later, the majority of the Congress, in a pique with President Johnson, passed an act providing that any vacancy that might occur on the Court should not be filled until the Associate Justices reached the number of 6. However, 3 years later President Grant was able to secure a further amendment whereby the Supreme Court's composition was to be made up of a Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices. That provision has remained the law ever since.

Perhaps you might be interested in knowing that Pennsylvania stands fourth among the States in the number of men who have served on the Court. Six men were appointed from your State, while 12 Justices have been from New York, 10 from Ohio, and 8 from Massachusetts. Little old Texas has only had 1. However, there are 22 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, who have furnished none.

As to longevity, two men—John Marshall and Roger Taney—served the Court as Chief Justice during more than a third of its life, a total of 62 years. Mr. Justice Field, who was appointed from California, served the longest, 34 years and 6 months. But Chief Justice Marshall served only 1 month less, and there were many close "runner-uppers," including Justices Story and Harlan, who served for 33 years each, Justice Wayne, who served for 32 years, Justice Johnson of South Carolina, and Justice Bushrod Washington, of Virginia, George Washington's nephew, who served 30 years each. The statisticians say that the average tenure of a Justice is 15 years. At the present time we have 3 on the Court who have served over 20 years each, and I come in a poor fourth with 10 years.

In the early days of the Court's history, many must have agreed with Alexander Hamilton that the judiciary was "the weakest of the 3 departments of power; [one that] can never attack with success either of the other 2." Little could they foresee today's Court, which disposes of nearly 2,000 cases a year, and has the admitted power to strike down statutes, and to pass on the constitutionality of the official actions of the Government. The Court's authority as the final interpreter of the Constitution extends to any official act of any officer in the Federal or State Governments. Though an act of Congress or of any State legislature receives the unanimous vote of the members of either of those bodies, together with the approval of the President or the Governor, as the case might be, it may be declared null and void by a majority vote of the Court. Let me add, however, that this power has been exercised very sparingly. The decisions of the Court in this field are a very small percent of the total Court business. In fact, since 1937, only a handful of the acts of Congress have been declared unconstitutional. Perhaps this wise judicial restraint was sown in the practical realization that, as James Bryce said fourscore years ago, it is "To the people we come sooner or later; it is upon their wisdom and self-restraint that the stability of the most cunningly devised scheme of government will in the last resort depend."

Wesleyan's Colloquium on Freedom—A Great University Accepts the Challenge

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, with freedom under daily attack in many areas of our country and of the world, I was glad to note recently that a university in my congressional district has been taking positive steps to advance the cause of freedom. In fact, the National Broadcasting Co. thought so highly of this educational innovation that they reproduced part of it on their weekend coast-to-coast "Monitor" radio program.

I am referring to the 2-day colloquium on freedom which was conducted this spring by the graduate summer school for teachers at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn.

There are two notable things about this freedom conference which lead me to draw it to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. In the first place, it was, so far as can be discovered, the first in which high school students, high school teachers, college teachers and a college president all participated. For a private university thus to concern itself directly with the education of high scchool students as well as their teachers indicates an awareness of the challenge of public education and a readiness to accept that challenge which I find commendable.

In the second place, it was an occasion when hard thinking—tough, sustained intellectual effort—was required. There was no facile repetition of slogans, no lazy acceptance of cliches, no easy and comfortable repose in established answers. Adult problems were dealt with in an adult way.

The participants, whether adolescents or adults, grappled with such problems as those of reconciling the highest degree of individual liberty with the legal restraints necessary to insure equal liberty for all; with the distinctions between spiritual, intellectual and physical freedom; with the presuppositions on which our constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly rest; with integration and segregation; with the puzzling contradictions involved in such matters as censorship and loyalty oaths, the attitude of our country toward France as a member of NATO, a traditional friend, and also a contestant in the Algerian struggle; and with the attitude of the United States toward the Cuban people, the Castro regime and the protection of United States investments in Cuba.

The colloquium grew out of the course called the philosophy of freedom which is given every year in the graduate summer school for teachers at Wesleyan University. This course was established because of Wesleyan's conviction that, though freedom is our priceless heritage, it will not be cherished unless it is understood, and not understood unless it is studied. The tragic record of the American soldiers who were captured by the Communists in the Korean struggle is only one of a number of evidences that many Americans do not understand, and therefore do not properly value, the freedom which is theirs by birth.

In attendance at the colloquium were eight high school teachers who had previously taken the philosophy of freedom course at Wesleyan, and 27 of their pupils from public and private schools in Connecticut and Massachusetts. Some of them were interviewed on the NBC "Monitor" program by Ross Miller of station WTIC in Hartford. Throughout their statements both the teenagers and

their teachers emphasized this theme: "Don't take freedom for granted." It was this mistake, taking freedom for granted without understanding its true significance and depth, that left many of our captured GI's in Korea unable to explain or defend the precious liberties for which they were fighting.

Proper understanding of freedom comes not through indoctrination, but through the study of history, government, economics, and suitable literary works. Courses in all these subjects, as well as in the philosophy of freedom, are provided by the graduate summer school for teachers at Wesleyan University.

The freedom discussion opened with a short statement by Dr. Victory L. Butterfield, president of Wesleyan University, on the morality and psychology of liberal education and its meaning in a free society. Three of his basic assumptions are worth repeating. They are:

First. That a liberal education is one which helps men gain greater measures of personal freedom for purposes of more significant living in ways that can help sustain or strengthen a free society.

Second. That the heart of personal freedom lies in the autonomy of the self—in that balance of inner compulsion, judgment, taste, and conscience, that constitute the will to appropriate action.

Third. It is this experience of being able to decide for ourselves what is true or false, wise or unwise, lovely or ugly, right or wrong, and to take appropriate thought and action that give us our positive sense of autonomy and freedom.

A later conference session was devoted to various aspects of political and social freedom. Dr. S. Hugh Brockunier, professor of history at Wesleyan, opened this session by quoting part of the report on the Communist brainwashing of U.S. soldiers in Korea made by Maj. William E. Mayer of the U.S. Army Medical Service School. Dr. Brockunier's central theme was that freedom cannot be taken for granted, and that the only people who have freedom are those who continually learn by study and experience how to fight for it. He supported his thesis by quoting a number of memorable statements, including these:

By the late Senator Borah:

The safeguards of our liberty are not so much in danger from those who openly oppose them as from those who, professing to believe in them, are willing to ignore them when found inconvenient for their purposes.

By the late Justice Jackson:

Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the existing order.

In each age man has to relearn the lessons of freedom. Our captured soldiers in Korea had to relearn through suffering. Most of us are more fortunate and may relearn the meaning of freedom in our homes, our libraries, and our educational institutions.

I find that the entire curriculum of Wesleyan's Graduate Summer School for Teachers serves the cause of freedom directly. From ancient to modern times, great men have repeatedly asserted the connection between freedom and education.

Jefferson summed it up for many when he wrote, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

All liberal study, whether of history, physics, philosophy, music or mathematics—all intellectual effort which leads to a wider view and a deeper human sympathy, builds, and supports the love of freedom.

The Wesleyan Summer School deserves commendation for pioneering in the field of education for freedom. This recent conference on freedom is exciting because it represents an unusual and valuable approach to one of our most important educational problems. I am confident that it will serve as a good beginning for further inquiries into the meaning of freedom both at Wesleyan and at other educational institutions.

Negro Youth Impatient Over Denied Dignity, Not Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SIT-IN STUDENT FREEDOM FIGHTERS—NEGRO YOUTH IMPATIENT OVER DENIED DIGNITY, NOT LEADERSHIP

(By Saunders Redding)

In a recent Associated Press dispatch out of Charlotte, N.C., where he went to address a "freedom mass meeting," Thurgood Marshall was quoted as saying in a news conference: "And if you mean, are the young people impatient with me, the answer is 'Yes'." The chief counsel of the NAACP is not often wrong about race matters, but he was wrong this time. The courageous, determined youngsters who sit-in at lunch counters are not impatient with Marshall and they are only reasonably impatient with the slowness of court action in furthering desegregation in public schools.

The sit-ins, the picket lines, and the silent parades are a frontal attack on another problem: the denial of the dignity and decorum of self, the bruise on the ego, the affront to the personality that is offered by discriminatory practices in places of public accommodation soliciting public patronage. Certainly this aspect is present in the school desegregation fight, too, but there you have an attack upon the structure and interpretation of the law. It is an organized attack, and it is basically impersonal.

The sit-ins are different. Youngsters who are taking part in them want something more than to be treated as first-class citizens within the frame of the Constitution. Citizens are political and legal entities. These youngsters are asserting themselves as first-class human beings, and human beings are spiritual and moral entities.

And certainly the continuing wave of protest is spiritual and moral, and although the Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, had to remind white southerners of the fact, he did not have to remind the Negro students. They knew of old, and from many sources—including their parents, and the ancestral memory of slavery, and Jim Crow. Nor are patience and what is called passive resistance new to them. It is only that—thanks to Mohandas K. Gandhi per Martin Luther King, Jr.—these psycho-emotional qualities have been reestablished on new moral and intellectual basis for the furtherance of social ends.

Patience inspired the songs these youngsters' grandparents sang and that the youngsters themselves sometimes sing in choral groups and have lately been singing in the jail cells of Tennessee, South Carolina, and Alabama. But the singing is different now. The oldsters sang out of social innocence and in reverence and in the fervent faith that "a bright dawn is coming." In that fenced-in jail yard in Orangeburg, S.C., the youngsters sang in defiance of those who seek to hold back the dawn. Patience is no longer an absolute virtue. It is a virtue only when linked with courage and coupled with nonviolent public demonstrations.

COLLEGE SIT-IN DEMONSTRATIONS ARE SPONTANEOUS

The key phrase here is public demonstrations. In Montgomery, Negroes simply refused to do something they had always done—ride the buses—and then they took practical steps to overcome the inconvenience of not riding them. Under Martin Luther King's guidance, they employed a technique called passive resistance. But the young college people are not passive. They are doing something they have never done, and they are refusing to desist from doing it. They did not organize for this purpose. What they are doing was of spontaneous origin. It was a blind grab for a hold on that human dignity that is instinctive in all men; and it was personal.

Asked why he took part in a sit-in in Richmond, a student at Virginia Union University replied that he was doing it for himself. Who told him to do it? No one. And one of the young women run in by the Tallahassee police and reprimanded with, "The devil must have got into you," shot back, "No. God has."

There have been one-man sit-ins, and lone women pickets, and silent parades of four. The demonstrators' signs have been personal, too. "I'm entitled to equality, and I want it"; "My stomach may be empty, but what about your heart?"; "The law of God will be fulfilled." No mass slogans are on parade. These Negro youths are speaking in their individual voices. In view of the intensely personal element in their push, it is right for them to do so.

Many white southern officials claim that Communication between the races has broken down; they say they no longer know what Negroes are thinking. In spite of broken communications, they know what Negroes are thinking now. It is better than a guess to say that they know because communications are broken down. For when they speak of communication between the races, they are speaking of a system of control whereby they made their will known to a Negro of their own choosing whose job and profession it was to make that will palatable to his own people. There are not so many of these local chefs de Negres anymore, and those who remain have forfeited the patience of young Negroes.

Although the Governors of Florida and North Carolina and the officials of a few southern cities are encouraging exceptions, many white southerners have never wanted an exchange of ideas with Negroes. The Governor of Virginia, for instance, refused to appoint Negroes to a citizens' committee to look into interracial relations, and recently all the top officials of Hampton and Newport News, Va., turned down an invitation to

discuss with Negroes the present "troubles" in race relations.

In point of fact, the thing that has most surprised the diehards and the fearful and silent moderates is that there has been so little trouble. And what there has been they have made—sometimes under the blush of preserving law and order, as, they say, the new gaggle of so-called "trespass" laws are designed to do, and sometimes in the sheer foolish hope of evoking anger so as to have an excuse for bashing Negro heads. Some managers of chainstores have hired goons to bar Negroes' entrance to lunch counters. Some are paying toughs to occupy lunch-counter seats to keep Negroes off them. Some police forces have used trained dogs in an effort to cow young Negro demonstrators; and in Montgomery a white man clubbed an unoffending Negro woman with a midget-size baseball bat.

COURAGE, CONDUCT OF COLLEGIANS HELD DOWN VIOLENCE

That there has been so little trouble is due to three factors: First, the courage and the conduct of the demonstrators. Southern newspapers invariably report of "the quiet behavior," "the good manners," and "the neat appearance" of the Negro youngsters. Second, the sympathetic reaction to the protest of people in Europe and Asia, but more particularly the sympathetic reaction of Americans outside the South. Third, the withering away of the southern notions that the race problem is exclusively the South's own business, and that only the South can handle it because only southerners "know and love the Negro."

How much influence to assign to each of these it is impossible to say, but none can be overestimated. The courage and the conduct of the Negro students has meant the difference between demoralizing ridicule and surprised though grudging respect. The reaction of people outside the South suggests the slow retreat of thoughtless prejudice along other fronts, and the gradual spread of the idea that democracy is not simply an ideology, but a way of living that all Americans must embrace.

Perhaps nothing represents this consciousness so well as the statement of the manager of Houston's city hall cafeteria the day after a pair of Negroes had asked for and received service there. The manager said, "I only served the Negroes so as not to embarrass a group of foreign dignitaries visiting Mayor Lewis W. Cutrer."

This is, of course, the wrong reason for doing the right thing, just as establishing "vertical integration" is the wrong thing for the right reasons. But in matters of revolutionary social change, right thing and right reason come together only slowly in the best of circumstances, and in this case, among a people who remain unconvinced that they are wrong in believing segregation right, expediency will be slow in yielding to moral principle.

Meanwhile, the cynical manipulation of fears is still the role of southern politicians, although these fears have no correspondence to facts in the objective world, and although these fears—of miscegenation, of "mongrelization" are a gross insult to white southern womanhood; and bitter race-hatred and tragic ignorance are still the lot of the wool-hat boys and the blue-jeaned, duck-tailed punks.

So a white mob—and mobs in America seem always to be white—can openly carry and make threatening gestures with guns, blackjacks, and baseball bats against Negroes, without fear of being arrested.

* * * * *

But if cynicism, bitterness, and unreason still prevail among many southern whites, a growing responsiveness to the moral imperatives of democracy, a divine courage, and above all a new sense of their dignity as individual men and women prevail among this generation of Negro students.

"I am not a problem," said one of these students at Hampton Institute; "I'm a person, and I want to enjoy the right of acting like a person." This is what the sit-ins, the picket lines, the silent parades are all about. They are about the right of the individual to choose dignity over degradation, decent pride over self-hatred, and moral courage over social cowardice.

Problems of Oversea Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my visit to the Far East last November I made the following recommendations:

First. Reemployment legislation: That prompt and favorable consideration be given by the committee to the official request of the Department of Defense for legislation to grant reemployment rights to employees of that Department who are assigned overseas.

Second. Housing: That the appropriate executive agencies investigate overseas housing policies and conditions for Federal civilian employees and make recommendations for appropriate changes in policy and legislation including, but not restricted to, the following: (a) Cutting off further shipments of household goods overseas and having basic needs furnished by Government; (b) establishing a program to purchase housing for civilian employees off as well as on bases; (c) coordination and reviews of existing restrictions by commanding officers overseas with respect to areas and price range; and (d) giving civilian employees housing allowances under a system identical to those given their military counterparts.

Third. Competitive status: That the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the Department of Defense join in devising improved procedures so that certain nonstatus employees in oversea areas may have better opportunities for achieving competitive status.

Fourth. Coordination: That regulations having to do with identical activities be issued by the Department of Defense rather than in three somewhat different versions by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as in the case of the recent teacher pay adjustment legislation.

Fifth. Duty limit on gifts: That section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be amended to increase the limit on duty-free goods from $10 to $50 but only with respect to Federal civilian employees assigned overseas.

I asked the Defense Department to comment on recommendations 2, 4, and 5. Under unanimous consent I am inserting herein a reply I received from Assistant Secretary Charles C. Finucane dated April 12, 1960. It is encouraging to see the steady and responsible progress being made in these areas. As for the duty limit on gifts, I intend to file legislation to provide for increasing the duty free limit for civilian employees overseas so that they will have the limit now provided for military personnel.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1960.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This is in further reply to your letter of February 12, 1960 to the Secretary of Defense, requesting comments on recommendations 2, 4, and 5 in your report on Federal civilian personnel activities in the Far East. These recommendations are commented on as follows:

2. Housing:

(a) The feasibility of cutting off further shipment of household goods overseas and having the Government furnish basic needs has been a subject of continuing study in the Department of Defense. In September 1956 a directive (No. 7000.2) was issued authorizing the military departments to restrict the overseas shipment of household goods when it is determined to be advantageous to the Government to do so. A copy of this directive is attached for your information.

Under this directive the military departments have restricted shipments to most overseas areas for military personnel to 2,000 pounds. Only in certain areas where the stock of Government-owned household effects is inadequate, or for special reasons it is determined to be advantageous for certain individuals to take their own household effects, is shipment of privately owned effects permitted.

Although this directive covers civilian as well as military personnel, it has not been generally applied to civilians because there is no legal authority under which their household effects can be stored at Government expense when they are not shipped. Section 301(c) of H.R. 7758, the proposed Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act provides such storage authority. As you know, this bill was passed by the House last year and is now pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. If H.R. 7758 is enacted into law, the Department of Defense will be in position to apply the directive to civilian employees.

(b) A large-scale program for the purchase of offbase housing overseas for civilian employees is not considered economically feasible at this time. The Department of Defense cannot afford to obligate substantial amounts of money to meet all family housing needs, especially in those areas where requirements cannot be considered firm. The overseas civilian force in an area such as Japan, for example, is subject to frequent readjustment, and construction or purchase of housing in the light of this situation is not considered to be warranted.

Under existing procedures, family housing is financed primarily from the proceeds of sales of surplus commodities. As of recent years these proceeds have been inadequate in most areas to meet essential military needs. In Japan, for example, it appears doubtful that adequate yen will be available to support the fiscal year 1961 military requirements for family housing construction. There is no reason to believe that financing will improve or that large amounts of foreign currencies will become available. To use appropriated funds for such construction or for purchase of housing would place a heavy burden on agency appropriations which would be unjustified under existing fiscal policies.

With improvement in the Japanese economy, it would appear that greater numbers of rental housing units will become available for civilian employees. It is considered desirable to determine the possible availability of such private housing before considering the need for any Government construction or purchase.

(c) It is understood that close liaison is now being maintained by the Army, Navy, and Air Force on all housing matters. For example after the recent cutback of Army requirements in Japan, excess family housing assets in the Tokyo area were reassigned to the Air Force and those in the Yokohama area to the Navy. However, it is our desire to insure that maximum use is being made of available housing in accordance with consistent policies. Therefore the problem of coordination and review of existing restrictions imposed by commanders with respect to areas and price range is being referred to the military departments for study and appropriate action.

(d) The Department of State, under authority of Executive Order 10011 is responsible for issuing regulations governing the payment of quarters allowances for civilian employees. At present maximum allowances are fixed, and an eligible employee is paid his actual quarters expenses or the maximum allowance, whichever is lesser. The Department of State has been considering the advisability of changing to a system of flat allowances comparable to the system for military personnel. The Department of Defense favors such a change and has so advised the Department of State.

4. Coordination: A primary function of this Office is to coordinate the policies and practices of the military departments relating to civilian personnel matters so as to assure consistency, where desirable, in the regulations which they issue. In the case of Public Law 86-91, rather detailed implementing regulations were issued by the Secretary of Defense. Also, the regulations of the military departments were reviewed in this Office prior to their release to assure consistency and compliance with the departmentwide regulations.

There still remain a few areas in which differences in practice with respect to employment of teachers in the overseas dependents schools were permitted to exist for the remainder of the current school year. These situations are now being reviewed with the view of eliminating unnecessary differences prior to the beginning of the next school year.

So long as the military departments continue to function as separate departments, with their own personnel offices, it has not been considered feasible to require a single set of regulations to be used by all. Again, however, this is a matter which will receive continuing attention with the view to taking any appropriate action which will promote economy and avoid duplication among the services.

5. Duty limit on gifts: Although this Office has not received any recommendations on this point, there would be no objection to providing the same duty-free limit for civilian employees overseas as is provided for military personnel.

Your thoughtful report has been reviewed with interest and profit. We appreciate the time which you have taken from your busy schedule to take a firsthand look at our overseas activities and to comment upon some of our personnel problems.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. FINUCANE.

Address by Ira D. Mackler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading industries of Lenawee County is the feeding and finishing of beef cattle. It is estimated that there are over 600 farm cattle feed lots in the county. It is claimed that this exceeds any other county in the United States.

The 40,000 cattle on feed in the county, not including dairy and breeding cattle, ranks in the top three of the country.

It is claimed that only about one-half of the States feed out more beef cattle than does Lenawee County. Feeders are brought into Lenawee County from some Southern States and many from the western range States.

The banks of Lenawee County lend farmers over $4 million annually to buy feeder cattle. These loans run from 6 to 12 months and there is almost a complete turnover every year.

The finished cattle bring the farmers of Lenawee County approximately $10 million annually. This is big business.

These cattle produce some of the finest steaks and meat cuts available anywhere.

The cattle are marketed in Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, and other cities. And, of course, some of the cattle are kept in the county for slaughter.

Lenawee is also one of the leading dairy counties, producing milk and meat for Michigan and Ohio citizens.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an address delivered recently to the Kiwanis Club of Bethesda, Md., by Mr. Ira D. Mackler, general manager of the Jepsen Hotel Supply Co. I think this speech is an excellent dissertation on a subject of great interest not only to my colleagues in the House but also to people in the country generally since it concerns one of the most delicious staples of our diet, namely, steak.

Under leave I include the text of Mr. Mackler's speech in my remarks at this point:

ADDRESS BY IRA D. MACKLER, GENERAL MANAGER, THE JEPSEN HOTEL SUPPLY CO., BEFORE THE KIWANIS CLUB OF BETHESDA, MD., MARCH 22, 1960

Mr. President Scott Brewer, members of the Kiwanis Club of Bethesda, invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, during the year 1944, it had become readily apparent to the Japanese high command that, for them, the war had been lost. As a consequence, they began to do all in their power to conquer the American fighting man on the psychological front, to bring him to his knees with emotional weapons in place of the more lethal weapons that already had failed.

Many of you who were in the Pacific theater of operations will recall this phase of the war in the Far East. It was the era of Tokyo Rose, and her plaintive attempts to make American fighting men homesick for their families, their wives, their children and their peacetime pursuits. It was the era of loudspeaker systems set up in forward battle areas, and geared to play American popular music, to give baseball scores, to nettle our troops by reporting how easy the folks were having it back home while these men were fighting and dying in the stench and heat and fever of the South Pacific.

It was at this time that one unit of Japanese psychological warfare activities came up with a most ingenious device.

Erecting a blower system on the edge of one remote jungle in the Solomons, the Japs filtered through this blower the pungent, nostril-tingling aroma of steaks being broiled over a charcoal fire.

Now picture it, if you will—here were our troops, many of them living on K-rations, thousands of them existing on luncheon meat and similar prepared rations which—for all their very wonderful nutritive value and their undoubted success as compressed foodstuffs—were far from being repasts calculated to delight a gourmet.

And suddenly, like a breath of home, there came to them the hearty, masculine aroma of a steak being broiled over a charcoal fire.

I think you all will agree that here, if anything ever could, was an ingenious, even diabolical weapon, that came very close to making even the most cautious and loyal GI in that particular theater lay down his arms and head for that charcoal pit, wherever it might be. And that they didn't, that our fighting men were able to see through the ruse for what it was, is not only a tribute to their willpower and training, but is one more indication of the superiority of our forces in World War II, and just one more reason why ultimate victory was ours.

I cite this story because I believe it indicates more than almost anything else can the tremendous popularity of the American love for a good, thick, juicy steak—and the way that popularity is known around the world. Truly, the steak—juicy, tender, sizzling, and done to a turn—is as American a dish as virtually any other one.

Italians are known for their national dishes—spaghetti, ravioli, the pasta. To a German, the schnitzel is as much a national dietary symbol as anything you can name. The English and their mutton are famous. The French have their snails, their wines, their incomparable breads. But here in America, if we are known for any national dish at all, it is our love of a good, thick steak.

Think if you can, do you know anyone, other than a confirmed vegetarian, who doesn't like steak? I doubt it. What's more, I occasionally suspect that even a diehard vegetarian now and then sneaks himself a bite of good beefsteak when he thinks no one is looking.

Today, beefsteak as our national dish is apparent to anyone who looks at the statistics to quote Charles R. Musser, vice president, Wilson & Co., Inc., meatpackers.

In 1935, Americans consumed some 6,770,000 pounds of beef. Even though we still were feeling the effects of the depression at that time, and not everyone who longed for the taste of a good steak could afford to enjoy one, the fact is that the figure I just gave you represented approximately 40 percent of our total consumption of all meats during that year of 1935.

We are practically at the beginning of the new year and the 1960's will be fabulous in most every respect. During the decade there will be approximately 30 million more people with a good many billion dollars more to spend. The building and general business in itself can't help but go forward.

There is no doubt now that more than 25 percent of the meat consumed this past year has been consumed in eating out. In other words, one out of every four meals has been eaten in a restaurant, hotel, motel, roadside stand, hospital, institution, or in an in-plant feeding group. More than 120 million meals a day are being served and every indication is that this field will grow.

Now consider how the popularity of a good steak has grown.

In 1958—the last year for which statistics are available—we in this country smacked our lips over a total of 13,798,000 pounds of beef, a jump of more than 100 percent in a little over 20 years.

What's more, by that year of 1958, beefsteak represented more than 50 percent of all meat sold and eaten in the United States, with consumption rising almost daily.

I think you'll be interested to know, by the way, that a fellow I was talking to on

my way over here this morning, and to whom I mentioned this fantastic 13-million-plus figure, remarked that there must have been an awful lot of black eyes during 1958.

Well, gentlemen, all I can say is that, in all my years in this business, I never knew anyone who used a steak to heal a black eye. As one man said about this, if you have a black eye and a nice thick piece of steak at the same time, broil the steak and eat it, and you'll forget all about the black eye.

Today, as you know, we are about to start taking our 1960 census. And one of the things that census is supposed to reveal, and will reveal I'm told, is the tremendous growth of suburbia. Today, more than a third of our population lives somewhere in suburbia, more than 33 percent of all Americans.

And I don't think you gentlemen have to be told that a most essential part of any suburban household is the outdoor grill, the barbecue pit in which the host can grill his favorite thickness of T-bone steak.

If there is any status symbol whatever that defines your true suburbanite, it is the backyard charcoal pit and the householder presiding over it as he grills a steak for his guests.

How he selects that steak at his butcher shop or supermarket, of course, will depend the success of his dinner party. If he has shopped wisely, if he has made no compromise with quality, then he is almost certainly guaranteed to have a reputation as a successful host. Indeed, if I were to bring one message to you here today, it would be that when in doubt, when you are unsure of the tastes of your guests, and when you wish to run no risk of making a mistake, then serve steak. And if you ever find anyone who doesn't like it, who turns up his nose and says he prefers something else, then I wish you'd send his name to me—I've never met such an individual myself, and I've often wondered what one would look like (aside from having no teeth).

When I say make no compromise with quality, gentlemen, I mean just that. Steak is expensive when compared with some dishes, I'll admit, and a housewife can't be blamed for shopping carefully and trying to find the very best grade and cut of meat for the least amount of money. There's nothing wrong with this, and we should bow toward our wives for thus trying to save some of our hard-earned take-home pay.

But, I say again, if you want a good steak for broiling and you plan to serve it to your important guests, then don't buy a cut of beef that's designed to be used as a pot roast or for the swiss types of steaks. The latter are fine and make very good economy dishes for the housewife who is saving her pennies; what's more, the nutritional value inherent in them is every bit as good as can be found in many similar dishes costing a great deal more. But if it's a succulent, juicy, and tender steak you are seeking, and your plan is to broil it over a charcoal fire in your backyard grill, then, by all means, insist on a cut of sirloin. Its thickness, of course, is up to your personal tastes, but I can assure you you'll never go wrong by having it as thick as your wallet can afford.

Sirloin is truly the grand knight among all cuts of meat, a position given to it by its having been graded—either U.S. Prime or U.S. Choice—by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Grading Service of the Federal Government.

You know, some years ago, when it was the fashion in this country to admire everything foreign and to downgrade anything that was truly American, they used to have an expression for use on certain types of men.

They called them "steak and potatoes" types.

They were "steak and potatoes" types as compared with the pinkie-waving teacup-balancing fortune hunters who once flocked to these shores to marry American heiresses, and who were then very much in vogue with impressionable young ladies.

But I think you'll notice how much of a change there has been in the years since the end of World War II. Today you rarely hear of anyone being called a "steak and potatoes" man, and I think the reason is that so many of us today—both men and women, boys and girls—are "steak and potatoes" types and are proud of it.

What's more, the change has been apparent in our national health. We're bigger, huskier, healthier today simply because so many of us are "steak and potatoes" types.

Most important of all, though, is the fact that we're happier.

In closing, would like to thank Mr. Richard D. Gruver, Wilson & Co., Inc., for his assistance and cooperation.

Thank you.

Forest Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize and direct national forest management to produce sustained yield and maximum use for all purposes. I feel that an affirmation of the national forest policy of multiple use will affect the economy of our area in many ways.

The Chippewa and Superior National Forests in Minnesota cover vast areas of the finest recreational land and water in the Nation. To use it for only one purpose when it has many present and potential uses is being rather short-sighted and neglectful of its full possibilities for the benefit of the ever-increasing recreational seeking public. This multiple-use policy has existed and been applied ever since the national forests were created. The legislation that I have proposed would further strengthen and implement its management and utilization.

With longer paid vacations, faster transportation, and better highways, the American people are seeking outdoor recreation as never before. The national forests are becoming increasingly important for camping, fishing, hunting, and other forms of recreation, in addition to their importance for timber production and watershed protection. These increasing demands for public recreation use can be accommodated without undue effect upon timber production and watershed protection. I feel that the practice of multiple use and sustained yield which will develop and sustain such integrated uses will result in the maximum benefits to the locality and to the country.

Such legislation would protect national forest resources from possible overutilization in the future as a result of economic pressures or those of single-interest groups.

It seems the legislation is timely and appropriate. The multiple demands are increasing as never before. We have all watched the recreation demand grow—considerably beyond our means to accommodate it. The future will bring heavier demands on all forest resources. Legislation acknowledging the necessity for recognizing all these needs would, most likely, in itself be a great aid in implementing the program.

The growth of recreation use on the Chippewa gives some idea of the rapidly increasing demands on the national forests. The number of recreational visits to the forest in 1955 was 341,000; by 1959 this was more than doubled—706,000. Estimates place the 1965 use at more than 1 million to exceed 1,500,000 by 1970. It seems sure that this increased demand will equally apply to timber and other forest uses.

In Minnesota the travel and tourist industry has become one of major proportions and its impact on our State's overall economy is vital and important. Annually, in excess of $300 million is spent in Minnesota by the recreational seeking public. Other States enjoy a similar return. We are dealing mainly with a replaceable resource and the license buying sportsman is paying the bill. Therefore, wise and protective utilization of our forest and lake areas should be of immediate and sincere concern to us all.

The following facts were revealed at a meeting held in Duluth, Minn., and are taken from a news story in the Duluth News-Tribune, dated March 24, 1960:

A Federal economic survey team heard complaints here yesterday that an excessive amount of land in northern Minnesota is publicly owned.

John Hoene, secretary of the Timber Producers Association, said that nearly 13 million acres in Minnesota is in Federal, State, or county hands now and the Federal Government is seeking to acquire more.

U.S. Commerce Department representatives and specialists of other Federal agencies met in the Spalding Hotel with representatives of area timber and tourist industries.

The Federal study group held a general meeting last night in Ely and will conduct another in Grand Rapids today. The survey team is examining longrun business and industrial potentials for use in coordination of Federal assistance to meet area unemployment problems.

Hoene declared that only about one-quarter of the land is privately owned in this area, compared with 90 percent in Southern States. The Federal Government is offering very little forest land for sale, he added.

Support for the Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, concurrent with my introduction of three joint resolutions to authorize the President to use the item veto, two daily newspapers in the district I represent, have published editorials in support of this action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an editorial "Item Veto—SCHWENGEL Pushes It," from the April 8 edition of the Davenport, Iowa, Daily Times; and a copy of an editorial from the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye Gazette of April 2, entitled "SCHWENGEL to the Fray."

The editorials follow:

[From the Davenport Daily Times, Apr. 8, 1960]

ITEM VETO—SCHWENGEL PUSHES IT

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL is preparing to press for legislation permitting the President to veto single items in an appropriation bill.

As matters stand, the President must approve or disapprove an entire appropriation bill.

Logrolling being a popular occupation in Congress, Members are able to get into necessary appropriation bills items which are of limited benefit. If he is not to hold up appropriations for essential governmental operations, a President has to sign the whole bill including provision for items to which he objects.

Every student of Government has condemned this process since it is extremely wasteful of taxpayers' money. It causes the Government to pay for projects scarcely needed except as a bid for votes.

Congressman SCHWENGEL is taking on a tough assignment since one of the prerogatives most highly valued by many a Congressman is that of getting projects for his district to which he can point as examples of his service. Some Congressmen have Federal projects spotted all over their districts. In some of these districts, in fact, there isn't much of any other kind of projects.

SCHWENGEL can point to successful operation of the item veto in some of the States and he can muster plenty of authority for its desirability in Federal law.

And the legislation would on occasion prove of great advantage to a Congressman. If his constituents should press him to support a project about which he had doubt, he could get the item into an appropriation bill sure that the President would veto it.

His constituents would think he had done all he could, his support would be unimpaired and the fault for failure to obtain the project would be placed on the President.

SCHWENGEL is proposing a basic improvement in Government. Its money saving potential is enormous.

[From the Hawk-Eye Gazette, Apr. 12, 1960]

SCHWENGEL TO THE FRAY

FRED SCHWENGEL is out to butcher one of the most sacred of Capitol cows—the blanket appropriation measure, the love of the logrollers and the aggravation of Presidents.

Representative SCHWENGEL would do this by giving the President item veto authority. He has a triple approach:

1. Permit the President to approve or disapprove items separately in any bill.

2. Disapprove or reduce items separately in all appropriation bills.

3. Approve or disapprove items separately in appropriation bills except those which have the approval of the agencies involved, the Bureau of the Budget and the appropriate committees of Congress.

The principal villain in this triangle is the present provision that the President must accept all appropriations in a money bill, or veto the whole thing. This is the basic reason so many questionable public works get on the drawing boards. They are put there by Congressmen who may not be convinced of their validity, but are willing to let the President take the credit or blame for their creation. Often, the President approves these matters rather than veto needed public expenditures.

A good example was provided last session, when Eisenhower vetoed the water resources measure because he had not authority to eliminate a dozen projects for which he saw no justification. Congress passed, over that veto, another water resources bill which was a much worse hash than the original, and more costly.

The item veto makes so much sense we question whether it gets out of committee. If SCHWENGEL should pull this one off, he may lose a few friends in Congress, but he is certain to win millions more among the taxpayers.

Mexican Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article concerning Mexican farm labor in the Christian Science Monitor for February 20, 1959:

REPORT VITAL TO FARMERS—BRACERO DATA BUOYS ARIZONANS

(By Ernest Douglas)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—Mexico's bracero, the day laborer whose work for U.S. farmers makes him Mexico's third largest source of income, has just been made the subject of a detailed, documented report which is tremendously pleasing to Arizona farmers.

Richard H. Hancock has made the study for the Hispanic American Society of Stanford University, which financed Mr. Hancock's intensive investigations. Mr. Hancock's findings fill a typewriter-size book of 146 pages titled, "The Role of the Bracero in the Economic and Cultural Dynamics of Mexico."

Dan W. Clarke, president of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association, says: "This is the first complete and impartial study ever made of the Mexicans who are brought in under contract to work on U.S. farms."

INFORMATION ASSESSED

Mr. Clarke adds that "the information developed by Mr. Hancock can be of incalculable value."

Prior to making this study, Mr. Hancock spent 7 years as labor director in charge of braceros for a farmer group at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

An inquiry into the whole field of bracero employment culminated in 4 months of traveling through Chihuahua, interviewing rural people and otherwise collecting information on how that state is affected by the annual bracero migration and the money they send or bring home.

His general conclusion is that the bracero program has imperfections but is of great benefit to Mexico, and that its discontinuance would severely cripple that country while opening few farm jobs to Americans.

STATISTICS DISCLOSED

Tables amid an array of statistics show that 436,039 braceros worked in 27 States in 1957. Texas used 188,824; California, 149,069; Arkansas, 23,658; Arizona, 23,108; New Mexico, 19,444; Michigan, 10,686; Colorado, 8,189. Numbers were small in the other 20.

Mr. Hancock estimates that they sent back $120 million. This places bracero earnings third among Mexico's sources of income, behind tourism's $348 million and cotton's $173 million. Those earnings were divided among approximately 2,250,000 of the nation's 33 million inhabitants. Recipients were members of "the most needy sector of the economy."

In 3 months of the border the bracero can earn as much as in a whole year at home, provided he found steady employment there. Many use their wages to get into farming on their own account, and do well. As private enterprisers they are vastly aided by skills learned in the United States. Mr. Hancock places those agricultural skills high among the benefits to Mexico.

KNOWLEDGE GAINED

One anomalous result is that the returned bracero is often better informed than intellectuals, such as teachers and merchants, who have never been out of the country. A certain amount of jealousy develops, but it is suggested that the progress of Mexico may be speeded thereby.

Furthermore, the bracero finds that justice is administered more equitably in the United States than in Mexico. He appreciates the health services which his contract, drawn under international treaty, guarantees him. Paradoxically, he discovers that to his own government he is an individual of more importance abroad than at home, where he is pretty well ignored by officials.

Mentioned with regret, as a Mexican weakness in the program, is mordida—the exaction of bribes by Mexican public employees from would-be braceros eager to earn the high wages paid in the United States.

EXODUS CRITICIZED

Although there is criticism of the braceros exodus among Mexican intellectuals, officials, and labor leaders, Mr. Hancock notes that they have no alternative to offer. "The program does much to lessen the distress of a large number of Mexicans." Its termination would be a blow to the whole country. It might even have to be replaced with aid from the United States, which would be extremely costly and of less benefit to the needy elements of the population.

Also, if bracero contracting were ended, the deplorable wetback system of Mexicans sneaking across the border to work for Yankee farmers would return. A new problem would be created that would raise international tensions and be on a par with that of enforcement of racial integration in the South.

Extensive literature published on braceros, including transcripts of congressional hearings, was perused by Mr. Hancock. He found it all a study of conflicting views. Most of the criticisms do not apply exclusively to the migrant-labor problem but are of a type that constantly arise from any labor-management relationship.

A Happy Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while in many places discussion of the so-called civil rights bill has engendered ill-feeling and caused trouble, there is ample evidence that, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, commonsense, observance of the Golden Rule, will prevent practically

much of the trouble with which, through the press, so many are familiar.

An editorial captioned "Senseless Picketing," from the News-Palladium of Friday, April 15 last, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., points the way. That editorial reads:

[From the News-Palladum, Apr. 15, 1960]

SENSELESS PICKETING

There were strong indications yesterday and today, that the local unit of the NAACP will ignore the advice and appeals of this area's Negro clergy, and of Mayor Smith, to abandon its announced intention of picketing the Benton Harbor Kresge and Woolworth stores next week in protest against the lunch counter ban against Negroes in some southern cities.

Mrs. Marie Nelson, president of the NAACP in Benton Harbor, said Thursday that she is quite positive that the picketing demonstrations will proceed.

Mayor Smith conferred with Mrs. Nelson, but reported that the organization leader appeared adamant. The NAACP by its own admission has about 300 Benton Harbor members, out of an estimated 7,000 to 10,000 Negroes in Benton Harbor and adjacent areas. Claiming to represent this great majority are a group of ministers who, while publicly expressing their sympathy with their southern brethren, emphasize that cordial and cooperative relations between racial groups here have always been satisfactory and mutually beneficial. The ministers disapprove of the picketing move, asserting that there is no local race problem, as such, and that Negroes enjoy the same status as white in stores and elsewhere. They point out that racial demonstrations could do only harm, not good.

Benton Harbor has a large Negro population, but the races have always gotten along. There has been no racial trouble in the schools. What then, is the NAACP striving for—racial friction, hostility and insecurity?

There is no paternalism here. Race relations have been based on the principle of fair dealing and mutual goodwill.

The situation is well summed up, we believe, in the following letter to the editor of this newspaper from the Reverend Charles L. Kolb, Jr., pastor, First E.U.B. church:

"The Negro ministers of the Benton Harbor community are to be commended for their carefully considered action in regards to the call of the NAACP for local picketing of chainstores involved in lunch counter disputes in the South.

"They show wise judgment in their desire to maintain the friendly relationships which exist in our community between the races and the commercial interests. Their forthright statement serves to ease possible community tensions and creates better understanding between peoples. For such positive Negro leadership we are grateful.

"Their statement comes at a time in national and international political and racial tension when Christians need to speak out boldly for the rights of all men everywhere."

As a boy of ten, with both colored and white, it was my privilege to attend the public schools and churches in St. Joseph County in the Fourth District of Michigan. Cass County in the same district was one of the stations on the underground highway from the South to Canada during the war and prewar days—and many a colored individual stopped over and made it his permanent home—good, prosperous citizens, engaging in farming and mercantile pursuits.

Not until recent years, when do-gooders and agitators came in, principally from outside, was there even a hint of discord. As this editorial, and as David Lawrence quoting Billy Graham suggested Christianity and a sense of fairness will give greater progress and harmony than will force or law.

From a practical standpoint, it is impossible to determine just where preference ends, discrimination begins. But one thing is sure: Law or force will never create kindly, charitable consideration of one toward another.

Black, yellow, or white—we are all people. We have in the Fourth District of Michigan always, while behaving ourselves, lived together in harmony and there is no reason why we cannot so continue.

Help Wanted for Building a Golden Sunset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, George Owen, a prominent lumberman and public-minded citizen in my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., published an advertisement in the Eugene Register-Guard earlier this year entitled "Help Wanted for Building a Golden Sunset at a Price All Can Afford."

This was no promotion for a money-making project. It was George Owen's idea how to provide properly for older people—and on a practical basis.

George Owens is both a practical and a philanthropic man. His ideas on this important subject are worth passing on and under a previous consent I am including the text of his advertisement hereafter:

HELP WANTED FOR BUILDING A GOLDEN SUNSET AT A PRICE ALL CAN AFFORD

The average lifespan of our people has jumped from less than 50 years to nearly 70 years in less than a century. Many oldsters cannot get a job and they cannot live on a meager social security check, welfare, or a small pension but they may "exist" under great hardship on it. My sister in Portland has long been concerned with this problem and tells so many pathetic stories of case after case of aged "castaways" living under deplorable conditions in privation and loneliness maybe in an unwanted attic although our badly overloaded welfare agencies are doing all within their power to meet the needs and are to be commended.

Other unfortunates such as a lady in Salem living near a friend of mine had terrific headaches almost constantly. My friend took her to the best doctors in Salem but they could find nothing wrong. Finally the University Medical School in Portland found the trouble, she was under great tension and strain. She must relax and stop worrying and she would be all right. But her answer was, how could she stop worrying? Getting a $90-a-month welfare check with her two teenage daughters the cheapest rent she could find was $50 per month. Her utilities averaged $14 per month which included a telephone which she must have so her daughters could pick up a few extra dollars babysitting. The $26 left plus these extra dollars just could not be made to stretch and left her in a highly disturbed mental condition. Such things need not be.

All over our Nation people are becoming aware of this big problem with our aged and unfortunates. The big cry too often has been give them "More money"—"More money." Dr. Townsend would have had us lift ourselves by our bootstraps by pouring more money into the pockets of our oldsters who would spend us all rich. The cry to give more money is not the answer. Where is it coming from? But here is a simple and practical solution.

FRINGE AREA LOCATION

Our thought is to secure land a few miles from town on a paved road where plenty of water is available, perhaps 20 acres or more. Build a lodge, a one-story building with a big lobby (a huge fireplace) with wings running at right angles in four directions for maximum view. This building might be 60 by 80 feet with the 4 wings 48 feet wide by 250 to 300 feet long with hallways in each and each wing containing 20 to 30 apartments or total 100 living units. In the space between the back wings would be a kitchen and dining room next to the lobby and the rest of the space between all the wings in lawn and trees.

But this would only be the beginning of the project. A shop where woodworking tools and all kinds of other tools would be available to the men who cared to make any of the hundreds of articles they could make and sell, making some money for themselves as well as for the project. Also, a sewing room and a laundry room might be a source of some income as well as pleasure for the ladies. Older people need two things especially, besides food, companionship and something to do. Here on the acres surrounding both would be provided, everything from games to gardening.

TRANSPORTATION

But in a place of this kind, transportation would be vital to give a feeling of freedom. And here again thrift would be the motto, but good cars 5 to 10 years old can be had for a song and a first-class mechanic kept there to keep them in top repair, watch tires, oil, and gas. Also, discarded school buses in good condition are available at an unbelievably low cost. Several of these could be there for groups who might wish to have a picnic at a park or riverside or maybe to the beach occasionally.

FOOD COST

But the food would still be the biggest single cost. Yet buying in large quantities for all people there the cost of food would be cut to a minimum. For instance, trucks hauling lumber to eastern Oregon and western Idaho can and do haul various kinds of produce back. The big potatogrowers in eastern Oregon and western Idaho are happy to have them pick out the irregular-shaped potatoes, those that do not look the best for market, for $3 per ton as they are dropped into a conveyor and put through a grinding mill for hog food. These could probably be hauled here for .01 cent or less per pound or $20 per ton. Meat also bought at the right place and handled in large quantities with deepfreeze units could be stored at a great reduction in cost over ordinary market prices. Also, at the right time of year many of these older people, the ladies especially, who have had experience in cooking and canning such things as beans and berries, fruits and vegetables could put up much for winter use by canning or cold storage. Apples now wasting on the ground could be made into applesauce and cider and these picked up by the more able men and all would enjoy it. Sauerkraut from cabbage could be made and enjoyed; the kind with which store kraut will not compare.

A PROFIT VENTURE

Anyone can get $90 to $100 per month if needed from welfare if nothing else. Some might like to work out part of their keep. Those preferring to do no work naturally

would pay more. A person drawing social security in good health might help with cleaning, cooking, laundry, dishwashing, or other general upkeep at regular fixed hours and pay maybe half or less, and another might pay $100 per month and do nothing toward plant upkeep and maintenance and work in the shop and make extra money. But on an average, if there were 200 people in the project (and there would always be a waiting list if properly managed), and if the average payment were $100 per month, in cash or labor, food cost would not exceed $20 per person per month, labor cost $10 per person average. Rent, including heat and water, $12.50 per person per month, hospital and emergency fund $10, transportation $5, utilities (mostly electricity), $5, and taxes, upkeep, and miscellaneous $17.50, total $80 per month cost, leaving a profit of $20 per person—$4,000 per month for 200 persons or $48,000 per year or 12 percent interest on the investment and profit is the thing we are after yet only because with profit thousands of these so badly needed projects would get going.

This can be done; it is being done today on a little different basis at the Taft and Carlton Hotels in Portland, which my wife and I helped finance. We have long felt what almost no one believes, that a profit can be made from the lowest income check after giving these people comfort, care and dignified living. Here in Portland it is being demonstrated. The Columbia Broadcasting TV system from New York is putting on a 1-hour program February 23 next at 3 p.m. on channel 6 "Problems of the Aging" over 176 stations throughout the Nation and among other things is showing some of the fine work being done at the Carlton Hotel. The picture was made in Portland and last Sunday, January 10, the Oregonian-Journal gave almost a full page feature and writeup (p. 32) of this project for which Portland is and may well be proud.

FREE ENTERPRISE

America has been made by the profit incentive and if we can take the precious dollars of those in lowest income bracket and give them three or four dollars in value for every one we take, we would be entitled to be well paid for it. And we would want to pay interest on the money because money is worth something to every business in our Nation. And for the Government to take money from you and me worth 6 percent or more to us and give it back to us at a low interest for us to help our older people get cheap rent is fine if there is no better way. But there is a better way.

TWELVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER MONTH RENT

But what about this $12.50 per month total rent, heat and water cost? That sounds unbelievable but is really very simple. The lowest grade lumber that does the job just as well would be used and pine, cedar, and hemlock here are much cheaper than fir. For this structure which would cover about 50,000 square feet these cheaper logs would be brought to a mill at a low cost and knotty pine and other lumber could be placed on the ground at a very reasonable price; lumber that would sell retail for much more. The floor, cement on ground level, radiant heat from big sawdust burner (the cheapest and best heat) to heat the circulating water would be the first step in construction. All fixtures, plumbing and wiring, would be bought in quantity in one big lot for the entire project at greatly reduced prices. The best carpenters, plumbers and electricians would head the project but much of the work could be done by those older men at a low wage or for shares in the project. What is wrong with that? They can't get a job anyway, and they would enjoy it for they would just be working on their own homes and at hours of their own choosing. They wouldn't need to try to keep up with men 30 years younger. Among them are the finest plumbers, electricians, and carpenters who have spent a lifetime at their trade and anyone can drive a nail as helper. I have contacted so many and almost all are enthusiastic about the entire plan.

OVERALL COST

I feel sure after a great deal of figuring this central meeting lodge plus these 100 apartments, housing 200 people can be put up for $400,000. Interest at 6 percent on this money is $24,000 per year or for 200 people $120 per year or $10 per month. This interest on the money plus $2.50 per person or $500 per month should pay for insurance, depreciation and taxes or a total of $12.50 per month total rent cost. Public housing while answering a need only scratches the surfaceand does not provide the many advantages outlined above. The magic wand of Government can't compete with free enterprise. But this plan is just as sound as social security checks or pension checks from industry. And millions of dollars of private capital is available for these projects all over our Nation when people have a few demonstrations of how solid, sound and profitable they can be. Much money has been spent for nice homes for our aged who need no help, this place would help those who really need it and still pay its way nicely on a profit, nondole basis.

The key to its success would be management. A good manager would be there at all times on the payroll, as well as cooks, nurses, mechanics and handymen who could fix such things as wiring and plumbing when not done by the guests themselves who would be paid for their services.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SAID

This plan is different from most. A Carlton hotel in a nice fringe area yet is entirely in line with the judgment of our wise old Benjamin Franklin who said: "There are two ways of sufficiency and happiness. We may either diminish our wants or augment our means—either will do—the result is the same; and it is for each man to decide for himself and do that which happens to be easiest. If you are idle or sick or poor, however hard it may be to diminish your wants, it will be harder to augment your means. If you are active and prosperous or young or in good health, it may be easier for you to augment your means than to diminish your wants. But if you are wise, you will do both at the same time, young or old, rich or poor, sick or well; and if you are very wise you will do both in such a way as to augment the general happiness of society."

This plan "aguments our means" by rubberizing low income checks so they will stretch many times their normal size.

If interested write me and give your suggestions. We would interest one person for $400,000 or 400 people for $1,000 or a lesser number in between. We have pioneered several sawmills and other projects now highly successful but this is the finest and most badly needed project we have ever contemplated pioneering. But we need your help. We now have all details worked out subject to improvements from your suggestions.

COST ESTIMATE

1.	Land—20 acres	$20,000
2.	Cement	70,000
3.	Labor	50,000
4.	Lumber	40,000
5.	Plumbing and water	35,000
6.	Bathroom fixtures	15,000
7.	Shop building	10,000
8.	Kitchen and equipment	15,000
9.	Landscaping, lawn	10,000
10.	Six beds and infirmary	15,000
11.	Supplies and equipment	20,000
12.	Transportation	5,000
13.	Heating system	40,000
14.	Doors, windows, etc	5,000
15.	Miscellaneous	50,000
	Total	400,000

American Legion Contest Winners from the 23d District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a State citizenship essay contest is sponsored annually by the local departments of the American Legion, and it gives me great pleasure to announce that among the 12 winners, we are honored to have 2 from the 23d Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the privilege of representing. It is most gratifying and heartwarming to read why these young citizens are proud to be Americans. I believe the following two essays contain excellent and inspiring expressions of Americanism. These young students, with their fresh and optimistic outlook toward the future, represent the next generation of Americans who will take our seats and carry out the plans we are formulating daily. They bring a meaningful message of encouragement to those of us who are at times burdened with the problems of the world today. I, too, am proud that these young people are Americans, proud to welcome them to Washington and pay tribute to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESSAY BY ANN KOEHLER, OLMSTED FALLS, OHIO

I am an American citizen. My parents are American citizens as were their parents and grandparents. Calling myself an American is as natural for me as eating or sleeping. Yet, when I think about being an American, I feel proud. I'm glad I was born in America and glad I live here.

What arouses this feeling of pride? What is its basis? This is January 1960, the beginning of a new decade. The world is troubled and people everywhere are anxious about the future. But, somehow, I feel secure. I am concerned, but not afraid, of the future. I know my country wants peace, not war. I know she is striving for a better understanding among the nations of the world. I feel secure and proud in the knowledge that brilliant men are working against opposing forces toward the goal of freedom and democracy for all. I am proud because I know that America is earnestly trying to help the suppressed peoples of the world.

Because I am an American I live in a country that is for the people, each and every one. I am proud when I realize that in my country every man is equal under law. Each individual can think for himself without fear of punishment.

I am proud when I see the cities of America, great towering cities of steel and glass. Strong free Americans have built these cities. I am proud when I see the homes and families of America, people taking pride in their land and in their work. When I see the farms of America I am also proud. Because of their improvements Americans enjoy the highest standard of living anywhere.

I am proud when I see the fine schools and colleges of America, open to all who will work. From within their walls have come and will continue to come the pillars of America—doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers, scientists, engineers, and many others.

I am also proud when I see the churches of America, and the people worshipping in them. They are helping unite our Nation and make it strong. In America each per-

son has the right to choose his God and worship Him when and where he wishes.

Every American has much to be thankful for. Each American has much to be proud of. Within his grasp is opportunity unlimited, unbounded. I am glad and proud to be an American. I only hope I can be a good American.

ESSAY BY ROBERT LACHANCE, JR., SHAKER HEIGHTS, OHIO

I am proud to be an American for many reasons.

First, I am proud to be an American because of my Nation's heritage, a heritage born in the crucible of blood and an abiding faith, a heritage that has been passed on to us through the generations, each one adding its bit to our country's history; a heritage that has been strengthened through five wars—none of our own making, but waged defensively because of our deep beliefs in the rights and principles of a free world.

Too, I am proud to be an American because of the many freedoms granted us under our Constitution and preserved for us through our religious convictions. In almost any community throughout the Nation, whether it be a village, town, or metropolitan area, a cross-section of mankind can be found that would be hard to duplicate anywhere else in the world. Negro and white, Christian and Jew, Hindu and islander and Chinese and Indian can be found brushing shoulders. Each has his own faith, his own God, and his own prayers—and he can worship in his own way in dignity without interference.

Again, I am proud to be an American because my country has utilized its natural resources more practically, skillfully, and profitably than any other nation in the world. And we have diverted a portion of all of these profits to the helping of needy mankind in every section of the earth. This has been done without thought to creed or custom, without evaluating friend or enemy. It is sufficient that the need exists—and our ability to aid is there.

I am also proud to be an American because of the broad uses to which we have devoted our scientific and medical knowledge and discoveries. We have shared our discoveries with our international cousins in the hope and belief that this common knowledge would cement a closer bond between all men of peaceful aims. Too, we have done it in the hope that it would bring strength where there had been weakness, light where there had been darkness, faith where there had been no hope.

I am also proud to be an American because I can feel a kinship with the great men whose sacrifices and contributions made such an enduring imprint on the high road of our Nation's history.

Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt each helped to lay a portion of the foundation for this great land we call home. Their footprints span the centuries, and their deeds bridge a chasm between two worlds—peonage and freedom.

Washington's sword helped forge the loose-knit colonies into a nation; Jefferson's pen gave us the document that lit the fires of freedom in the hearts of men; Lincoln's wisdom brought dignity and equality to the downtrodden; Wilson's foresight gave birth to the League of Nations in an effort to bring the peoples of the world into a family circle; and Franklin Roosevelt, whose grim courage fostered a brotherhood among all men, virtually lifted poor nations to an upright position through sheer determination, restoring the pride they had lost in home and country.

I am proud to be an American because I can shape my life according to my personal preferences, so long as my aims do not interfere with established order, knowing that my opportunities will only be limited by my personal abilities.

Finally, in summing up my feelings, I am proud of my American citizenship because human good has always been my country's first consideration, rather than nationalism. Americanism is a creed, not a geographic circumstance. No matter where I go I will see evidence of the friendly hand my country holds out to other peoples of the world. This gives me a kinship with everyone.

President Garcia, A Man of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the book written by Norman Cousins, one of America's great writers, entitled "In God We Trust," he underscored the religiousness of America's outstanding Presidents. Faith in God is a leader's unyielding anchor, his armor, and his guide. It is, in our contemporary life, the unassailable rampart against Marxian material mindness, the steadfast defense against communism.

It is with great interest, therefore, that I read in a Manila paper, the Daily Mirror, an article which describes how truly religious is the President of the Philippines, what a genuine Christian he is, how in his daily life he practices the tenets of Christianity. President Carlos P. Garcia who had the vision and the courage to sign the law outlawing the Communist Party from the Philippines, translates his belief in an Almighty in actions that redound to the welfare of his people. This is a facet of President Garcia that is not known in the United States.

It is not strange, therefore, that in his desire to protect his country's national security against the inroads of communism, and having the vision of a statesman, he recently made a statement which reveals not only his foresight and his patriotism but also his confidence in and his friendship for the American people. He came out openly in favor of allowing the United States, after securing the approval of the Philippine Congress, to have Philippine-based missiles for the protection and security of his country in particular and of Asian countries that believe as he does in freedom and democracy in general.

The Washington Evening Star of April 9 and 11 and the New York Times of April 11, published the following dispatches:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 9, 1960]

UNITED STATES INVITED TO SET UP PHILIPPINE A-WEAPONS

MANILA, April 9.—President Carlos P. Garcia today issued a Bataan Day invitation to the United States to station atomic weapons in the Philippines.

The approval of the Philippine Congress would be necessary "but I am sure Congress would approve," Mr. Garcia said in an interview with the Associated Press.

"The weapons could include missiles," the President said. "If the United States felt it necessary they could be kept at the American bases here rather than under control of the Philippine Government."

BUILDUP

Mr. Garcia made his plea for a drastic buildup in Philippine military might on the 18th anniversary of the surrender of Filipino and American forces on Bataan to Japan. The day is a holiday of national mourning in the Philippines.

Diplomatic negotiations have been underway for some time with the United States on the Philippine desire to become a center of free world military might in Asia. This was the first time that there has been public mention of the Philippine desire to have atomic weapons available here.

"We need the weapons so if there is another Bataan we can stand on this ground long enough for an outraged world to come to the rescue," said Mr. Garcia.

Mr. Garcia made no specific mention of Communist China, whose giant army lies only a few hundred miles away across the South China Sea. However, his words seemed to indicate that he felt the major threat of Asian aggression lies in China.

CORREGIDOR CITED

"I am trying to point to America a historical parallel," he said. "Before World War II there was a myth that Corregidor was impregnable. In fact, Corregidor strength depended on Pearl Harbor.

"Corregidor could hold out indefinitely only if the ships could come from Pearl Harbor and resupply it with weapons and food. Otherwise, it could hold only 3 months. Seventy thousand Filipinos and 30,000 Americans fought the battle there and on Bataan that history has not had time to appreciate. It was heroic beyond belief. They were just waiting for arms and food to hold out indefinitely and shatter the Japanese movement south. However, the destruction of the American fleet at Pearl Harbor made resupply impossible."

The Philippine President went on:

"Learning from that experience—Corregidor—if the Philippines have the wherewithal to undertake their defense I can say with full knowledge of the fact that we will stand firm."

The Associated Press reporter asked if the President included atomic weapons in his plea for more armaments.

"Yes, atomic weapons or missiles if they are necessary. That is my personal view. The matter would be up to the Philippine Congress. I am sure Congress would approve."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1960]

STRONG SUPPORT GIVEN PHILIPPINE A-BASE BID

MANILA, April 11.—President Carlos P. Garcia's bid for U.S. missile bases in the Philippines drew strong bipartisan support in Congress here today.

Unofficial reaction in Manila's leading newspapers was equally favorable to the proposal Mr. Garcia made in an interview with the Associated Press.

Mr. Garcia said he would like to see the most modern American weapons stationed in his country, including atomic weapons and missiles.

The President added that he felt certain his Congress would approve.

Speaker of the House Daniel Z. Romualdez told newsmen, "The President was correct." This was echoed by other leading Congressmen of Mr. Garcia's Nacionalista Party, including Representative Cabangbang, chairman of the House National Defense Committee.

Members of the opposition Liberal Party said they also favor stationing missiles here.

One Liberal commented that "it's about time" such a proposal was made.

Lt. Gen. Manuel Cabal, armed forces chief of staff, said he also fully supports the President's proposal but admitted it "caught me unawares."

There was no immediate word from Senator Recto, an extreme nationalist who opposes the presence of U.S. military bases in the Philippines. Senator Recto is expected to lead whatever opposition develops to Mr. Garcia's proposal.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1960]

GARCIA FOR A-BOMBS IN THE PHILIPPINES

MANILA, April 9.—President Carlos P. Garcia said Saturday that he wanted atomic weapons stored in the Philippines where they could be put to instant use in the event of an attack. He emphasized that this included U.S. missiles.

President Garcia's top air force general, Brig. Gen. Pedro Q. Molina, quickly backed the President. Both men were obviously thinking about the giant armies of Communist China, only a few hundred miles across the South China Sea.

Mr. Garcia issued the invitation to the United States to bring atomic weapons here in an interview on the 18th anniversary of the fall of Bataan to the Japanese.

The President appeared to have been thinking a great deal about the question, and chose his words carefully. He was obviously aware of the violent opposition of some other non-Communist Asian nations, especially Japan, to storing atomic weapons on their soil.

President Garcia said that if the United States felt it necessary, the atomic weapons "could be kept at the American bases here rather than under the control of the Philippine Government."

He added that the approval of the Philippine Congress would be necessary, "but I am sure Congress would approve." There has been some congressional opposition to any such arrangement.

The Daily Mirror of April 13, 1960, written by one of the veterans of Philippine journalism, Silvino Caparas, is the following article, entitled "Lent: How President Garcia Observes It":

[From the Daily Mirror, Apr. 13, 1960, Manila, Philippines]

LENT: HOW GARCIA OBSERVES IT

(By Silvino Caparas)

The religious aspect of the life of President Garcia has come now to the fore because of the present holy days.

Practically on a continuous spiritual retreat and mortification since Passion Sunday, the President is now up in Baguio leading the faithful in observance of the Holy Week.

He practices his religion in a realistic way. He is a religious man by conviction without fanatism or intolerance.

He is a convinced believer in God. He sees the divine hand in all things on earth especially the good, beautiful, and rich things which abound in the country.

He follows his creed not only by praying, going to church, and hearing mass, confessing, and receiving holy communion. He also applies his religious beliefs in the fulfilment of his duties, as family man, as citizen, and much so as head of the nation.

To him religion is not only spiritual action but also human force.

Knowing that man is composed of body and soul, he sees to it that both are given the necessary care. Last Passion Sunday he submitted to a complete medical checkup. This is for the body.

He then started his annual 2-week fasting. This is to clean his body and fortify his soul. And now he is in Baguio devoting the days of the Holy Week to meditating and contemplating things divine.

In the exercise of his duties as President of the Republic he has shown that his conscience, heart, and mind are deeply religious. He complies with and applies the teachings of God and His church.

He subjects official matters to a long, profound study because he does not want to commit injustices or harm people unnecessarily. When attacked he shows control and humility. He does not explode, and much less retaliate violently with hate in his heart. He answers calmly, dispassionately, with reason, without insults.

Personally he has no vices.

To him the best readings to feed his spirit and mind are the four gospels. The Old Testament according to him is a great history book, which presents a long array of great leaders of men like Moses, Josuah, Gideon, and other biblical personages.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, particularly, chapter 13 is one of his important guides in life. To him, faith, hope, and charity and love was emphasized by St. Paul are the mighty forces on heaven and earth.

"The Imitation of Christ" by Thomas á Kempis and "God is Dying," a collection of Seven Last Words sermons by Fr. Fulgence Meyer, are his other favorite reading matter during these sacred days. But he also reads authors who are not Catholics like Renan who wrote "Life of Jesus" and Ingersoll author of "Myths and Miracles." His purpose is to have a wider possible knowledge of all kinds of human views on Christ and religion.

But he warns that people who are not well grounded in their faith should not take the risk.

In his speeches he seldom forgets God.

In a recent speech in Cebu he said:

"In our planning and thinking for country, let us never forget the supremacy of spirit over matter. Our spiritual welfare is above our material well-being. Let us establish the moral foundation of our Nation on granite rock. Let the signet of eternity be the stamp mark of our culture and let our manhood seek first the kingdom of God, and everything else in life will be added to him.

"Let our cherished treasures be freedom and justice. Let the Christian trinity of faith and hope and love be the warp and woof of our national life. Then can we say with deep conviction and satisfaction that we have lived a full life dedicated to service of God and country."

Speaking at the Pax Romana dinner, last January, he explained that his "administration supports the movement (for world peace founded on justice and moral law and love of his fellowmen) because it rejects the principle embodied in the atomic bomb that 'might is right.' I support Pax Romana because it reaffirms on international scale the deathless Pauline principle in 13th Corinthians, viz: 'So there abide faith, hope, and love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.'

"Peace based on might is fleeting. Only peace based on justice and love will endure. Only peace based on the eternal laws of the Almighty will prevail."

At the beginning of his administration the President in his inaugural speech said in conclusion: "I reverently invoke the aid of the Divine Creator, Infinite Fountain of all blessings, that we may have unity where we have been divided, that we may have faith and courage where we have faltered and weakened, that we may be given light and vision where we have walked in darkness, that we may have love where we have been selfish, and that we may achieve lasting peace, prosperity and happiness for our people."

Mrs. Garcia herself is a pious lady and much is due to her for the strong influence of religion in her family. In fact only last week she sponsored a 3-day spiritual retreat and CANA conference at the Malacañan social hall conducted by Jesuit Fathers Rev. Francis Parisi and Rev. Lorenzo Ma. Guerrero. Besides the President, Attorney and Mrs. Fernando Campos, others who attended were members of the cabinet, solons and other Malacañan officials.

Helping the President in the discharge of his religious duties, is the presidential chaplain Fr. Juan Tugadi. He is always with the President, in Malcaañan, in the presidential residence in Quezon City, on the Lapu-Lapu, in Baguio, etc., to say mass and perform other religious rites.

Address by Martin B. McKneally, National Commander, the American Legion, Before the 69th Continental Congress of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, on April 18, 1960, at Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, last evening I attended the 69th continental congress of the national society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Constitution Hall.

President General Mrs. Ashmeade White, a distinguished citizen of Maine, opened the session which offered as fine a program as has been conducted for a continental congress in many years.

As part of the program there was an excellent address delivered by Martin B. McKneally, a citizen of New York and the national commander of the American Legion. I commend this statement to everyone as an excellent challenge to our thinking, for it is a real inspiration to our patriotism:

ADDRESS BY MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE 69TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, ON APRIL 18, 1960, AT CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Madam President General, Daughters of the American Revolution, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to participate in this Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I am delighted to bring to you the greetings of the American Legion and to laud you for the record of accomplishment which you have compiled over the years. I note the wide range of your activities, all nicely fitted and arranged so that one objective is served: the maintenance in the United States of a patriotic citizenship. I cannot refrain from informing you on this occasion that the American Legion seeks to do no less. And I tell you more and not without melancholy—that the work of these two organizations must not be limited by considerations of comfort, ease or unwillingness to stand and fight for the things in which we believe.

No citizen of this great country, no beneficiary of its freedom, no disciple of its spiritual ideals can, in thoughtful moments derive comfort in viewing the events and

developments of these days. One billion of our fellow human beings are held in a Communist thrall. Emissaries and agents of communism encircle the globe and aim to increase the figure either by appeals to friendship, ideals of a sort or by subversion. We see at our doorstep a Government that is headed by a revolutionary named Castro who is doing the Communist business. And yet, we also see a number of Americans who have achieved a certain celebrity, apologizing and praising this Government. These Americans who presumably wish to serve democratic ideals and in many instances hold themselves out as the definitive interpreters of them, find no incongruity in their espousal of the cause of a man who ordered hundreds of his fellow citizens gunned down without a fair trial or even the remote trappings of proper court procedures. Where, one wonders, were these men when lessons in justice were taught? Where were they when respect for the dignity of human beings was taught? What kind of men are these who aline themselves with a predatory Communist oriented government in Cuba? Where, alas, is their loyalty to American ideals.

One extraordinary thing about these men and women who find it easy to socialize and fraternize with tyrants is their distaste for organizations such as yours and mine. You have found as have we, that organizations devoted to God and country and the maintenance of America's traditions and a forthright devotion to their country, are the targets of those extremists. There is, therefore, a great gulf between our thinking on the basic issues facing America and certain highly articulate well-placed critics, important in the fields of propaganda.

How to explain that gulf? Is it not the result of an abandonment on their part of certain basic values which you and we husband with great care? Is it not that they have adopted for themselves and for all the rest of us new standards by which men are to be judged and actions are to be taken? We daily see matters seriously proposed and supported in the Congress of the United States, which but a few years ago would have received scant consideration. We daily see brought into the homes of America television programs portraying violence and seaminess as accepted ways of life. We have become curiously aware recently of a new usage of the art form. In other days, dramas were written in order to amuse and entertain and to lift up the spirit of a man to noble emotions. Now we are told that they are created to make us think—think according to whose pattern, one might ask—the producers, the directors, the writers? Whom are we supposed to think like? Some person with exalted patriotism or someone with tarnished and perverted ideals? Are we supposed to think in accordance with a mentality that is disposed to war with our system—our basic beliefs, our quintessential values of God and country. Are we to accept as art a portrayal of morbidity and salaciousness offensive to good taste and be satisfied with the explanation—that this is adult fare—that this is just a reexamination in the light of modern experience of certain basic tenets heretofore taken for granted; that the producer knows best what is good for us?

Are we to accept as right, as in the best interests of our country, arguments by men of exalted station both in the Congress and the academic world that a simple affirmation of loyalty, coupled with an affidavit attesting to freedom from the taint of disloyalty, is a burden upon young Americans going to school with Government aid; is it, as they contend, a reflection upon their integrity or their loyalty?

Are we to accept as sound the arguments from men of high office, editorial writers, and columnists that the best way to develop a rule of international law is by submitting ourselves to the jurisdiction of a court largely composed of judges either innocent of or in opposition to our theory of rights as described in the Declaration of Independence?

Are we to be pleased with the state of education in America, which seems to have removed the rigors of mind training, of building mental muscularity and substituted therefor a kind of vague life adjustment process; an instruction in the art of living, an acculturation, if you please?

Are we able to rely on the state of our spiritual defenses? Can we say that we believe in our system with a fervor and a faith equal to those of Communists? Has it not been eroded away by the constant and carping criticisms that have been leveled at it by men of little faith? By television and radio commentators who in their sepulchral tones of omniscience dilate upon its minor defects, smear its upholders? Are we already propagandized too much by men who have traveled too much, and thought too little; acquired facts but no wisdom, success but no faith?

Is it too late to head off the final plunge into basic, crass, and hopeless materialism, in which men place all of their confidence for the future? Or have we lived so long now by the doctrine of spend and spend, consume and work, build more, buy more, and want more, that there is no room in our heads for the doctrine of belief upon which this Nation was founded?

Communism proposes that life is material and that man is a product of nature with no purpose, no will and no soul. As harsh as this doctrine is, the Communist accepts it as truth and will give his all to sustain it. He is willing to give everything we covet in its support. Bakunin-Nechayev in his "Catechism of a Revolutionist" describes the Communist revolutionary as follows: He is a doomed man; he has no personal interests, no affairs, sentiments, attachments, property, not even a name of his own. Everything in him is absorbed by one exclusive interest, one thought, one passion—the revolution.

Is it any wonder that a revolution started 40 years ago in a retarded nation has ripened into a governance of one billion human beings, and a threat to every freeman on the face of the earth, when it has disciples of supreme conviction and the capacity for ultimate sacrifice?

"The question for us here tonight in this august hall is, "is there any hope to withstand the pressures of so dynamic a faith and so powerful an enemy as communism?" The answer is, "Yes," but the work lies with you.

If we shall win in this struggle it is because patriotic women like yourselves have kept the faith, have reenkindled the spirit of patriotism, have fired youth with love of their country, have said so loud that all can hear; yes, the students of America will take a loyalty oath in this day of freedom's darkest peril; yes, we shall stand for justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty in the traditional modes of American thinking; yes, we shall retain the Connally reservation protective of the sovereign rights of our citizens; yes, we shall reject the preposterous theory that freedom of conscience requires that a man may engage in a conspiracy, the objective of which is to overthrow the established order; yes, we shall reject Hollywood producers as the arbiters of our morals and our thought patterns; yes, we shall reject the presumptuous notion that freedom of speech may be denied to those who wish to publish the records of men who have been and may still be the enemies of our country; yes, we shall insist upon the reexamination of our basic educational ideals with a view not to decrease its democratic nature but in order to strengthen its learning and its training of the minds of youth; yes, we shall build our spiritual defenses in the home, in the school, in the church by increasing our faith in God and our dependence for the rules of action upon His moral law; yes, we shall reject the doctrines of relativism that say there are no objective standards by which man's conduct can be gaged; yes, we shall proclaim that right is right if nobody is right, and wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong; yes, we shall oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations; yes, we shall stand up for America in the ways that our traditions and the love of our country require; yes, we shall avail ourselves of our opportunities; yes, we shall do our duty to America; yes, we shall absorb the blows that, in this desolate age, are aimed at women who think and believe and speak out as you do; yes, we shall bear in mind the credo of the revolutionist to whom all things are possible because he believes.

And we shall in our turn proclaim our own beliefs, our own faith in our country. May I suggest to you that these are neatly summed up in a passage written by a refugee, one who came to these shores from Herr Hitler's concentration camp, one who came to us delivered from sights, sounds, and agonies no child of God should ever experience.

He became a citizen of these United States and then wrote:

"I am an American citizen—a member of the greatest fraternity on earth—the brotherhood of freemen. Because a million American citizens have died and millions have suffered in the wars of our Republic, I have greater freedom than any other citizen of any other nation in any other period of mankind. I have greater freedom to work, to worship, to love, to learn, and to play. Mine is the freedom to compete, to invent, to save, to invest, to create, to promote, to own. I have freedom to choose, to join, to vote, to speak, to travel, and to walk erect with my head held high. I am free to be my own self as an individual human soul. I am free to glorify Almighty God."

Electronics in the Field of Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be of interest to every Member of Congress, especially to my colleagues from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to learn of a pilot project, which in this age of automatons, has geared for the first time electronics into the field of rehabilitation. The Remington Rand division of the Sperry Rand Corp., the department of property and supplies, and the Department of Justice of the State of Pennsylvania, are cooperatively offering a course for the training of Univac programers to a selected group of 20 youthful prisoners in the State correctional institution at Camp Hill, Pa. Remington Rand is providing, without cost, instructors, manuals, laboratory facilities, and textbooks.

The significant aspect of this development, in view of increasing problems of crime and delinquency, is the demonstration that our system of individual enterprise can do something constructive about it. In this respect I heartily

recommend that our industries, corporations, businesses, and union authorities, explore the possibilities, through training and employment, of bringing out the constructive capabilities of the youthful offender.

The officials of the respective organizations are to be congratulated on their dynamic progress in the area of treatment.

Lincoln's Greatness—1865

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 this year, during the anniversary week of Lincoln's assassination, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL was one of the speakers at a special ceremony at Ford's Theater. He delivered an address on "Lincoln's Greatness—1865." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include SCHWENGEL'S speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LINCOLN'S GREATNESS—1865

Fourscore and 15 years ago next Thursday, a shot was fired in this building that was heard around the world. The assassin's bullet triggered the beginning of the greatest worldwide tribute ever given to an American—indeed to any political statesman in history.

Ever since the morning of April 15, 1865, when the Reverend Dr. Gurley bowed his head on a bloodstained coverlet and prayed fervently in the backroom of the Peterson house across the street from here, historians, poets, philosophers and writers have pondered the mystery of Lincoln's greatness. Barrels of ink have been spread on carloads of paper telling the story of, explaining the mystery of and commenting on the life of this great and good man.

On February 11, 1959, the President of the United States, speaking at the annual Lincoln banquet which was the real beginning of a year's commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, made the observation that, "Abraham Lincoln belongs not only to the ages, but to all humanity. Immortality is his in the hearts of all who love freedom everywhere in the world."

The following day that great poet and historian, Carl Sandburg, gave, from the podium at the Capitol to a Congress in joint session and to the world, the finest statement on Lincoln ever uttered. This dissertation on Lincoln was noted by all the areas of communication more than any other in history except some of Lincoln's own statements.

All of this, plus the tremendous response to the great program inspired and promoted by the Sesquicentennial Commission, chairmanned by that great Senator from Kentucky, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, has encouraged people to believe that Lincoln has become great since his death. While a good case can be made for this feeling, it shall be my purpose today to suggest that the people he lived with, the people he knew and the people he led through the dark valley of the shadow of death to preserve the Nation sensed his greatness and importance more than we realize. To add sustenance to this contention, we need only to refer to the public records of the time of his death and we will note the universal, immense and moving response of great respect tendered him by the press, by men in public office and by the people in their response to the plans carried out by governmental leaders for his funeral. Most statements and sermons by the clergy of that period speaking from the pulpits of every church in the North and from a vast number of churches in the South were eloquent and inspiring.

The funeral ceremonies lasted from the time of his death, April 15, 1865, until the 4th of May when he was buried at Springfield. Every public official of that time from the mayor of the smallest village to the President of the United States publicly paid tribute to this man. A reporter who was on the funeral train during its 12-day journey from Washington to Springfield, a distance of 1,682 miles, reported that "From the time the train left Washington until it reached Springfield there never was a time when it was out of sight of people during the day or that the lanterns, torches and bonfires could not be seen from the train during the night."

Sandburg reminds us that "in this period along the funeral route bells sobbed, cities wore crepe; people stood in tears and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in the leading cities." From the record we find that along the route, when his body was taken from the train, over a million people passed by the open casket and newspaper accounts tell of the many hundreds of thousands who wanted to pass by and didn't because there wasn't time and of the many millions that watched the funeral car pass along the route. Here, then, is abundant evidence that the people sensed and deeply mourned the loss of a great man.

Great statesmen, great leaders, and great thinkers inspire others to build and carry forward nobel objectives. While it is true that many authors and students have, since his death and in recent years, been inspired to great heights by the life and works of Lincoln. It is also true that the great leaders of that time, using Lincoln, expressed themselves nobly and effectively and in a way that added immeasurably to our heritage.

Here are some of the thrilling and significant statements by the clergy and statesmen who addressed audiences during the period of his funeral.

Probably there has never been a better known preacher than that man who served the pulpit in the great Plymouth Church in Brooklyn for 40 years—Henry Ward Beecher. Among other things, comparing Lincoln to Moses, he reminds us that, "Again a great leader of the people has passed through toil, sorrow, battle, and war, and come near to the promised land of peace, into which he might not pass over, and asks, 'Who shall recount our martyr's sufferings for this people?' Since the November of 1860, his horizon has been black with storms. By day and by night, he trod a way of danger and darkness. On his shoulders rested a government dearer to him than his own life. At its integrity millions of men were striking at home. Upon this government foreign eyes lowered. It stood like a lone island in a sea full of storms; and every tide and wave seemed eager to devour it. Upon thousands of hearts great sorrows and anxieties have rested, but not on one such, and in such measure, as upon that simple, truthful noble soul, or faithful and sainted Lincoln."

He continues:

"He wrestled ceaselessly, through four black and dreadful purgatorial years, wherein God was cleansing the sin of his people as by fire."

He pointed out:

"Men were bereaved, and walked for days as if a corpse lay unburied in their dwellings. There was nothing else to think of. They could speak of nothing but that; and yet, of that they could speak only falteringly. All business was laid aside. Pleasure forgot to smile. The city for nearly a week ceased to roar. The great Leviathan lay down, and was still. Even avarice stood still, and greed was strangely moved to generous sympathy and universal sorrow. Rear to his name monuments, found charitable institutions, and write his name above their lintels; but no monument will ever equal the universal, spontaneous, and sublime sorrow that in a moment swept down lines and parties, and covered up animosities, and in an hour brought a divided people into unity of grief and indivisible fellowship of anguish."

He asks: "Do not all soldiers that must fall ask to depart in the hour of battle and victory? He went in the hour of victory."

He explains a facet of Lincoln's greatness by telling us: "He was a man from the common people that never forgot his kind."

He reminds us that "this blow was but the expiring rebellion."

He reminds use of an eternal truth when he says: "Slavery wastes its victims; and it destroys the masters."

He sees the need for the people to be reminded that "the blow has signally failed. The cause is not stricken; it is strengthened. This Nation has dissolved—but in terms only. It stands foursquare, more solid, today, than any pyramid in Egypt. This people are neither wasted, nor daunted, nor disordered. Men hate slavery and love liberty with stronger hate and love today than ever before. The Government is not weakened, it is made stronger. How naturally and easily were the ranks closed. Another stepped forward, in the hour that the one fell, to take his place and his mantle; and I avow my belief that he will be found a man true to every instinct of liberty; true to the whole trust that is reposed in him; vigilant of the Constitution; careful of the laws wise for liberty, in that he himself, through his life, has known what it was to suffer from the stings of slavery, and to prize liberty from bitter personal experiences."

He describes the power of the spirit of Lincoln "and now the martyr is moving in triumphal march, mightier than when alive. The Nation rises up at every stage of his coming. Cities and States are his pallbearers, and the cannon beats the hours with solemn progression. Dead, dead, dead, he yet speaketh."

He asks: "Is Washington dead? Is Hampden dead? Is David dead? Is any man that ever was fit to live dead? Disenthralled of flesh, and risen in the unobstructed sphere where passion never comes, he begins his illimitable work."

We know that Reverend Beecher sensed his greatness when he reminds us that: "Four years ago, O Illinois, we took from your midst an untried man, and from among the people. We return him to you a mighty conqueror. Not thine any more, but the Nation's; not ours, but the world's. Give him place, O ye prairies. In the midst of this great continent his dust shall rest, a sacred treasure to myriads who shall pilgrim to that shrine to kindle anew their zeal and patriotism."

That great leader Henry Bellows from the All Souls Church of New York, editor of the Chrisian Inquirer and President of the U.S. Sanitary Commission during the Civil War, speaking in New York in 1865 tells us:

"Our beloved President, who had enshrined himself not merely in the confidence, the respect, and the gratitude of the people, but in their very hearts, as their true friend, adviser, representative, and brother; whom the Nation loved as much as it revered; who had soothed our angry impatience in this fearful struggle with his gentle moderation and passionless calm; who had been the head of the Nation, and not the chief of a successful party; and had treated our enemies like

rebellious children, and not as foreign foes, providing even in their chastisement for mercy and penitent restoration; our prudent, firm, humble, reverential, God-fearing President is dead" and he continues by observing: "But he has gone. Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States during the most difficult, trying, and important period of the Nation's history; safe conductor of our policy through a crisis such as no other people ever had to pass; successful summoner of a million and a quarter of American citizens to arms in behalf of their flag and their Union; author of the Proclamation of Emancipation; the people's President; the heir of Washington's place at the hearths and alters of the land; the legitimate idol of the Negro race; the perfect type of American democracy."

He bravely points out that maybe we needed to make this sacrifice by saying:

"And may we not have needed this loss, in which we gain a national martyr and an ascended leader, to inspire us from his heavenly seat, where with the other father of his country he sits in glory, while they send united benedictions and lessons of comfort and of guidance down upon their common children—may we not have needed this loss to sober our hearts in the mist of our national triumph, lest in the excess of our joy and our pride we should overstep the bounds of that prudence and the limits of that earnest seriousness which our affairs demand? We have stern and solemn duties yet to perform, great and anxious tasks to achieve. We must not, after ploughing the fields with the burning share of civil war, and fertilizing them with the blood and bones of a half million noble youth, lose the great harvest by wasting the short season of ingathering in festive joy at its promise and its fulness."

Then Reverend Bellows suggests that: "God has startled us, to apprise us of our peril; to warn us of possible mischances, and to caution us how we abuse our confidence and overtrust our enemy."

Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler, pastor of a Presbyterian church, a man who then had an international reputation as a preacher and writer saw virtue in Lincoln's humor. He said:

"Lincoln's humor was as natural to him as breathing. It was a happy gift. It kept his temper sweet, and lubricated his mind, that might otherwise have been worn into sulleness or into despondency by the tremendous friction of care and overwhelming anxieties. None of his jokes were ill-timed or malevolent. Some of them were exceedingly adroit. For instance, when an inquisitive visitor questioned him too closely as to the destination of the Burnside expedition, the President inquired with mock gravity, 'my friend, can you keep a secret?' 'Yes, sir,' he eagerly replied. 'Then,' said Mr. Lincoln, 'I will venture to inform you that the expedition has gone to sea.' "

He comments on his religion by telling us that "Abraham Lincoln's religion, as far as the world saw it—lay in two cardinal principles—a rigid sense of right—and an unfaltering faith in the Providence of God. He was a child of Providence. 'If I did not seek help from God every morning I could not stand up under the load laid upon me,' was the substance of a remark made to an intimate friend during a gloomy period of the war. What was the degree of our President's heart-faith in Jesus Christ is known only to the Omniscient. He worshipped in God's sanctuary; he once taught in the Sabbath School; he was rigidly moral; he practised abstinence from the wine cup as well as preached it; he set a noble example of industry, continence, fortitude, and integrity."

He underscores Lincoln's faith in the power of right:

"After issuing the proclamation of freedom he said to a friend, 'I did not think the people had been educated up to it; but I thought it was right to issue it, and so I did it.' "

Reverend Cuyler also refers to the people's response to Lincoln's death by telling us that "Lincoln in his coffin has put a world in tears. Never was a man so mourned; never before did all Christendom stand mourners around one single bier. That pistol shot at Washington echoes around the world in the universal wail of humanity. God pity our noble friends abroad when they hear the tidings."

He raises a question that has been discussed since his death when he asks, "Did Lincoln die too soon?" And answers that, "For us and for the world he did; but not for himself. It is all sadly right. God's will be done. The time had come when, like Samson, our beloved leader could slay more by his death than in his life. He has slain the accursed spirit of slavery yet lurking in the North. He has slain the last vestige of sympathy with the discomfited rebellion in every candid foreign mind. That pistol's flash has revealed the slave-drivers' conspiracy to the world—our father died at the right time; for his mighty work was done. He lived to see the rebellion in its last agonies; he lived to enter Richmond amid the acclamations of the liberated slave, and to sit down in the archtraitor's deserted seat; he lived until Sumter's flag rose again like a star of Bethlehem in the southern sky, and then, with the marty's crown upon his brow, and with 4 million broken fetters in his hand, he went up to meet his God."

Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, a graduate of Yale, a great pastor and the sanitary commission member with General Sherman's army during the Civil War, touches on Lincoln's greatness:

"I count it one of the noblest acts in the history of the race, an impressive proof of the progress of human society, that a nation has rendered its spontaneous homage, a tribute without precedent in its own annals, and hardly equaled in the annals of the world, to a man whom it had not yet learned to call great."

Commenting on Lincoln's education this reverend from Yale reminds us that "whether his books or his teachers be few or many, whether his education be in professional schools or in the open school of nature and of practical life, he who would become a power either in the world of opinion or in the world of action, must make himself a man of self-discipline and culture with such helps as are at his command. Mr. Lincoln made himself, not by despising advantages which he had not, but by using thoroughly such advantages as he had."

He continues:

"He thought out every subject for himself; and he did not commit himself in public upon any subject which he had not made his own by reflection. Hence even familiar thoughts, coming before us in the simple rustic garb of his homely speech, seemed fresh and new. He took from the mint of political science the bullion which philosophers had there deposited, and coined it into proverbs for the people. Or in the great placer of political speculations, he sometimes struck a lode of genuine metal, and wrought it with his own hands."

In his reasoning on the Constitution, Reverend Thompson points out that: "The Union is older than the Constitution; the Union made the Constitution, and not the Constitution the Union."

Then commenting on Lincoln's simple philosophy Reverend Thompson said:

"With a noble contempt for political prejudice, and with a touching moral simplicity, Mr. Lincoln avowed this principle in his treatment of the Negro. In pointing out that more has been given you (by the Creator) you cannot be justified in taking away the little which has been given him. If God gave him but little, that little let him enjoy. In the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. In his highest prosperity he never forgot his kindred with men of low estate. Amid all the cares of office, his ear was always open to a tale of sorrow or of wrong, and his hand was always ready to relieve suffering, and to remedy injustice. I seem to see him now, leaning against the railing that divides the War Office from the White House, while the carriage is waiting at the door, and listening to the grievance of a plain man, then sitting down upon the coping and writing on a card an order to have the case investigated and remedied. An undignified position do you say? It was the native dignity of kindness."

It seems to me that one of the most eloquent statements by a public official was made by Job Stevenson, a Representative from Ohio, when he gave the principle address for the service at Cleveland. He reminded the American people that "for 4 years the war raged, and the President was tried as man was never tried before. Oh, 'with what a load of toil and care,' has he come, with steady, steadfast step, through the valley and the shadow of defeat, over the bright mountain of victory, up to the sunlit plain of peace.

"Through all these trials the President stood firm, trusting in God and the people, while the people trusted in God and in him. Tried by civil affairs which would have taxed the powers and tested the virtues of Jefferson, Hamiliton and Washington, he administered them so wisely and well, that after 3 years no man was found to take his place. He was reelected, and the harvest of success came in so gradually, that he might have said, 'Now, Lord, let us Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.' Yet he was free from weakness or vanity. Thus did he exhibit, on occasion, in due proportion and harmonious action, those cardinal virtues, the trinity of true greatness—courage, wisdom, and goodness; goodness to love the right, wisdom to know the right, and courage to do the right. Tried by these tests, and by the touchstone of success, he was the greatest of living men."

Abraham Lincoln's very good friend, Matthew Simpson, the Methodist bishop, concluded the final service at the grave by recalling: "How different the occasion which witnessed his departure from that which witnessed his return. Doubtless you expected to take him by the hand, and to feel the warm grasp which you had felt in other days, and to see the tall form walking among you which you had delighted to honor in years past. But he was never permitted to come until he came with lips mute and silent, the frame encoffined, and a weeping Nation following as his mourners. Such a scene as his return to you was never witnessed. Among the events of history there has never been a greater procession of mourners."

He, too, refers to the people's moving response:

"There have been mournings in the kingdoms of the earth when kings and princes have fallen, but never was there, in the history of man, such mourning as that which has accompanied this funeral procession, and has gathered around the mortal remains of him who was our loved one, and who now sleeps among us. If we glance at the procession which followed him, we see how the Nation stood aghast. Tears filled the eyes of manly, sunburnt faces. More persons

have gazed on the face of the departed than ever looked upon the face of any other departed man. More faces have looked on the procession for 1,600 miles or more—by night and by day—by sunlight, dawn, twilight, and by torchlight, than ever before watched the progress of a procession."

His closing remark is appropriate and touching. He said:

"We crown thee as our martyr—and humanity enthrones thee as her triumphant son. Hero, martyr, friend, farewell."

Here is abundant evidence of the spontaneous homage of the tremendous outpouring of grief rendered at his death. A tribute that is without precedent in all the annals of history and this to a man who they had not yet learned to call great even though they, in their action, proved him the greatest. From the experiences of this funeral period and from what we have learned about Lincoln since that time, we can believe that there may be something greater than greatness itself. Even though he had not yet been enrolled with the great names of literature; and no feats of arms nor strategy on the field had yet placed him among the military heroes; and even though he was not yet ranked with the great thinkers and philosophers of history, the people sensed his greatness or they would or could not have paid such moving tribute to him at that time. Possibly he was great in his own way. Maybe he represented a new type of greatness. It seems the less it was recognized and acknowledged, the more it is genuine and divine. Even though the people and the leaders had not begun to accord him the epithets and the homage of greatness, the people in their simple way demonstrated so well that they believed him great. He had something that they understood and felt akin to greatness and it may be that there are lessons to learn from their reactions; maybe the recognized grandness in this character, rather than greatness, is the fitting epithet for the life and character of Abraham Lincoln; not greatness of endowment nor of achievement, but grandeur of soul. Grand in his simplicity and kindliness; grand in his wisdom of resolve and his integrity of purpose; grand in his trust in principle and in the principles he made his trust; grand in his devotion to truth, to duty, and to right; grand in his consecration to his country and to God, he rises above the great in genius and in renown, into that foremost rank of moral heroes, of whom the world was not worthy.

The people who were of the Nation he loved knew he was great. The leaders knew too when they saw the multitudes weep and they then expressed the depth of their feelings marvelously as they proclaimed him the greatest of the great, grandest of the grand, a statesman who built his own monument in the hearts of those who love liberty unselfishly for all mankind.

Yes, he was rather great and grand in his own time. If it were not so we would not know him so well or love him so much today.

Electronic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker. I direct your attention to a special report on electronic warfare appearing in the current issue of Space/Aeronautics, a Conover-Mast publication.

In any war of today or tomorrow electronics will play the prime role as a data gatherer—radar, infrared, optics—and for control and communications. Any side that has the capability of depriving the other of the use of all or part of the electromagnetic spectrum will have the top hand in modern warfare.

This is why electronic countermeasures is so important, this is why it has been a closely guarded secret and has been the least written about phase of all electronics. The ECM—electronic countermeasures—goal is to deprive the enemy of the use of the electromagnetic spectrum, hence to deprive him of the use of his radars, infrared equipment, radio control and communications and his optical viewers, such as cameras.

It can take two major forms: confusion and deception.

In confusion you saturate his electronics with noise, or send several false targets along with the true target.

In deception you give him false information but make him think it is true information.

Countermeasures dates back to the days of the Trojan horse. The battle of countermeasures and counter-countermeasures is analogous to a game of chess but the stakes are high—human loves and the fate of nations.

In the April issue of Space/Aeronautics the editors have made a complete report on the state of the art at this moment, to the extent that security permits.

Air Route to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn of the Civil Aeronautics Board decision which prevented removal of certain Seattle-to-Honolulu air service. I believe this decision is in the interest of all concerned and will contribute to the continued growth of air transportation in the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the April 4, 1960, issue of the Seattle, Wash., Times:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Apr. 4, 1960]

AIR-ROUTE CASE WELL MADE

Voices of the Pacific Northwest spoke often, vigorously and with clear logic in the fight for continued competitive air service on the Seattle-Portland-Honolulu run, and the Civil Aeronautics Board gave heed.

Here was one case where this community did not meekly bow its head and accept an adverse decision of a Federal official—a decision which appeared to ignore vital facts.

Community alertness, a refusal to accept defeat after a losing "first round," were rewarded when the CAB overruled the recommendation of its examiner and gave permanent certificates on the Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route to both Northwest Orient Airlines and Pan American World Airways.

The examiner had recommended last September that Pan American be dropped from the route, and only Northwest continued.

Seattle could have said, "too bad," and sat back with resignation to await the expected confirmation of the examiner's decision.

Instead, a vigorous campaign was pressed under the leadership of the municipal government, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Seattle Traffic Association, the State public service commission and the attorney general's office. Strong support came from Oregon and Hawaiian spokesmen.

It was pointed out that traffic on the Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route climbed from about 36,000 passengers in 1958 to more than 57,000 in 1959, and continued to climb dramatically in January of 1960.

It was further pointed out that Hawaiian statehood, the general boom in the islands' economy, the increasing popularity of "off-season" vacations, the conversion to jet aircraft, and population growth in the immediately affected areas all pointed to continuing climb in traffic on that route.

Competition on the route to the island State will guarantee this area first-class service on that route, and will be important to the city's bid for recognition as a key terminal on global air routes.

Removal of Pan American from Seattle-Honolulu service would, for instance, have created a great gap in Pan American's one-carrier service between London and Sydney by way of Seattle and Honolulu. Traffic on transpolar flights to Europe from the central Pacific, otherwise destined for Seattle, would have moved through San Francisco.

This community can take great satisfaction from the CAB decision, which was a wise one, supported by the facts.

It can take satisfaction also in having spoken up—and been heard.

The McGuffey Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, I stood in the well of the House and announced I had in my office for the perusal of anyone who might care to see them, a set of the famous McGuffey Readers.

I addressed the House briefly and made some passing comment.

To my surprise, I received in the mail from the west coast of our Nation—Oakland, Calif.—a letter containing the favorable reaction of Mr. Frank P. Stelling and his additional comments and personal observations. They appear in his letter which follows:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 5, 1960.*

Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUMMA: I read your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, page 6327, entitled "The Three R's," with great pleasure.

I have felt for many years that juvenile delinquency, the lack of knowing right from

wrong, the desire for security from the cradle to the grave, has been "progressive education" pushed by the famous lobby, the National Education Association.

My father (who died in 1933 at age 71) was brought up on McGuffey's Readers, and when I was a member of the Ohio Society of New York, in the old Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, where the Empire State Building is now—the board of governors bought a full set for the library of McGuffey's Readers.

I have a first eclectic McGuffey Reader before me for my grandson (I am 69 and a graduate of Amherst College, A.B., 1913), which I bought.

I shall buy the other five readers later from Old Authors, Department C1-12, Rowan, Iowa.

The McGuffey Readers are springing up over the country and, I hope, save the day in education.

Thank you for your splendid speech.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK P. STELLING.

Eight Myths About the Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, farmers today are in the unenviable position of witnessing a continued downward trend in their income, while in the same breath are being accused daily of receiving unwarranted handouts and becoming wards of the Government. In an effort to bring forth a proper perspective concerning this Nation's farmers, Mr. Carroll Streeter, distinguished editor of the Farm Journal magazine, has written a booklet dealing with some of the commonly held misconceptions regarding our farm families. Mr. Streeter has labeled these misconceptions as the eight myths and I would recommend this reading to all persons interested in unbiased public understanding of the present problems being faced by our farmers.

The article follows:

EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT THE FARM SITUATION

(By Carroll P. Streetcar)

May I make clear, first of all, that I am not writing to defend the present farm program. It has its faults, and some virtues. I shall, however, defend farmers. Not that all farmers are completely lily-white, but I believe that farmers as a class deserve far less blame than the public has been putting on their shoulders.

The farm situation itself is no myth. There are, however, several commonly accepted myths about it, and it's time somebody exposed them.

MYTH NO. 1—THE FARM SITUATION IS SO COMPLICATED NOBODY CAN UNDERSTAND IT

Actually I believe I can state the situation in four sentences:

1. We are producing more of some farm products than we can sell at support level prices—about 2 to 3 percent too much of our overall farm production—and we haven't been able to shut off the spigot.

2. Under the support price program we have held some of this surplus production at too high a price, so we haven't been able to move it into consumption either at home or abroad.

3. Thus, even though the oversupply is not large, except for a handful of commodities, this surplus unduly depresses the farmer's price and causes disproportionate distress because the demand is so inelastic.

4. Farmers' costs have continued to go up, adding to the squeeze.

MYTH NO. 2—ALL FARMERS ARE TAKING A HANDOUT

We have an unfortunate proclivity in this country to lump all farmers together as though they were an homogenous group. There is no such thing as a typical farmer. A range cattleman in Colorado is a far different kind of individual than a dairyman in Vermont, who hardly resembles a cotton grower in Alabama, who in turn bears little likeness to an Iowa hog farmer or a Pennsylvanian egg producer.

These people buy from and sell to each other. Often they compete with one another—and whole regions compete. Their views on farm policy vary from one pole to the other.

It may surprise you to know that less than one-fourth of agricultural produce gets so much as one red cent of Government subsidy. In the 27 years that the Government has been in the farm-program business, it has supported prices for only 45 of the 256 farm commodities produced in this country. Right now, only 21 are being supported.

Wheat, of course, is the conspicuous example—we have nearly 2 years' supply stored up. Next come the feed grains, chiefly corn and grain sorghums; then comes cotton, then tobacco.

Practically the entire livestock world—which accounts for more than half our farm income—has never accepted supports, even though stockmen could probably have had them for the asking. The lone exception is diary products, but the support prices there are not being used to any extent, except on dried milk powder.

I think it's useful to know these things. They put farm subsidies in some perspective. If more people had this information, we'd probably hear fewer heated statements about farmers as a class, or about the farm mess.

MYTH NO. 3—FARMERS GOT US INTO THIS SITUATION

Well, they produced the food and fiber all right, too much of some things, but they had a lot of push from forces they weren't entirely responsible for. Let's see how we want to assess the blame.

Two wars had much to do with it—World War II and the Korean war. It was suddenly patriotic to raise all the food possible. "Food will win the war and write the peace"—that was the slogan. War contributed in another way, too. The sudden demand for nitrates for munitions gave tremendous impetus to the fertilizer industry, and it's been booming ever since. As fertilizer stayed relatively cheap it paid farmers to pour it on. Quite naturally they did.

During the war Congress adopted support prices on a half dozen basic commodities at 90 percent of so-called parity. These supports were supposed to expire 2 years after World War II, but Congress hung onto them until 1954 (and tobacco still has them, albeit with tight acreage control). The farmers concerned with those crops had something to do with that, all right. It was a mistake, except possibly for tobacco, and most growers know it now. It not only whooped up production for these farm products beyond all need, but it priced us out of the export markets, and out of some of the domestic markets as well.

Another important factor has been a literal explosion of new scientific information about farming which the colleges, high schools, and the farm press have carried to every farmer in the land. For 100 years it has been American public policy to carry on agricultural research. We've all been for it. And consumers should be. It is not too difficult to demonstrate that it has done consumers more good through lower food costs than it has done farmers through higher yields.

The Government is pouring fuel on the fire in other ways. While trying to control farm production, it continues to vote money for reclamation projects which bring new land into production. It continues to dole out $250 million of so-called agricultural conservation practice money, chiefly for lime and fertilizer which further stimulate production.

On top of all that, we've had phenomenally good crop weather over most of the country in recent yaers. No wonder we've had overproduction. And no wonder the individual farmer, caught up in this tide, had no alternative but to produce his head off in an attempt to survive. What would you do? Try to cut production for the benefit of society when you had no assurance others would do the same?

MYTH NO. 4—FARM SUBSIDIES ARE COSTING US $6 BILLION A YEAR

Let's take that $6 billion figure apart. It is indeed the amount in the Federal budget labeled "Agriculture." Only two items are bigger: defense, and interest on the national debt. But a lot more than subsidies comes out of that $6 billion.

Part of the agriculture budget goes for general services which are of benefit to the entire population, not just to farm people—services such as scientific research and education, grading of food products, market reporting, the Forest Service, soil conservation, food inspection services, and the like. Should we charge all of these just to farmers alone? We do.

A large part of the budget is used for commodity loans and purchases, most of which the Government will later recover. Some of the commodities the Government acquires go for the school lunch program. Should we charge this to agriculture, or to school lunches?

In the past we've given away vast quantities of food to needy nations. We've sold great quantities more on long-term credit, and still more for soft currencies we spent in the recipient countries. Is this farm aid, or foreign aid, or a mixture of the two? Certainly we're using the money for both—but charging it all to farmers.

Actually, of the entire agriculture budget, probably not more than half can be charged to farmers alone, and not all of that to subsidies. That still is a very substantial sum of money, but it also is quite a distance from $6 billion.

No one denies that the Government is holding a tremendous pile of surplus food and fiber—some $7.3 billion worth on January 31, plus another $1.9 billion worth under current loans. We can't go on piling it up indefinitely. And you might be surprised to know that most farmers agree with that view.

Twice in the past 2 years Farm Journal has printed ballots asking farmers to choose among five possible courses of Government action, all the way from complete Government control of farming to getting the Government clear out. The vote each time was within 1 percent of the other time—apparently it was no fluke. Some 55 percent of the farmers who responded voted in favor of getting the Government clear out—which, incidentally, is farther than Farm Journal would go.

Well, then, who does oppose cutting back our farm plant, and putting some of our wheat and cotton land back into grass and timber—conserving it for the time when a steadily rising population may call it back into production? Three groups, chiefly: (1) a substantial group of farmers, many of

whom feel there are better answers to an undeniable problem, (2) politicians who come from these crop areas, and—surprise—(3) businessmen in the wheat and cotton belts who sell farm supplies, those who process what farmers raise, and those who market it. Naturally they hope to find some other answer than shrinking farm production—at least the part that affects them. Farmers aren't the only ones guarding the status quo—not by any means.

MYTH NO. 5—THESE FARM SUPPORTS ARE COSTING US TWICE—ONCE WHEN WE PAY TAXES AND AGAIN AT THE GROCERY STORE

In taxes, yes. At the store a trickle, maybe, but not enough to put in your eye. Since wheat is mentioned frequently, let's consider wheat. According to a 1959 report of the House Committee on Agriculture, labeled "Food Cost Trends," "the pound loaf of bread that sold at retail at 19.3 cents in 1958 contained wheat having a farm value of 2.4 cents." You could double the price of wheat and it should make practically no difference in the price of bread to the consumer.

While it has nothing to do with farm support prices, I think it's interesting to note what is happening to the food bill—and why.

First of all, food is one big item that is only moderately higher than it was 10 years ago—19 percent higher according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The House Agriculture Committee report puts it at 20 percent. "But," says the committee, "prices received by farmers for food have declined 8 percent in the same 10 years."

Then where did the widening spread go? To services, to packaging, to refinement of product. I'm not condemning such. If consumers want to pay for these services and this convenience, it's all right with me. But I do say they ought to realize what's putting food costs up, and not blame farmers for it. Farmers, more than any group in our population, have stood between consumers and an increased cost of living.

MYTHS NOS. 6 AND 7—FARMERS ARE BROKE—A LOT OF THESE FARMERS ARE DRIVING CADILLACS

You can find farmers who are driving around in Cadillacs, and also you can find farmers who are broke. You might, somewhere, find a farmer who is broke and also driving a Cadillac. But what is the truth about agriculture as a whole?

Farmers' net income from all sources in 1959 was lower than in 1958, although still the second highest of the past 6 years. It's too early to tell about 1960. Some prices will be higher, some lower. Hog prices, which fell sharply in 1959, are halfway back and should improve further this summer. Eggs, which hit the skids in 1959, will do better in 1960. Cattle prices, still pretty good, will drop on some, while milk should hold steady. Costs will doubtless keep on inching up. We'll have to wait and see about 1960 but it may well turn out better than expected.

There are three things to remember when you see the Government's most widely quoted "realized net farm income" figures.

The first is that they do not include some $8.5 billions that farmers take in annually from off their own farms.

The second is that the figure has covered everybody who calls himself a farmer, and generally speaking, that's anybody with three acres, or who sells $250 worth of farm stuff a year. If you consider just the 3 million commercial farmers—the real farmers of this country—the net income per family runs materially higher than for all "farm" families.

The third thing to remember is that we have fewer farm families dividing the agricultural income pie every year, which only means that the piece per family steadily is getting bigger.

I do not say that the net income situation is not serious for many. For some it is calamitous. Farmers as a class have been substantially underpaid and still are. They deserve much more income than they're getting. But the picture is not as serious for commercial farmers as a group as Government figures make it seem—nor as serious as some city reporters, venturing into the country for interviews with a half dozen farmers on a snowy day in March, make it sound.

While net income is of vital concern to farmers, their gross income is important to the businessmen who deal with them, and is part of the measure of agriculture's importance in the national economy. It's from gross income that farmers spend for their business needs (and on the farm even the family automobile is partly a business expense). Farmers' gross income has more than tripled in the past 20 years, and it's bound to go higher, not lower, as agriculture continues to grow. Agriculture continues to be a bigger industry to do business with, not a smaller one.

If you want the full story of how farmers are doing, you have to look beyond their current income figures to see how their net worth statement reads down at the bank. Farmers' total assets are now around $208 billion. Their debts come to $24 billion, leaving net assets of $184 billion—a ratio of assets to liabilities of 8.6 to 1. Nor are things suddenly getting worse—in 1956 the ratio was 8.9. If you follow the stock market, you would call that pretty good. Seven out of ten farmers have no mortgage.

That's good, and we should give thanks for it. But the mere fact that a farmer may be worth more when he sells out or dies doesn't reduce the pain of trying to make ends meet now.

It's like saying to the man in town: "Don't worry because your salary has been cut; your house is worth more."

This gain in assets has been largely in land values. High-priced land is fine if you happen to own land. If you're a tenant, as about one-fourth of all U.S. farmers are, it only increases the cost of buying your own place.

What about agriculture's prospects?

We have seen a population growth of 48 million in the past 20 years. The Census Bureau forecasts additional growth of 80 million in the next 20. The upward curve will keep getting steeper. Personally, I'm glad I won't be around by the year 2050 when we're likely to have a billion people in this country. It's hard enough to find a parking place now. But all these new millions will be food customers, three times a day, for tomorrow's farmers.

Nor are family farms about to be a thing of the past. They're about as big a proportion of the total as they were 10 years ago—and 30 years ago—and somehow most of them manage to steadily improve their levels of living.

MYTH NO. 8—FARMERS AREN'T A VERY IMPORTANT GROUP ANY MORE; THERE ARE TOO FEW OF THEM

It's true that fewer than one out of eight of our population now lives on a farm. But let's consider a few facts, too often overlooked, about the place of farm families in our scheme of things.

Obviously, farmers provide us all with our daily bread, as well as cotton and wool for clothing. Rather important, but what else?

Well, every 10 years they send to the cities some 1.9 million fine young people—completely reared, educated, ready to work. These children are trained in self-reliance, in responsibility, in habits of work, in our finest family traditions. Not only do they make excellent citizens, but a great many of them turn into leaders.

This is a tremendous social contribution. But have we considered how much of a financial contribution it is? Not to the individual taxpayer personally, but to the Nation. What would you say—$20,000 per child? I saw that statistic from Kansas State University the other day as being the cost of rearing a child from birth to age 18. At that figure the total would come to $3.8 billion per year—a considerable offset to the $6 billion agriculture budget mentioned earlier.

Well, how else are farmers important to us? Farming is our biggest single industry, measured by almost any standard, and a major customer of other industries. And it is getting bigger, not smaller. It's a real growth industry, if there ever was one. But do we realize how big it really is?

In 1959 farmers' gross income was $46.3 billion. That's a big hunk of money. It was 9.7 percent of our gross national product for that year.

With that money farmers buy 6½ million tons of steel a year—half as much as the automotive industry uses. They buy more petroleum than any other single industry—more than one-eighth of all the petroleum produced in the country. They use more electric power than Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, and Houston combined. It takes $6 billion worth of containers and packing materials to pack the food U.S. farmers raise in a year.

Then let's not forget the jobs that farming creates in food processing and distribution, in the manufacture and distribution of farm machinery and supplies. All these jobs are part of the agricultural complex, too.

So the "no longer important" myth holds no water at all. Citizens with a $46 billion income and $208 billion in assets, who buy from nearly everybody and sell to everybody, can't be dismissed as nobodies.

What, then, should we do about the "farm problem?"

That's for every citizen to figure out for himself. Most farmers are not special pleaders. But they do have a right to ask their fellow Americans to base their opinion on facts and on a fair picture of the situation. Most metropolitan citizens haven't had much chance to get such. It's not their fault—they've been given a lot of half-truths, some untruths, and little unbiased information. With this statement, I hope I may have been of some help to them in understanding "the farm situation."

4–H for Good Farming and the Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest an article which appeared recently in Corn Quarterly, a publication of Corn Industries Research Foundation. This article presents a very fine picture of 4–H Club work and some of its excellent results.

The tremendous impact that has resulted from the devoted efforts of 4–H Club members would be hard to measure. Many of us have personally learned much because of this effort, first by personal participation as a club member and later because of the leadership and inspiration that has been supplied by young

men and women who, after being 4–H Club members, have assumed roles of leadership in their communities.

The 30th national 4–H conference will be held here in Washington April 23–29. About 200 delegates will represent 4–H Club members in the conference and about 100 State 4–H leaders will hold concurrent work meetings in Washington. These 300 people represent the 2¼ million young people who belong to about 93,000 4–H groups in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Corn Quarterly:

4–H FOR GOOD FARMING AND THE GOOD LIFE

Back in 1955, a 16-year-old boy startled the world of agriculture by becoming the corn-growing champion of the United States. Far from the midwest Corn Belt, Lamar Ratliff, a 4–H Club member of Baldwin, Miss., grew 304.38 bushels of corn on a measured acre. (The U.S. average yield in 1955 was 40.6 bushels.)

This was no flash-in-the-pan achievement. In several previous years, young Ratliff had made sensational yields on his project acre. His 4–H training had taught him about soil, seed, irrigation and fertilization; more than that, it had inspired him to excel, instilled that competitive drive which is prerequisite to any victory. Some people hailed the boy as a corn-growing genius, and maybe they were right. But Ratliff's 4–H training had taught him to apply that genius to practical ends.

On countless other farms in every State, more than 2,253,000 4–H Club boys and girls are engaged today in projects of farming, home crafts and community betterment which are teaching them better agriculture, better citizenship, better living. These solid achievements of rural youth, under the 4–H banner, make few headlines. But they should be heeded by those inclined to judge the younger generation by the much-publicized crimes of juvenile hoodlums.

4–H BEGINNINGS

The 4–H idea began to take shape years before its formal organization into the club whose emblem is the green four-leaf clover with the words "Head, Heart, Hands, and Health."

As early as 1856, none other than Horace Greeley sponsored a corn-growing contest for boys in Cattaraugus County, N.Y. The record of one contestant, young Franklin Spaulding of East Otto, N.Y., and his exhibit of corn, are still preserved in a local library and would be credited today as an acceptable 4–H project.

During the latter decades of the 19th century, Cyrus McCormick's reaper was taking over the jobs of thousands of farm hands. Rural youth, out of work on the farm, headed for the cities in droves. Alarmed by this trend, leading agriculturists, educators and others saw a need to reawaken the interest of farm youth in farming, as a means of livelihood and a way of life.

As few rural teachers were versed in agricultural subjects, the State college experiment stations were called on to furnish information. Farming institutions joined with school superintendents in promoting contests in crop production and soil testing. One such program, conducted in 1900 in Macoupin County, Ill., provided seed corn to each of 500 boys who grew the corn and exhibited their best ears for prizes at harvest time.

Then as now a leading crop, corn was the subject of many of these youth projects. In January 1902, Albert B. Graham, school superintendent in Clark County, Ohio, organized 85 boys and girls in an agricultural club to grow corn, plant vegetable gardens and test soil.

Elsewhere, school superintendents followed suit. In the South, where diversified farming was being urged because of boll-weevil damage to cotton, Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, encouraged the formation of boys' corn clubs. The first of these was organized in 1907, in Holmes County, Miss.

By now the youth-in-agriculture movement was fanning out over the East, Midwest, South and Southwest. The early farm-youth clubs had enlisted mostly boys, but in 1910 Miss Marie Cromer, a rural-school teacher in Aiken County, S.C., started the first of the girls' canning clubs which today are nationwide.

Such were the beginnings of 4–H. The club's officials today state that the movement cannot be attributed to any single individual but grew out of the efforts of many. Albert B. Graham, however, who died in Columbus, Ohio, on January 14, 1960, was cited in his obituaries as the founder of 4–H. Mr. Graham's death, at the age of 90, came exactly 58 years after he had organized his corngrowing club, and throughout that time he had continued active in 4–H work.

PROJECTS AND PROFITS

Graham and other pioneers saw the extension of the 4–H emblem to every State and virtually every rural county, and to Canada, too. Despite the sharp decline in farm population and the trend toward fewer and larger farms, 4–H activity is reaching new peaks. Increases in urban and rural nonfarm enrollments have offset a slight decline in farm membership. In 1958 (latest year of 4–H statistics) the 2,253,999 enrollments represented an alltime high, and included a slight majority of girls.

The 4–H age bracket is 10 to 21; the average age is about 12½. The organized 4–H clubs, supervised generally by county agents and led by local adult volunteers, numbered 92,932 in 1958—also an alltime high.

"Project" is a key word in 4–H. A project may occupy a boy or girl for weeks or months, perhaps for years. A boy engaged in swine production, for instance, starts with one little of baby pigs. He feeds and cares for them, raises them to market weight, and then demonstrates his results. Local club members compete for county prizes: county champions go to the State fairs; State champions exhibit livestock or corn, or otherwise demonstrate their knowledge of a subject, at the National 4–H Congress held annually in November in Chicago.

Rewards of success are often more tangible than the recognition of ability. Though the 4–H philosophy properly deemphasizes cash earnings, it is by no means unusual for a 4–H member to make his project pay for a year or more at college.

Last November, at the 38th National 4–H Congress in Chicago, 154 scholarships, each worth $400, were awarded to 4–H members from virtually every State.

The scholarships, given by industrial firms and private individuals, cited achievements which, in many cases, produced substantial income. Walter L. Record, a 20-year-old Lyme, N.H., boy, was awarded 1 of the 12 scholarships given by the Ford Motor Co. for national achievement. Walter started 4–H club work in 1947, with assets of two animals. Today he has 40 Holsteins, 120 Hampshire sheep, and several hundred poultry. He has won 136 blue ribbons since 1949. Graduated from Hanover High School in 1956, he has taken charge of 100 additional Holsteins during his father's illness. In his 4–H project Walter has sold $3,850 worth of cattle and grossed over $14,000 in sales of dairy products and bull services.

A long way from New Hampshire lives 19-year-old Margaret Ann Burk, of Vale, Oreg., the only girl among six winners of the Du Pont scholarships in the 4–H beef program. Miss Burk started her 4–H work in the usual modest fashion, with a cow and calf, 10 years ago. Her herd of registered Herefords now numbers 20 and is valued at $4,700. Her animals have won for Miss Burk's trophy collection 5 cups or plaques, 12 blue ribbons, and 20 second- and third-place ribbons.

Some of the projects are less remunerative but nonetheless challenging. The electrical program, for example. To win a scholarship in this one—provided by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation—you have to be a veritable wizard with volts and amperes. Sixteen-year-old Robert James Sims, of Grand Bay, Ala., possessed enough wizardry to be one of 6 national 4–H winners last fall out of 133,000 members engaged in electrical projects. Robert's products, some of them fashioned of discarded and salvaged parts, include a chick brooder with heat lamp, a 20-foot exhaust fan, a hi-fi preamplifier, a portable sound system (used at several school and community events), and a six-station intercom which was set up between buildings and tents at the Greater Gulf States Fair at Mobile. We would guess that the name of Robert James Sims may be a prominent one before this electronics age is much older.

Among the national winners are quite a sprinkling of city-bred boys and girls, and some of them go in for projects that attract the dedicated scientists. Consider young Morgan Morrison, 17, of 112 South Aberdeen Street, Arlington, Va. Morrison's interest is entomology, and his urge to study "man's chief competitor, the insect," led him to form a 4–H Club in his city three years ago. His own project was to prepare a reference collection of beneficent and harmful bugs. He now has a classified album of 800 insects, of 690 species, representing 22 insect orders and including data on life cycles. Basic knowledge acquired in 4–H studies has been applied to practical ends. Morrison has controlled in his local area such pests as rose and maple aphids and Japanese beetles. He had conducted surveys for campaigns against the Mexican bean beetle and the European corn earworm; carried out 3 insecticide-research projects under joint grants from industrial firms; built 20 exhibits and given 120 demonstrations on entomology; lectured and appeared on TV programs. His insect collection has been used as a reference tool by his high school and as a classification aid by the County extension service.

For this formidable roster of achievements Morgan Morrison earned one of the Hercules Powder Co.'s six scholarship awards for entomology. No less than 47,000 club members competed in this program.

There is old saying: "Don't send a boy on a man's errand." The youthful 4–H'ers are disproving that dictum every day, on a million farms.

In the variety of its projects, 4–H offers dozens of opportunities and challenges to the imagination and ingenuity of the young.

The foregoing examples merely typify those of 154 national winners, boys and girls, kids from early teens to early twenties, in projects ranging from food preparation to forestry, and embracing corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, beef, dairy, poultry, swine, home improvement, clothing, home economics, health and nursing, safety, soil and water conservation, and many other activities that contribute to better agriculture and better living. Other than the 154 top winners, thousands have won county and State awards, and tens of thousands have performed to the credit of themselves, their local clubs, their leaders, families, and communities.

Some 4–H projects that never get close to a national award can nevertheless be of great local benefit. Recently in the Deep South

the success of a single 4–H member boosted the farm prosperity of an entire county. In Lee County, Miss., Negro 4–H'ers started milk-production projects in 1951. So successful was Roy Beene, of Guntown, in raising production per cow to profitable levels that his grandparents bought additional dairy cattle through the Farmers Home Administration, and now have 13 head. The news spread; today many of the 1,000 or more Negro farmers in Lee County are making money in dairying by feeding and breeding according to the doctrine of Roy Beene.

Investments in 4–H youths are considered gilt-edged by many banks, Rotary clubs, and others who finance the purchase of pigs and baby chicks for 4–H projects. Such loans are later repaid, with interest, by the sale of hogs and poultry resulting from the original stock.

Collectively, 4–H club members earn millions of dollars a year directly from projects. Indirect earnings are incalculably greater, for their 4–H work equips them for profitable farming or for jobs in other fields. Among today's distinguished 4–H alumni are Governors, Senators, editors, clergymen, and high officials in the Department of Agriculture and other branches of government.

THE 4-H SETUP

The organizational pyramid of 4-H rests on the foundation of the local clubs and rises through the county, State, and national levels.

The National 4-H Foundation, an organization of the Cooperative Extension Service, was created 10 years ago to serve as a supporting arm of Extension's youth program. The Foundation appraises educational projects and keeps them geared to the new technological age of agriculture. It enlists private support for 4-H work and provides certain physical facilities, specifically the National 4-H Club Center.

The Center, a large and handsome edifice in Chevy Chase, Md., near Washington, was officially opened by President Eisenhower on June 16, 1959. This new building houses the Foundation's offices, provides meeting rooms for 4-H conferences and those of other eligible groups, and accommodates up to 300 persons in its dormitory-style bedrooms. First major meeting in the Center was the 29th National 4-H Conference in 1959—an event which, in former years, saw its delegates living in tents pitched on the Mall before the Department of Agriculture Building.

The foundation and its associated activities, such as the International Farm Youth Exchange, are financed by private funds. Donors have included 4–H members and leaders, business firms, foundations, and private citizens. Member companies of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., are among the contributors.

In the half century since men like Albert B. Graham revived a lagging interest in agriculture by starting a few farm boys on corn-growing projects, the 4–H movement has inspired many millions of youngsters to probe the scientific truths of agriculture. The results cannot accurately be measured, but the fact is that America's agricultural production is the envy of the world. This global supremacy in farming assuredly owes much to the 4–H training of farm youths who have become the master farmers of the present day.

4–H has shown the way not only to better farming and the all-important production of food, but to qualities of homemaking and citizenship which are the true bases of this Nation's leadership.

A Manifesto for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD this thought-provoking article by Harold B. Wess, professor of business administration at American University:

[From Human Events, Mar. 10, 1960]

A MANIFESTO FOR AMERICA—WHAT IS NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN OUR COUNTRY

(By Harold B. Wess, professor of business administration, American University)

In his recent visit to this country, Khrushchev said that capitalism followed feudalism and that communism follows capitalism. When asked what will follow communism, he answered in typical Communist double-talk that since they had not fully tasted the cake of communism, why talk about it now? Someone should have pointed out to Khrushchev that in Russia communism was preceded by semifeudalism and not by a capitalistic society, and that in China, communism was imposed on a feudalistic state. In all other countries, communism was imposed by military force or by infiltration and subversion by Russia and China.

Communists are trained in the skill of dialectical materialism, the theory that social and economic changes are the result of materialistic forces only. If we fail to challenge this untruth, it will inevitably lead us to the conclusion that only communism, the so-called classless society, is the answer to all human problems. Karl Marx predicted that ultimately the state as a force will wither away and the utopian classless society evolve. After more than 40 years there seems to be little indication that the state in Soviet Russia is showing any signs of withering.

Our reaction to Khrushchev's propaganda, as reflected in the press, radio and television, indicates a strong fear that Soviet Russia will overtake us militarily and economically and ultimately become the most powerful nation in the world. Even a former ambassador to Russia finds himself in the dilemma of suggesting, by implication, that there is little hope for this country unless we change the very character of our society. After enumerating areas of weakness in our society, such as overemphasis on personal comfort and amusement, too much privately sold gadgetry, an educational system where quality is sacrificed to quantity, he had this to say: "* * * if you ask me whether such a country has, over the long run, good chances of competing with a purposeful, serious and disciplined society such as that of the Soviet Union, I must say that the answer is 'no'."

Is the implication of statements such as this one which have been made by others as well, and by some in very high places, that we ought to impose a disciplined society on the United States? Do these people mean to say that within the framework of the free enterprise system we cannot meet the Soviet challenge? When people speak of our lack of a "national purpose," what do they really mean? They never spell it out.

Underlying these pessimistic and alarmist statements is a tacit assumption that our social system, which has enabled us to become the greatest Nation in the world through the fostering of plural centers of initiative with decisionmaking and values concentrated not only in our Government, but in the home, in professional associations, business corporations, labor unions, church groups, universities and other forms of associations in a free society, can no longer work. Do they really wish to imply that the only way to meet the Communists' challenge is to become more like them? I submit that we do have a national purpose but that we have failed to spell it out and to be articulate about it.

In our present uncertainty and panic let us remember what our national purpose must not be—it must not be the easy road blueprinted by some dictatorship or powerful centralized Government. There were many in this country during the Nazi and Fascist era who believed that these doctrines were "the wave of the future." There are many today in our midst who likewise believe that communism is "the wave of the future." We must not compromise with our belief in the sanctity of the individual. We must not deteriorate the integrity of the purchasing power of the dollar. We must not forget that there are many millions of people with fixed incomes who see their purchasing power dwindle year after year to a point where they cannot make ends meet. Among these it is estimated that in the 1960's there will be about 20 million people over 65 years of age. Above all we must not compromise with the underpinning of the Judeo-Christian ethic of our society.

Let us not listen to the false prophets who would lull us into a sense of well being generated by inflation where people have more and more dollars that are worth less and less. This is a sure road to ruin.

We must also guard against anything that will slow up our ever-increasing productivity per worker. Increased productivity per worker is basically the result of the capitalist system of reinvesting a substantial part of its earnings in new and better tools of production. But this is being eroded by ever-growing featherbedding and restrictive practices. If this should continue unabated, our productivity may slow down to a point where the Russians can overtake us, not because they are stronger than we, but because we are not making maximum use of our productive potential.

An example is the railroads. There was a time, years ago, when a run of 100 miles of freight took 8 hours and a run of 150 miles of passenger service took 7½ hours. Today the run from New York to Chicago of 900 miles takes 16 hours, but the railroads are required to pay 9 basic days for the total run. The Chicago-Denver run requires eight different engine crews, each averaging a run of about 2 hours. Similar restrictive practices exist in the building industry, and in many other areas of our economy. One thing is certain, if we do not eliminate these restrictive practices our economic growth must inevitably slow down and our standard of living cannot continue to expand.

These are some of our national purposes and if pursued faithfully and vigorously, we need have no fear for our future either from communism or any other form of dictatorship. Our difficulties today arise from the fact that we are moving away from the fundamental principles that have been the underlying basis for the dynamic growth of our country.

We have failed to imbue our young people with the knowledge and understanding that what has made our Nation great has been not only our genius for production but

also our jealous concern for the rights of the individual. If we had to name just one thing which distinguishes our society from that of the Communists, I would place the rights of the individual first.

After spending a lifetime as a business executive and having been in recent years a professor, I am disturbed by the lack of understanding on the part of young people of what makes our social system what it is. During a seminar in business management, for example, I made the statement that it is the duty of every businessman to participate in the civic, cultural, and philanthropic life of his community. One of the students in unmistakable tones of animosity said, "What makes you think that businessmen are better qualified than others?" It was obvious that he was harboring a prejudice toward businessmen. This is not the first time I have encountered this type of reaction but it is surprising that it should come from students preparing for business careers. It may come as a shock to many that students in our high schools, colleges, and even those in graduate schools are not taught the basic principles of our economy nor what makes for a free enterprise system.

Public debates in the press and other fields of communication seldom come to grips with these basic principles so it is not surprising that we panic every time there is a temporary downturn. Some who have been predicting the doom of our capitalist society have witnessed instead, not only survival, but tremendous growth and expansion. They fail to understand the uniqueness of our system which has forces within it to transform and adjust to changing conditions without changing its basic character.

In a seminar in human relations in business I find a lack of sensitivity to spiritual values. During a discussion of a problem involving human values I reminded my students of the teachings in the Sermon on the Mount. While they agreed these were noble lessons in human conduct, they did not believe that in actual practice they could be applied. In relating this to a friend of mine, he asked how I could reconcile my belief that this country has been built on the rock of the Judaeo-Christian ethic and my concern for the deterioration of these spiritual values. My answer was that we are still living on the accumulated spiritual forces built into our society by our Founding Fathers and the great leaders who followed them.

Our weakness is that we are looking for easy and quick answers to problems. We will grab at short range reforms in spite of the fact that they may violate long range principles. A good example is our noble experiment of prohibition. Some well-meaning people, disturbed by the increasing use of alcohol, were influential in establishing prohibition in this country. Theirs seemed a simple solution—pass a law that will prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcohol and people would have to stop drinking. But they overlooked another law, that of cause and effect, and failed to anticipate the chain reaction which followed. Prohibition brought in its wake gangsterism and corrupt politicians which continue to plague us even today.

Let us take the recent steel strike for instance. Nobody will deny that a prolonged steel strike adversely affects our economy. The solution for some well meaning people would be a law to empower the Government to deal with such a situation. If this should mean that the Government will have the power to set wages and prices of steel, it also follows that it may determine the profit of steel companies. Should profit become so fenced in, the public will not be attracted to invest in steel companies. This would lead to insufficient capital with which to expand plants and improve machinery. Here we have what appears to be a simple solution but it could start a chain reaction which might conceivably lead to the socialization of the steel industry. Granted that strikes of the magnitude of steel are bad for our economy, we must be certain that the cure will not be worse than the evil itself.

A good many reforms being urged upon us today must ultimately lead us to socialism. We have gotten into the habit of using palliatives and hypodermics that were applied to alleviate certain economic problems 25 years ago which no longer apply to present economic conditions.

As a civilized and spiritual Nation we know that wrong means never justify ends, no matter how noble. In fact, we know that wrong means ultimately become ends in themselves. The noble experiment of Karl Marx of a stateless society, with each individual voluntarily contributing his labor and everyone receiving according to his needs, was established through means of dictatorship and murder. The means used have now become ends in themselves. Instead of a classless society there is a new and most powerful ruling class in Communist Russia; instead of a stateless society they have the most powerful state in the world and instead of freedom, they have virtual slavery. We must be ever vigilant that we do not adopt improper means which would curtail the rights and sanctity of the individual, or which would place too much power in any segment of our society.

We must not allow our horizons for the future to be beclouded by ignorance and the mistakes of the past. We must not allow precedents to limit our growth. Time was when man thought that only wooden ships would stay afloat and, so long as he believed this, he was bound by that precedent. As soon as he discovered the principle of flotation, he was freed from this precedent and began to build iron ships. So it is true for an individual, a business or a nation. So long as we allow ourselves to be bound by precedent and lose sight of basic principles, we stunt our growth.

There are many examples of how precedents are hemming us in right now. Take our farm program which was inaugurated years ago at a time when the farmer needed help desperately. This emergency action by the Government to help the farmer has become a precedent which we are unwilling to replace with the principle of the free marketplace. We now hand out large sums of the taxpayers' money to big farming enterprises that should be able to establish a price-cost relationship and a healthy marketing program as other enterprises in our economy do. Instead, we depart from the basic principle of a free market economy, thus artificially keeping prices up, trying to keep production down without noticeable success, and of course, contributing an important share to inflation.

We have similar precedents, such as subsidies and tax laws introduced for reasons which no longer apply and which in effect actually inhibit the growth of our economy by distorting economic incentives. Let us consider our foreign aid program which was started after World War II when most countries were in desperate need of help. We continue this aid as a precedent, although the need has been considerably reduced. Today, there are many nations economically in a position to contribute their share to underdeveloped countries, but not doing so.

Another example of a precedent we seem unable to eliminate is the matter of fixing railroad rates. When the Interstate Commerce Commission first came into being it was undoubtedly necessary to fix railroad rates, but today competition among other methods of transportation makes such price fixing outdated and unnecessary.

These are but a few examples of how we have been functioning within the framework of precedent instead of fundamental principles. A nation, a business, or an individual can only continue to grow by discovering and understanding the principles underlying its progress and growth and avoiding the pitfalls that bind it to precedent. Were this not true, we should still be primitive savages.

Our way of life, our capitalist society, is still in the process of growth and we must stop looking back at what preceded it and begin to think of the road ahead. Our manifesto for America therefore consists of adhering to the following:

1. The sanctity of the individual must not be violated even though it may appear that communism has made great strides by doing just that.

2. We must continue to increase productivity per worker as a basis for a higher standard of living.

3. We must protect the integrity of the purchasing power of the dollar.

4. We must avoid the danger of short-range reforms as immediate palliatives if they violate our basic principles of long-range objectives.

5. We must not use wrong means to achieve desired ends no matter how desirable they may seem to be.

6. Our best and surest way of meeting the Communist challenge is to keep alive the image of the destiny bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers.

Box Score in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 14, 1960:

BOX SCORE IN SPACE

Coming so soon after Pioneer V's flight into orbit around the sun, and Tiros I's bow as the world's first picture-taking weatherman with a globe-encircling eye, the successful launching of Transit I–B serves as striking additional evidence of the steady progress our country is making in its effort to be second to none in space.

The Navy, using Air Force rocketry, is responsible for having put this latest of our earth satellites into orbit. Although described as "only" a test vehicle, Transit I–B represents a vital step in the development of a great new navigational system of far-reaching military significance—not merely in terms of guiding warships at sea, but also in terms of insuring the accuracy of nuclear ballistic missiles like the Polaris.

Indeed, according to spokesmen for the Navy, this new traveler in space confirms predictions that the United States—by 1962, if not sooner—will have in operation a full-scale transit system made up of four signaling satellites (each in a different orbit) covering every square mile of earth. Clearly, as soon as such a system is functioning, missile-bearing vessels, particularly the Polaris submarine, will be endowed with a deadly new degree of effectiveness, and all

other ships—including nonmilitary passenger liners—will have spatial navigational assistance enabling them, as never before, to determine their exact positions almost instantaneously.

So Transit I–B, through basically a military project, holds out a good promise of important peaceful applications. More than that, it helps to remind the world at large that our country is doing rather well in competing with the Soviet Union in space. The box score may be set forth as follows, dating it from October 4, 1957, when the Russians startled all of us by putting into orbit sputnik I, history's first manmade earth satellite:

(1) Seventeen earth satellites launched successfully thus far by the United States, with eight continuing in orbit. (2) Three launched successfully by the U.S.S.R., with none now in orbit. (3) Four deep-space probes successfully launched by us, with two—Pioneers IV and V—hurtling perpetually around the sun. (4) Three deep-space probes including Lunik II's hard landing on the moon, launched successfully by the U.S.S.R. And (5) all Soviet instruments now absolutely silent as important information is still being transmitted by five of ours—Vanguard I, Explorer VII, Pioneer V, Tiros I, and now Transit I–B.

This is a comparison that speaks pretty much for itself. Although the Russians still excel us in the rocket power needed to put heavy payloads into space (an advantage they are likely to lose in the next year or so), our American program continues to produce scientific data more efficiently and in greater volume than theirs. We have no reason to be complacent, of course; but neither have we any reason to belittle ourselves.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week it was my privilege to testify before Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging in support of legislation to provide medical insurance to our older citizens as proposed in the Forand bill and in my bill, S. 1151.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to express my thanks to the chairman and subcommittee not only for the opportunity of appearing at this hearing, but for the splendid work that the chairman and the subcommittee have already undertaken and accomplished in the field of the problems relating to the care of our senior citizens. I believe that the work of this subcommittee has done a great deal to guide the thinking of the Congress in all of these matters of legislation concerning the care of our senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to see Representative FORAND here this morning and I am grieved to read the announcement of recent date that he would not seek reelection. I might say that the most popular man that I find in America today amongst people who are thoughtful and are concerned about their fellow human beings is Congressman FORAND and it is a justly deserved tribute to you, Congressman. You have pioneered in this area and shown the way, and I believe those of us in Congress who have followed in your wake, so to speak, owe you a great debt of gratitude and appreciation.

There is only one other man that I can think of that has consistently joined in this same great effort and that is our own colleague here in the Senate, Senator MURRAY who, for years, has been advocating the extension and improvement of our social security system in the health field. Of course, the father of the Congressman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], whom I had the privilege of knowing when I first came to the Senate, was another one of those pioneers. Both he and Senator MURRAY took a great deal of abuse in earlier days for their efforts to improve medical care but I noticed it did not seem to affect them particularly. People still placed their faith and trust in them.

When I first came to the Senate I joined in Senator MURRAY's amendment to the Social Security Act which would have provided for hospitalization under social security for those who were to be the recipients of old age and survivors insurance.

Since that time social security has been greatly expanded in its coverage. I believe I am correct in saying that about 8 out of 10 wage earners are covered under social security and I think that in time it will be pretty much universal. It well ought to be.

We also now have arrangements for the self-employed to be covered as the Forand bill indicates.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement that I have prepared and I am going to ask—with your permission and consent—to have that statement made part of the record as if I had delivered it in person.

Senator MCNAMARA. It will be made part of the record at this point without objection.

Senator HUMPHREY. Along with that, if the chairman will permit a statement of a five-minute radiocast to my own constituents back in Minnesota, along with a brief analysis of provisions relating to the Social Security Act in which I have particular interest.

Senator MCNAMARA. That, too, will be made part of the record in the same manner at this point. If you will see that the reporter is supplied with a copy it will be placed into the record.

(The statements follow:)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of legislation to help in meeting the urgent health needs of our older citizens. This subcommittee is to be congratulated for directing attention to this crucial problem. Your hearings and reports make a wonderful contribution to public understanding of the needs of our older citizens.

We are now in the 25th anniversary year of social security, a program which has paid tremendous dividends in human welfare and human dignity for American citizens by making many welfare benefits a matter of earned rights rather than a matter of charity.

The conscience of our affluent society must now face up to the moral challenge presented by the health care needs of our senior citizens. This is a human problem. It involves our fathers and mothers, our grandparents and ultimately, of course, ourselves and our children. This is a human problem we cannot—and should not—sweep under the rug. We have the resources and the time-tested method of social insurance to meet this challange successfully.

Last year—as in the 85th Congress—I introduced legislation to help meet this problem. My bill, S. 1151, would provide insurance against the costs of hospital and nursing home care through the Social Security mechanism. Similar in intent and purpose to the legislation of Congressman FORAND—it would add these benefits to those already provided through old age and survivors insurance:

1. Up to 60 days of hospital care, with subsequent nursing home care, if necessary, up to a combined total of 120 days in any year.

2. All hospital services, drugs, appliances and other care ordinarily furnished to patients in semi-private accommodations.

3. Upon certification by a physician, freedom to choose any hospital that can admit them, and which has previously contracted with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish such services—except tuberculosis and mental hospitals.

4. Similar freedom to choose nursing home service, including skilled nursing care, related medical and personal services and accompanied bed and board provided by a licensed nursing home operated in connection with a hospital or in which a medical doctor directs the care.

This program of hospital and nursing home insurance can be fully financed by an increase in the present social security tax of one-fourth of 1 percent for employers and workers and by an increase of three-eights of 1 percent for self-employed people.

In this way, with the wonderful tool of social insurance, we can spread the heavy health care costs of old age over an entire lifetime of earnings instead of demanding that our senior citizens use up their meager savings just at the time when their income is barely enough for the simple necessities like food and shelter.

Just think for a moment about the heartrending problems of the average retired couple trying to struggle along on $1,440 a year—and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that it costs at least $2,300 a year for a couple to live by themselves in a modest fashion—without luxuries.

And the average individual with social security benefits receives only $72 a month. That is scarcely luxurious living. Let us consider the desperate situation facing 1,300,000 aging widows who must try to exist—I can hardly call it living—on average insurance benefits of $56 a month.

The budget-shattering impact of unexpected hospital costs creates terrible anxieties and hardships for these people. Three out of every five men and women past 65 have no protection against hospitalization costs. A survey published last year by the Health Information Foundation showed that half of the people over 65 without health insurance could not afford it or were denied coverage.

Insurance companies have taken steps to cover a larger proportion of our older citizens in their private health care plans. These efforts are indeed praiseworthy, but it is clear that the greater health care needs and the lower income of aged people do not make them good insurable risks for private carriers. Either the private insurance company must raise its premium to a prohibitive level for low-income pensioners, or the company must impose such restrictions on benefits that the value of the coverage and protection is too small in comparison to the need.

A working man in his earning years usually can take advantage of group hospitalization, but when he retires, his income goes down drastically, his right to group coverage in hospital insurance plans is often lost, and the cost of private health insurance is often completely out of reach.

Thus, our older people past 65, who use more than twice as much hospital care as the rest of our fellow Americans, find that increased health needs and lower income create terrible financial worries and anxieties when hospital or nursing home care is necessary.

As my friend, Prof. Wilbur Cohen, told this subcommittee last year:

"These are the people who, as they need hospital care, even though they are receiving social security, must ultimately apply for public assistance to supplement their social security to pay for this hospital care; or not receive hospital care; or borrow money; or receive it from relatives or friends; or get free care in some way from the communities."

There are many doctors who provide free services. There are many free clinics and free hospital rooms for indigent patients. Through public assistance programs we spend hundreds of millions of dollars for medical care through our city, county, State, and Federal governments. And, of course, children and grandchildren and other relatives bear many costs of medical and hospital bills during emergencies.

But who will ever know how many aged citizens have suffered, or even died, because they were unwilling to ask for charity, because they waited too long before they asked for help?

And how can we measure the heartache that accompanies the reluctant decision to ask a son or a daughter to exhaust savings or go into debt to pay for the patient's hospitalization or nursing home care?

We cannot be heartless or insensitive to the health care needs of our 16 million fellow citizens who have passed their 65th birthday. I would like to point out that lengthening lifespans in the next few years will mean that many adult Americans will find they have parents and grandparents trying to exist on retirement pensions.

We must have a Government with a heart. A Government which will expand its humane, dignified system of social insurance where benefits are available as a matter of right—a right that results from a lifetime of work and a lifetime of contributions. And I further believe that we must make up for past neglect by blanketing in those Americans who have already qualified for social security benefits.

America's older people deserve protection against rising hospitalization costs this year. I hope this Congress will not allow White House opposition to block action on this urgently needed and thoroughly justified legislation. Certainly the Eisenhower administration has offered no reasonable or workable alternative.

For 8 years the President and Vice President and their experts at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have had plenty of opportunity to come up with some plan to help elderly Americans in time of serious illness.

But now this Republican administration is suggesting that action be postponed for another study—in spite of the backlog of urgent needs, in spite of overwhelming demand for action. We have had plenty of studies. We have files full of evidence on the need to protect our older people against unexpected health costs. Any Member of Congress who reads his mail knows just how concerned, how worried and anxious our older people are about the costs of serious illness.

I say Congress must act now, because, if we wait for the Republican go-slow, not-now, veto administration to take action on a program to help finance health care, we will wait forever.

I do not doubt that a voluntary program involving local government as well as State and Federal support can be invented for an election year. But I believe we should let commonsense and reason guide us—instead of creating an administrative monstrosity.

We already have a successfully operating national program of social insurance to help take care of Americans in their retirement years. Social security has helped to make our country great and strong. Social security has enhanced human dignity and welfare—and it has done so with an administrative cost of less than 2 percent. Let us improve and expand this wonderful program. Let us help protect the health of our senior citizens economically and effectively. Let us show them government with a heart.

Protection against hospital costs through social security has top priority but it is only one of the steps we must take to give security and dignity to our senior citizens in their retirement years. I have introduced other legislation to help older Americans, but I do know that you are chiefly concerned at this time only with the problem of health care for the aged.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that you include in your record of hearings the text of my radio speech of March 7 and my newsletter of March 11 about my 6-point program for senior citizens. I believe Congress should give most urgent attention to legislation carrying out this program.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to discuss the health needs of our senior citizens with you. Thank you very much.

A PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Text of recording by Senator HUMPHREY week beginning Mar. 7, 1960)

We often hear the word "crisis" thrown about these days. It is a word which is used all too often to describe problems of all types.

Today I want to talk with you about a problem which is truly critical. It is a problem which can not wait for more talk and more study. It is the crisis faced by our Nation's senior citizens.

Let me first give you an idea of the immensity and growth of this crisis. In the year 1900, there were only 3 million Americans over the age of 65. Today there are nearly 16 million. In 10 years there will be more than 20 million.

But these are just figures. They do not tell the pathetic story of the needs of our senior citizens in terms which all of us can understand.

They do not tell the story of the elderly widow whose income is so low her day begins and ends with a sense of hunger.

They do not tell the story of the elderly man who needs but can not afford hospital or nursing home care for illness or disease.

They do not tell the story of the elderly couple who live each day in fear of losing the roof over their heads.

We hear noble talk about "the golden years." But more and more people are finding that these are years of despair and anxiety. This is a disgrace for a nation with our wealth and luxury.

I am not just talking about a few isolated cases. Millions of Americans—through no fault of their own—are existing without adequate incomes, health care or housing, and without a recognized role in the community.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that it costs at least $2,300 a year for a couple to live by themselves in modest fashion.

But the average retired couple on social security receives only about $1,440 a year.

And 60 percent of the individuals retired on social security have less than $1,000 a year in money income.

Even more desperate is the crisis facing the 1,300,000 aging widows who now receive an annual social security benefit of $56 a month.

I ask you, is this what our mothers and fathers deserve? Do these fine citizens deserve a shabby rented room and a diet of bread and soup in their final years?

There are selfish and narrow-thinking persons who say the problem is not theirs. They say "It's every individual for himself." They say every individual has total responsibility to plan for retirement.

I agree that we should all plan on an individual basis to provide for our future needs. But the best plans and preparations of all men can be crushed by forces beyond their control. Disease, economic fluctuations and just plain bad luck can make a mockery of even the wisest investments and preparations.

What we need is a new dedication to end the crisis facing our senior citizens. What we need is a government with a heart and understanding. And what we need right now is action on a program to allow our senior citizens to live with dignity, security and a sense of usefulness.

Let me specify six steps which are vital to such a program:

1. Increase social security benefits to keep pace with living costs.

2. Increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount which individuals may earn without losing social security benefits.

3. Extend the social security system to cover costs of hospital and nursing home care for senior citizens.

4. Establish minimum Federal standards which States must meet for old-age assistance programs.

5. Provide effective Federal assistance for specialized housing programs for the aged.

6. Allow a tax credit incentive to encourage hiring of older workers.

I have sponsored legislation for these purposes in the Senate and will continue to fight hard for favorable action. This is no sudden effort on my part. I have never forgotten—and I will never forget—the crisis facing our senior citizens. We must let them know they are not alone.

NEWSLETTER

(From the desk of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, special to editors—week ending March 11, 1960)

A program for senior citizens. We hear noble talk about the "golden years" for our older citizens settling down into retirement. But too often these years bring despair and anxiety.

Millions of Americans, through no fault of their own, are barely existing, without adequate incomes, without access to adequate health care, without decent housing, and without the dignity and respect to which they are entitled. An action program to help our 16 million senior citizens is needed now.

Desperate needs: A married couple living by themselves needs at least $2,300 a year for a modest, minimum standard of living—but the average couple retired on social security gets only $1,440 a year. And three out of five people on social security pensions get less than $1,000 a year in cash income. Do these citizens deserve a shabby rented room and a diet of bread and soup? Should they be forced into overcrowded charity wards in hospitals and nursing homes when the savings of a lifetime are wiped out by unexpected sickness or hospitalization? I say this is disgraceful and unjustified in our rich and productive country.

Dividends of medical research: Wonderful advances in medical science promise eventual conquest of crippling and killing diseases such as arthritis and heart ailments. A man of 65 today can expect to live another 13 years and a woman will probably live another 15½ years. If medical research continues successfully, we may have 30 million or 40 million people over 65 instead of the expected 20 million. My Senate Subcommittee on International Health is helping to advance research on the problems and the process of aging. But, in addition to lengthening life spans, we can put more "life" in the retirement years. We can give our older Americans the security and the dignity they need and deserve.

Action program for 1960: Since I first came to the Senate, I have worked for legislation

to help America's older people. Here is my action program:

1. Health benefits. My health benefits proposal will give protection against the heavy costs of hospitalization and nursing home care through social security.

2. Increased social security benefits to keep pace with rising living costs. A 30 percent increase in the minimum payment is needed.

3. Raise earnings limits from $1,200 to $1,800 so benefits won't be lost by many older workers.

4. Minimum Federal standards for State old-age assistance programs. Protect the dignity and self-respect of relief recipients. Abolish public "shame" lists.

5. Effective Federal assistance for special housing for the elderly.

6. Tax credit to encourage hiring of older workers.

Government with a heart: This is the 25th anniversary of social security—the first major attack on poverty, helplessness and shattered family life. In these 25 years, we have created "government with a heart"—a government properly concerned with the welfare of all citizens, not as an act of charity, but as a moral and social obligation—bringing new security, new dignity and new independence to millions of American families.

I am sure you know that a number of us have been meeting with rather substantial numbers of people in recent weeks and I have been asked many times by reporters, by interested citizens, by commentators—what are the American people concerned about? I think the chairman of this subcommittee, along with his associate here from the House of Representatives, Congressman FORAND, would be interested to know that in a series of television programs that I conducted called "Ask Senator HUMPHREY" just a question and answer program with people just calling in with no advance preparation, just picking up the phone and calling the television station—that we had more questions on the problems of medical care and hospital care for the aged than all the other questions put together.

Now, these were just people calling in, not any organized group.

Also, I found out in analyses relating to those questions that a goodly number of them came from younger people, not the elderly who were already eligible for social security benefits, who were concerned, first of all, about their own parents and what would happen to them under prolonged sickness, and secondly, they were concerned about their own future, what kind of care would they get?

Mr. Chairman, the costs of local and county and State governments in the field of health care for our elderly has become one of the largest items of cost, next to education. The property tax burden upon citizens and localities is a very heavy one. In fact, I would say that many communities today have property taxes at such high rates that they act as a deterrent to further economic expansion in the community.

One of the reasons for the high property tax is medical and hospital care of the needy, the indigent and the elderly. In my own State of Minnesota, we give pretty good care to our elderly people. We feel, through our University of Minnesota Hospital, University Medical School, through our welfare departments, we have done a good job, but, Mr. Chairman, this has become a very, very heavy burden upon the property owner. That is the only way we have raising taxes for them with the exception of an income tax which has its limitations and has its dedicated funds.

Through the wonders of medical science and technology, we have been able to extend the lifespan of our people, we have come to the point where we have a substantially larger group of people 65 and over to be cared for.

Now, their sickness increases with age and their capacity to pay decreases with age. The incidence of the need of hospitalization goes up with age and the ability to pay for it goes down.

One does not have to be a wizard to figure out what ought to be done. What needs to be done in a country such as ours is to provide some means of caring for these people. This is just elementary social justice.

Now, the argument apparently is not over whether or not they should be cared for at the moment even though I think that behind some of the pettifogging that goes on, there is a little argument about that. But, let us assume for a minute that everybody wants to provide hospitalization, nursing home and medical care for the elderly. Then the argument comes down to the means of doing it.

If we are going to spend the next year, 2 years, 3 years, arguing over means, we are doing it at a great expense because in the meantime a large number of people are being inadequately cared for.

We have a true, tried, and tested method for providing adequate care. That method is under the social security system.

The Forand bill provides freedom of choice for hospitalization, freedom of choice for the surgical service. I have introduced a bill, S. 1151, which does not include the surgical services but includes all hospital care, all nursing care, including the drugs and other items that are required under nursing home and hospital care.

I put that bill in because I thought it might be well to have a bill that provided only hospital and nursing home care as a way of possibly some compromise on the broader Forand bill. But I want the fact quite clear—I support the principles and the details of the Forand bill.

My proposal should relieve some of the attack from the American Medical Association, which is so concerned about the possibility of interference with the freedom of choice of doctors. But I think we ought to put our foot down on this strawman right now. There is no denial of freedom of choice under the Forand bill. The choice is there but it is a real choice. It is a choice you can make and know that it will be paid for. There is no use of having a choice of automobiles, you know, if you cannot buy one, no use of having a choice of homes if you cannot even afford to have a tent. To talk about freedom of choice for doctors and hospitals for the elderly when they have no way of paying for it except to swallow their pride and go on relief and the public welfare rolls, seems to me to be denying the real meaning of freedom of choice.

The Administrative says it is going to come up with some kind of alternative proposal. What we want is a program that will help the patient, that will help the needy.

I recognize that there is a variety of services in this country such as group health and group hospitalization, and various private insurance plans, but let the record be clear: If we could relieve the private medical care programs, the private and group hospitalization and medical care programs of the extra cost that comes with the care of the elderly, premium payments on other insurance policies for the rest of the American people could be substantially reduced.

The way to relieve those costs and to put them in proper relationship with the income is to take the group that are eligible for old age and survivors insurance benefits and include them under social security. Those who do not want to do that are really asking that others pick up a disproportionate share of the bill for a group of people that could have better medical care, better hospital care, better nursing home care, under some provisions under social security. And the cost under social security, according to the studies made in the House and according to private research foundations, can be financed with a quarter of 1 percent increase in the tax on both employer and employee and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed.

This is a modest amount for the care that can be extended.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to extend to you my thanks for doing a service for first of all, the elderly; secondly, those who will be under private health insurance plans; and thirdly for the insurance companies, themselves, which will be able to give better insurance coverage for the vast number of people under 65, if they can be relieved of the cost and the burden of those above 65.

I thank you very much.

Senator MCNAMARA. Thank you, Senator HUMPHREY. We appreciate very deeply your taking time to be here this morning and to speak so eloquently and well on behalf of the elderly citizens.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator, for the record, we had a tremendous audience that gathered in Detroit recently on this very issue. All of us in public life know a good audience when we see one. I believe there were about 18,000.

Senator MCNAMARA. That is about what it was said to be.

Senator HUMPHREY. Approximately 18,000 people who gathered in the Coliseum in Detroit, elderly citizens, on a Sunday to urge upon the Members of Congress passage of the Forand bill. I think that every Member of Congress who would come in here and testify would have to admit that his mail on the so-called Forand bill is the biggest bulk of mail that he has today and the letters are not these "jimmied up" ones. These are letters that come in from people who write them in their own way, appealing to the Congress of the United States to do something in this crucial area.

We had better get busy and do something or some of these Members will not be back here. If some of my friends in Congress want a little political health insurance, may I suggest that they get busy and do something for the elderly people?

Senator MCNAMARA. Thank you, Senator. We appreciate your suggestions here this morning and intend to move forward this morning to accomplish the ends you have suggested.

Are there any questions?

Senator BRUNSDALE. I just want to ask the Senator if, under his plan, he wants to limit the contribution through the Social Security payment to one-fourth of 1 percent? If that is not enough, would he not agree that it should be raised so that these people can be adequately cared for?

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely would, Senator.

Senator BRUNSDALE. That is all. Thank you.

Senator MCNAMARA. All the records we have from them indicate this, and you do agree, I take it, Senator, that there is evidence that a quarter of 1 percent from the employer and employee, plus three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, would do the job?

Senator HUMPHREY. I not only think it would do, I think it would more than do the job. This is particularly true if you get the 4 million unemployed in this country employed, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCNAMARA. And we can look forward to some increase in our gross national product which we expect would take care of some of this unemployment and, therefore, the prospects would be very good.

Senator HUMPHREY. Absolutely. With this economy moving forward at any rate that is worthy of being called America, and with the picking-up of the unemployed and seeing they are reemployed, which is the least the country ought to do, there would be no problem with one-fourth of 1 percent ac-

cording to the actuaries who have studied this.

I am not an expert, but I do know that studies have been made by private groups as well as Congress and that percentage of tax seems to be adequate. But I want to be very frank about it, if it requires, for example, one-eighth of 1 percent more or whatever the figure would be, the Senator from Minnesota does not hesitate to say he would vote for it. I happen to think the American people can afford to have education for their youngsters and they can have decent hospital and medical care for their oldsters. If we cannot, we ought to close up shop, because this country spends a good deal of time wallowing around in its commercial recreation which adds little or nothing to its character.

I think the richest country in the world ought to be able to protect the elderly.

I was over in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark. They do not have nearly as high a standard of living as we do, but there is not an elderly person there that is not given the best medical care that modern science can provide.

If the Swedes, Norwegians, Finns and Danes can afford it, this cosmopolitan society of ours can afford it. I would like to think we could aspire to those heights.

Senator MCNAMARA. Many people oppose the social security approach to solving this problem and have recommended that the States participate in payments to the fund. What is your reaction to that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think it would be a good idea to go out and find out how the States are going to finance it. You know, Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of ways to duck an issue, and they have been perfecting some new ones of late. One way that people try to duck the real responsibility for meeting head on an issue is to say "Well, we will let the localities do it," or "we will let the State do it."

And when you go to those same States, you discover that they are often times incapable of financing their education program, their highway program, their basic State services. To load onto them additional responsibilities with their tax base base being sorely limited, is, I think, ducking or avoiding the issue. The real truth is the one area of government that has the capacity to raise the money to pay for this cost is the Federal Government and that is exactly why those who do not want to pay for it, are saying, "Let the States and localities raise the money."

There are constitutional prohibitions in some States against this thing, and there surely are under city charters. I have been a mayor of a city. No one needs to tell me what a problem it is for a city to raise money. I know what has happened to the tax base. I say those persons trying to shift this burden back on local, county and State governments, are really trying to avoid the responsibility altogether.

There are differences. Some States can and are being helpful but in the main——

Senator MCNAMARA. Another suggestion made by the opponents of the social security approach is that it is not or does not take care of a certain number of people, 2 million, 3 million, 4 million. Actually, all of the shortages in our social security system or the failures to meet the total problem under the social security system would be reflected in this program and is it not a pretty good argument for extending the social security system to others when they are so much concerned with this area in connection with medical care?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator's insight into this matter is only excelled by his great compassion for the people. The Senator is absolutely right. Now we find people pointing out the shortcomings of social security—the very same people who made those shortcomings mandatory.

I am perfectly willing to have social security cover every person in the Nation. I think it ought to. And I want to say the gaps that are there can be filled as social security is expanded. This is a good argument for expanding social security. Also, I understand that this subcommittee is working on some proposals to cover those not currently covered under social security.

Senator MCNAMARA. That is correct.

Senator HUMPHREY. I might add that if the administration feels as deeply as it apparently claims of late about uncovered workers, it might want to try out its programs on those not covered. That is a possibility. We will see which plan works the best. It would be very interesting.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator HUMPHREY, we know of your concern to get away. You do have important commitments, and again we appreciate your testimony.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am going over to the Committee on Foreign Relations to see to it that the public funds are protected. I came over here to see that the public interest was at least helped along. I did not need to do much with you as the chairman.

Senator MCNAMARA. I hope you do as well over there.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

Are Democrats Playing Politics With Science?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times of April 13, 1960:

ARE DEMOCRATS PLAYING POLITICS WITH SCIENCE?

The vote of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy against authorization of the 2-mile, $170 million Stanford University linear accelerator was distressing.

That the committee did budget $3 million for design studies is small comfort. This sop suggests—but by no means guarantees—eventual authorization of the project. With a change of Presidents in the offing, anything could happen.

Committee Democrats set the course, with only one Republican joining their majority. Their vote flew in the face of recommendations of President Eisenhower, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Nation's very finest scientific brains in the high energy physics field.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, Joint Committee chairman, has offered the explanation that legislators are alarmed by the rising costs of such research tools and want to give this factor more study. That explanation has a tinny ring.

In addition to its unimpeachable scientific backing, the project has had extremely thorough reviews. Every objection the committee has raised—some of them farfetched—has been met.

Then what is the trouble? We can't help suspecting that the project is just too expensive. So expensive that politicians may hate to see rivals get credit for it. So expensive that legislators dislike seeing so much money put on one spot when it could be spread around. So expensive that it may have become a target for partisan whacks at the budget.

It is very discouraging to think politics, not science, may be ruling the work of the Joint Committee, which is supposed to be a "blue ribbon" group of outstanding legislators.

It is even worse that the committee majority is risking U.S. leadership in one field where we are well ahead of the Russians.

How the Democrats can defend their position we cannot see.

If these impressions are false, a frank statement of the reason for defying unanimous scientific opinion—or better yet, authorization of the project—will correct them.

We wish Congressmen VAN ZANDT, GUBSER, and YOUNGER success with their proposed floor fight to reverse the committee decision, but as long as a party line division exists, it is hard to be very hopeful.

Mount Holyoke College Withdraws From Student Loan Program of the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement announcing the withdrawal of Mount Holyoke College, at South Hadley, Mass., from the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act, in protest against the disclaimer affidavit.

Personally I believe that students should take the loyalty oath, but that a disclaimer affidavit is not necessary. Mount Holyoke College is one more college in Massachusetts which protests against the disclaimer affidavit.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.—Mount Holyoke has joined the growing list of U.S. colleges and universities to withdraw from the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act in protest against the disclaimer affidavit.

The board of trustees has voted to endorse the resolution passed unanimously by the faculty on February 8 urging withdrawal because the requirement of the affidavit is "inconsistent with the principle of intellectual freedom."

The Mount Holyoke trustees, in approving the withdrawal of the college from the program, went on record as making a sharp distinction between the loyalty oath required of student borrowers, which they supported, and the affidavit, requiring applicants to disclaim "vaguely defined beliefs," against which they were protesting. They expressly urged support of Senator Kennedy's bill, S. 2929, which has my full support, for repeal of the affidavit, which has been endorsed by President Eisenhower and Arthur S. Fleming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mount Holyoke has received thus far about $15,000 under the program, of which $13,000 has already been loaned to students. The college will make no further loans from the

remaining $2,200, President Richard Glenn Gettell reports.

The faculty resolution against the affidavit declared that "such a requirement by Government, while ineffective as a measure to prevent subversion, constitutes an invasion of freedom of thought and belief, establishes ambiguous standards for determining perjury, and discriminates in an unwarranted fashion against students seeking financial assistance."

The total number of colleges which have now withdrawn from the program is now reported to be 15. Among the group are Amherst, Yale, and Harvard. Another group of eight colleges, including Bryn Mawr, Princeton, and Swarthmore, refused to enter the program from its beginning.

President Gettell, in reporting on the action of the college, commented that "we looked upon the institution of the program with enthusiasm as a means by which additional worthy students could be assured of a good education. We hope that the affidavit will be withdrawn and that we can rejoin the program."

Some Gas Rate Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 17, there appeared in the Pittsburgh Press an editorial which asks some very pertinent questions as to what is happening in establishing gas rates by the Federal Power Commission in cooperation with State utility commissions.

I believe that the Members of Congress want to know these points. On the surface it looks as though the Federal Power Commission, who should support the consumers of America, are protecting the large gas companies now operating throughout the Nation. All the questions we want answered I think are contained in this editorial.

In order to expedite action on the questions asked by the Pittsburgh Press, I am introducing a resolution asking for an investigation of the Federal Power Commission's decisions by a special subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I believe this problem is of such magnitude that another committee should have their independent investigation to determine just what has happened in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolution shall be considered with numerous other resolutions which have been introduced as this is not only a problem in Pennsylvania but one in other States as well, and should get immediate attention.

The editorial follows:

SOME GAS RATE QUESTIONS

Distribution of natural gas is a natural monopoly, like street railway or telephone service. Since there can be no automatic control of prices, by competition, Government rate regulation is necessary.

Regulatory bodies have one main function, which is to protect the public against exorbitant rates. That is the job of the Federal Power Commission (FPC), in cooperation with State utility commissions.

All the evidence isn't in and, until it is, no final judgment should be made. But, on the basis of what already is known, it seems to us some pointed questions are in order.

1. The FPC permitted Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. to build a $50 million line from Tennessee to the Chicago-Gary area.

It permitted delivery of gas for industrial users at a rate actually less than cost in Tennessee.

2. Household rates were fixed high enough to cover costs of the pipeline, plus transmission costs and profit.

3. These decisions were reached by the FPC after testimony to the effect that big industrial users in the Chicago area would not shift to gas if the rate were any higher than the 22 cents asked. They would stick to coal.

The questions are these: Why did the FPC break with former policy which divided transmission costs between household and industrial users? What business has the FPC engaging in a cut-rate plan which will hurt the coal business, in favor of the gas business?

Commission staff members warned that the FPC action will increase gas rates for household users not only in the Chicago area but also in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York—areas in which local gas companies, including three in the Pittsburgh district, are served by the pipeline firm which owns the Midwestern company.

There's been a great deal of talk about "off the record" conferences between members of the FPC with utility officials or their representatives. A free ride on a company plane has been admitted.

At the very least these conferences and this ride are evidences of bad judgment. And so, at the very least, seems this Midwestern rate ruling which appears to violate the fundamental purposes of rate regulation.

A congressional committee is looking into this affair and has scheduled, as one witness, Thomas Corcoran "Tommy the Cork," former New Deal braintruster and now in law practice with utility clients.

It is highly important that Congress get to the bottom of this whole affair. If there are more logical explanations for events, let's hear them. If not, let's find out what's going on.

The Dallas News Approves Bills To Permit Aged To Earn Money Without Losing Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News, the Texas newspaper with the largest daily circulation, published an editorial Saturday, April 16, in support of two bills I introduced last week to aid senior citizens.

Both of these bills are aimed at encouraging elderly citizens who are drawing social security or old-age pensions but want to work more, to do so without loss of social security or old-age pension payments.

Under my bills, retired persons drawing social security would be permitted to earn $2,400 annually instead of the present $1,200 limit, without their checks being cut. Folks drawing old-age pensions would not be docked for the first $50 they earned each month, because pay up to that amount would be exempted in computing their needs. The denial of the right to earn money often kills the initiative, injures the health, causes mental problems, and shortens life.

The Dallas News editorial makes a valid point when it says that permitting social security recipients to earn $2,400 a year would not only encourage older folks to work, but would also encourage businessmen to hire them since they would be more likely to stay on the job in a year-round basis.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 16, 1960, entitled "Yarborough Has Sound Plan."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YARBOROUGH HAS SOUND PLAN

The two bills offered by Texas junior Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH would provide a sound method of practical relief for one disturbing angle of our old-age situation. He would permit the retired persons to earn $2,400 instead of the present $1,200 without sacrificing the social security check and the old-age-assistance pensioner to earn up to $50 a month without penalty.

In the first case, the existing limit of $1,200 does not take into account the serious inroad on living costs made by inflation. But even disregarding that factor, terrifying to so many, it is still true that most retired persons want to go on working. The limit handicaps their plans in this respect.

Many employers have work available for older persons. When the latter must budget working time to avoid forfeiting the social security checks, the employer loses interest in this type of employee. He does not want to have to replace a worker who suddenly finds he is going to exceed the $1,200 pay limit and must quit.

The present law permits unlimited earning after age 72 is reached. But if the worker waits until the attained age, he has been out of the labor market too long to have a free opportunity at a job. Undoubtedly, too, employers will hesitate to take on a 72-year oldster as a starter.

In the case of the old-age pensioners, the checks are pitifully small, the need urgent. Even the $50 monthly limit may not help much.

Against the Yarborough proposals may be argued that, in setting up social security, one aim was to make job room for the younger folk stymied by longtime elderly workers. If that was and is sound economics, it is tragically bad psychiatry. The unoccupied human being goes quickly to seed. A job is the best medical prevention for deterioration mentally and physically in most cases.

Shall We Have a Free World Common Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Organization for European Economic Coopera-

tion has been observed closely since its inception by many of the leaders of the United States.

One of the keenest observers has been my very distinguished constituent, Mr. Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and an officer in Anderson, Clayton & Co., Inc., Houston, Tex. Last November 30, Mr. Clayton made some observations to the philosophical Society of Texas which are now being voiced by other students of world affairs. I would like to commend to my colleagues for their thought and consideration the brief but cogent observations made by this distinguished statesman at that time.

For this reason, Mr. Clayton's letter and memorandum to the Philosophical Society of Texas follow:

ANDERSON, CLAYTON & CO., INC.,
Houston, Tex., November 30, 1959.

To Fellow Members of the Philosophical Society of Texas:

Because of my inability to attend the San Antonio meeting, I decided after conferring with president Garwood to send you the enclosed memorandum bearing on the subject to be discussed at the afternoon symposium.

Since this memorandum was written, dispatches from Europe speak optimistically of moves being made by both sides to bridge and differences between the six and seven.

Even without U.S. leadership or participation, we may in the near future see the 18 OEEC countries, plus Canada, united in a free trade area.

If this happens, with these 19 countries taking about half the U.S. exports, the United States must then either go common market or go isolationist to a degree which would make Smoot-Hawley look like amateurs.

But no isolationist haven exists in the modern world.

A very wise statesman, Lester Pearson of Canada, recently said in a lecture at Oxford: "No isolation is possible for the West today. Values that cannot embrace all men are as out-of-date as the Divine Right of Kings."

The common-market movement, properly directed, could save the world for freedom, but only if its doors are kept open to every free-world country.

The course finally taken by the poorer countries of the world will decide this war.

We cannot hold these countries by giving or lending them billions with one hand, while with the other hand we impose quotas on our imports from them and heavily subsidize our exports in competition with theirs.

After 100 years, we have again arrived at a period in our history when, to use Lincoln's words, "We must think anew and act anew if we are to save our country."

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON.

A FREE WORLD COMMON MARKET

Except for the Marshall plan, the Communists have held the initiative and the West the defensive in a worldwide struggle between freedom and communism.

Recent events present the West with an opportunity and a challenge to reverse this situation, with profit to the entire free world.

The 18 Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) countries are now divided into the six and the seven, with five countries still on their own.

Soon, the force of competition is almost certain to cause the five to join the six or the seven.

If these two groups continue on their separate ways, the consequences to free world unity could be catastrophic.

We are looking at the beginnings of a world economic revolution.

Under adequate leadership, this movement could weld the West together as nothing else can.

Only the United States can give such leadership.

The United States and Canada are associate members of the OEEC. They should become full members of this group, which would then become the Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation (OAEC), comprising 20 countries with nearly one-half billion of the most highly industrialized people in the world.

Under the leadership of the United States, the 20 OAEC countries could become one free trade area under articles of agreement open to any country of the free world willing to subscribe to the conditions.

Sound industrialization of the poorer countries can be achieved only on the basis of such an economic federation of the free world.

But time is running out on us. How much longer will we have?

It will take a "giant step" to win this war.

Abraham Lincoln said in his message to Congress on December 1, 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion * * * we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country".

Under a Free World Common Market, the standard of living throughout the world would rise, sound industrialization of the poorer countries would take place, the economic gap between the richer and the poorer countries would be progressively narrowed, communism as a threat to world peace would recede, and the world would be a more healthful and peaceful place in which to live.

WILL CLAYTON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *November 24, 1959.*

America's Stake in Its Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as this 86th Congress moves well into its fourth month of deliberations of this final session, we stand confronted with what is undoubtedly our most serious domestic problem—the difficulties confronting American agriculture.

It is unfortunate that in the field of agriculture, more so than in any other segment of our economy, that our efforts seem to be always directed at finding a political solution to what is basically an economic problem.

With this year being an important time of decision for the American voter, we once again find the farmer and his problems being subjected to unusual—but not always accurate—scrutiny.

On one hand we find the American farmer pictured as an overly greedy citizen feverishly raiding the Federal Treasury. On the other he is pictured as a poverty-stricken, downtrodden individual attempting to farm a plot of land with a mule-drawn plow.

Neither of these characterizations is accurate, and I am delighted to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues an excellent, well-written and to-the-point analysis of the difficulties confronting agriculture as presented in a two-part editorial series in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, daily newspaper published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

In bringing these two important editorials to attention, I want to cite two or three paragraphs of these editorials which I believe place this problem in proper perspective.

The definition of the farm problem, or basically what the problem really is that is hurting the farmer, sometimes escapes those who are searching for a solution in that they lose sight of the actual cause and effect.

As the Argus-Leader points out:

The farmer's personal problem is that his income has been going down, and the price of things he has to buy have been going up. He's caught in a squeeze.

This, then is the dilemma of agriculture—the cost-price squeeze.

Another factor which compounds the difficulty of the American farmer is the fact that he has become a minority voice in our economy, and with the decrease in numbers also comes a decrease in his effectiveness in the legislative halls of government.

In pointing this fact out, the Argus-Leader renders a service from the standpoint of accuracy. Too often we have heard the statement that American farmers are leaving the farm in greater numbers than ever before.

I do not dispute the fact that American farmers are leaving the farm, but I do take issue with those who attempt to divert this statistic to the benefit of a political party simply for the benefit of votes.

This is what the Argus-Leader states:

In 1933 farmers and farm families comprised about 26 percent of the population. Today, it is 12 percent. More people left U.S. farms in the Truman administration than in any like period before or since.

I cite this statistic for one reason—the hope that in our studies of this immense problem that we need not be subjected to the propaganda of false information designed to show the farmer in worse shape than he is, or for that matter, information directed to picture the American farmer better off than he really is.

What we need is an accurate approach to this problem, and no service of value is rendered, either to the farmer or to the American people, by compounding the farm problem through erroneous political propaganda merely directed at vote hunting.

Which leads to the other side of the coin, to those advocates who wish to place the American farmer on his own in a free economy. The American farmer has no objection to participating in or being a part of our free-enterprise system.

But I strenuously object to the farmers being entitled or subjected to the "free" while the "enterprise" is left for others. By this I mean that the American farmer is willing to stand on his own in a free economy provided that he is on equal ground with the rest of the economy.

The Argus-Leader editorial points this up well in answering those who would "free" the farmer from all Government controls, assistance, redtape, and what have you with these comments:

The plot calls for the United States of America to lose all its problems of subsidizing farmers, of costs of storing grain and dumping it on the world markets, when the farmer jumps into a free economy.

The businessman will no longer have to fork up taxes to pay the farm subsidy. The consumer will get cheaper food. The Government will be out of the farm business.

Missing from the scenario is one important fact—that the American farmer is expected to sink or swim in a free economy while the others stay behind in their controlled economy. The farmer was in a "free economy" before 1933, and that didn't work very well, either.

The Argus-Leader reviews the problems which would further confront the farmer if he were cut away from Government programs while others in our economy continue in what can best be termed a regulated economic system.

I call attention to this editorial series in South Dakota's leading newspaper not with the intention of indicating that it provides an answer to our farm problem. It does not offer a solution, but what the Argus-Leader does is to clarify the difficulties facing agriculture and wipe away many of the misconceptions, and, yes, downright falsehoods, which have served only to hamper constructive efforts in seeking a solution.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Apr. 16, 1960]

AMERICA'S STAKE IN ITS FARMERS—I

Elsewhere on this page you will find an article called "The Vanishing Small Farm." It appeared in the New Leader, a Socialist magazine published in New York.

In the last several weeks there has been an exchange of letters on this page on the same subject. M. D. Schneider, a Chicago man who visits southeastern South Dakota every summer, thinks socialized factory farming is the answer. He would have 20 small farmers get together and farm 2,000 acres with one tractor. Maynard Engelstad of Astoria doesn't agree with him. He'd like to see a farmhouse on every quarter. He wants to perpetuate the small family farm. He abhors the socialistic approach.

Politicians this year will make much of the family farm. All of them will be for it. Likely, they will not define the family farm in precise terms.

In this election year of 1960 the Democrats and the Republicans will be attempting to prove that the blame for the farm situation lies in the other camp. It seems very doubtful if anything resembling an adequate solution will be forthcoming this year.

A POLITICAL MINORITY

The farmer's personal problem is that his income has been going down, and the prices of things he has to buy have been going up. He's caught in a squeeze.

This squeeze catches many more persons than those who actually till the soil. The residents in the cities and towns of the farm area are dependent upon farm income. The cash registers in Sioux Falls and Brookings reflect immediately any change in the economic situation of the country.

The farmer's general problem is that politically he is becoming less important in modern America. Farm population has declined by 10 million in the past 20 years.

In 1933 farmers and farm families comprised about 26 percent of the population. Today, it is 12 percent. More people left U.S. farms in the Truman administration than in any like period before or since.

When Congress is reapportioned in 1961, on the basis of the 1960 census, the farmer will find that he will have fewer votes in his corner. He has become a political minority.

FARMING MUST CHANGE

America needs a farm solution. Whether the solution will perpetuate the family farm remains to be seen. It should.

We think there is a place for the family farm, but we think that such a farm is larger than we've been accustomed to thinking about it. Realistically, it's a half section and probably larger than that.

The world is changing. Farms will change with it. The family business on Main Street is often a corporation these days. They've had to increase their gross to stay in business. But they have had a much larger say in their revenues and costs than the farmer.

Most of the difficulties of farm programs have stemmed from the costs of administering supports and storage for the six basic crops: cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Most of these payments are never seen by the small farmer. Yet the farmer generally has had his most satisfactory years, from the standpoint of sharing equitably in the Nation's wealth, when price supports were high.

As President Eisenhower said in February, "The wheat situation is particularly acute. Federal funds tied up in wheat approximate $3½ billion. Although this means that well over 30 percent of the total funds invested in inventories and loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation goes for wheat, this crop provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from sales of farm products. The Government sustains a net cost of more than $1,000 a minute—$1,500,000 every day—the year round, to stabilize wheat prices and income.

"Day by day this program further distorts wheat markets and supplies. Its only future is ever higher cost. Inexorably it generates ever larger surpluses which must be expensively stored. Ultimately, if our Government does not act quickly and constructively, the danger is very real that this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation and thousands of our farming people will be hurt."

The Government is put in the ridiculous position of selling its surplus in cotton to foreign mills at a price 8 cents a pound below what our domestic mills have to pay.

We dump other surplus on world markets to the chagrin of Canada and other agricultural producers. In both wheat and cotton, the Government pays two subsidies: one to the farmer in America, the other to the foreign user.

THE SEARCH FOR A SOLUTION

Fortunately, the picture is not all black. South Dakota's west river rancher has done well with cattle without price supports. The sheepman does well, although it is accomplished by tariff protection. The hog grower is having trouble with prices. The cattle feeder is in a better position.

Thus, those who seek a solution may concentrate their efforts in the areas where a change is needed most.

The general solution is that we shouldn't continue to produce much more than we need. The outpouring of our farms shouldn't be piled up in an endless series of granaries and storage bins.

The personal solution for the farmer is to assure him a fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

Can it be done without subsidies or controls? Some Americans think so. They would make the farmer sink or swim in the world market. But they wouldn't put our commerce and labor in direct competition with the low-cost labor countries of Europe and Asia.

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Apr. 17, 1960]

AMERICA'S STAKE IN ITS FARMERS—II

On the political scene today there's a big swimming pool labeled "free economy."

The luckless individual on the diving board is the American farmer. Sitting in the audience are Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, the industrialists, most businessmen, and American labor.

They're all chanting: "Jump in, the water's fine." The plot calls for the United States of America to lose all its problems of subsidizing farmers, of costs of storing grain, and dumping it on the world markets, when the farmer jumps.

The businessman will no longer have to fork up taxes to pay the farm subsidy. The consumer will get cheaper food. The Government will be out of the farm business.

Missing from the scenario is one important fact—that the American farmer is expected to sink or swim in a free economy while the others stay behind in their controlled economies. The farmer was in a free economy before 1933 and that didn't work very well either.

WHO ELSE IS SUBSIDIZED?

Labor has been subsidized by the Government's hand at the bargaining table. It has pushed up labor income—and also the prices of the things the farmer has to buy. The manufacturer can adjust his prices accordingly. The farmer cannot.

The Government has subsidized defense industries, airlines, and shipbuilding companies directly. In an indirect way the import levies on steel, automobiles, and television sets subsidize Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. In either case, it comes out of the public's pocket.

We are in a world-minded era. Export, import, trade and get along is the credo of the times. Our Nation has wisely decided to trade with the world on a two-way street.

It is becoming a chilling experience for some American manufacturers. They have found themselves undersold by nations this country put on their feet. The farmer has been up against a world market and its lower prices for generations.

THE FARMERS' ALTERNATIVES

Our American farmers can either increase their gross, cut their costs or use a combination of both to survive. Let us consider how they could cut their costs.

Since 1930 the United States has levied no import duties on farm machinery shipped into this country from abroad. Theoretically, this should help the farmer by lower costs. Practically, imports are a drop in the bucket. In 1958, 6,449 tractors were im-

ported, mostly from Canada. Domestic shipments totaled 239,161.

One way the farmer could beat high American costs would be to reverse those buying figures and purchase 250,000 tractors a year from the United Kingdom and Europe.

The farmer could ask the Government to take off the 8½-percent import levy on foreign cars, so he could buy German and British automobiles instead of Detroit's more expensive models. On one popular import he'd save $100—a subsidy that has been going to Detroit, if you please, in the form of a world price differential.

He could ask Washington to stop subsidizing TV manufacturers by taking off the 10½-percent import levy. Then he could buy Japanese sets instead of American at a much lower price.

We do not believe that either American labor or industry would appreciate a "Buy Foreign" campaign, but it could help the farmer with his costs.

WHOSE PROBLEM IS IT?

It seems obvious that the farmer cannot survive by lowering his costs alone. He is already efficient. He will use even more automation in the future and produce bigger yields per acre. His production will continue to outrun the population gain.

Main Street businesses do not thrive by cutting their gross. If the farmer is to survive on a family farm of half a section or more, he will need more gross than he gets today on 160 acres.

The farmer may be able to increase his cash return by diversifying, by more concentration on livestock, particularly cattle in South Dakota, and less dependence on one cash crop.

The Government probably will have to continue to use a system of subsidies and controls, both to help the farmer and to avoid the mistakes and surpluses of the past. The controls must consider the agricultural export-import picture and the world market. The problem is how to do it without venturing forth on a program of complete regimentation or one which prepetuates inefficient farming methods.

Realistically, the farmer won't get unlimited license to produce and the country will not write an unlimited subsidy check. A compromise solution that passes Congress is better than an idealistic bill that is never enacted.

In South Dakota it is our big problem, but it is also the Nation's problem. It seems inconceivable that a prosperous America cannot solve the farm problem.

We like to believe that an urban America will act with a sense of fair play, through its city-dominated Congresses of the future, in dealing with the American farmer.

Surely, there is a practical, economic solution—not a political one—which recognizes the changes in the world and keeps a place and a fair share of our national income for that great individualist, the American farmer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as the Congress this week turns to another examination of the farm problem and possible solutions to at least part of that problem, namely, wheat, I had intended to call attention to two recent editorials appearing in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader on April 16 and April 17.

Written by Anson Yeager, one of the most thoughtful and conscientious reporters of the South Dakota press, they set out in some detail the dilemma of the American farmer.

Mr. Yeager points out that it is not only the farm States' problem—it is the Nation's problem—to assure these people a fair share of national prosperity.

I thank my colleague for having had the editorials printed in the Appendix.

Science Island, Casco Bay, Portland, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great personal satisfaction to those of us who have participated in its organization to be able to announce the start of a practical, imaginative, and urgently needed educational project, which will make a substantial contribution to America's efforts to produce more qualified scientists.

I am referring to the creation of the National Youth Science Center on Science Island, now known as Cushing's Island which is located in Casco Bay, near Portland, Maine. The stirring story of the National Youth Science Center may well be a classic example of how an American institution is rooted. In this true-to-life saga, one finds a large measure of ingenuity, a humble start, several years of hard work and the foresight and faith of a number of individuals in a bold pioneer program aimed to guide and inspire our future scientists to eventually undertake discovery as well as applied scientific efforts.

It all started prior to Sputnik I when an overzealous housekeeper complained to the SPCA and her boss, Mr. David L. Lukens, a South Orange, N.J., business executive, that Mr. Lukens' son, 14-year-old Jeff, had dissected a frog. The boy's father, seeking a method to channel the bright youngster's talents, hit on the idea of a youth science center where the boy could receive guidance under competent scientists and educators. Mr. Lukens then consulted with Dr. Vannevar Bush, board chairman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, then board chairman of Bell Telephone Laboratories, and Prof. George Sutton, president, American Rocket Society, as to the need and practicality of his idea.

The idea was enthusiastically received and then followed some 3 years of planning and legwork, during which time hundreds of educators, scientists, and business executives were personally interviewed by Mr. Lukens so that a practical and firm foundation would be built.

It was the unanimous opinion that the value of such a center would be in finding the gifted youngster and then giving him the opportunity and guidance and inspiration for development. This would be done with a minimum of formal education during the 2-month summer session at Science Island. The youngsters would engage in projects of their own choosing and carry them out under the supervision of capable teachers. An important part of the program would be visitation periods where renowned scientists who have already made their mark would meet the future scientists and discuss matters in an informal "shirt-sleeve" manner.

The permanent home of the center would be a major portion of the scenic island, some 125 acres, in which the Government had originally invested some $2 million for improvements and which housed about 1,200 Army and Navy personnel as a harbor defense during World Wars I and II.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman and Dr. Harry C. Kelly, respectively Director and Associate Director of the National Science Foundation, were others who in those early pre-Sputnik I days envisioned the need for more quality scientists and gave encouragement to the program.

Even though the program in its early days consisted of only a blueprint and words of encouragement, a small group of top business executives aided in providing funds for further development. This founding group consisted of Charles Shipman Payson, industrialist; Carl Gilbert, board chairman, Gillette Co.; George Pew, Sun Oil Co.; Dr. E. Gifford Upjohn, Upjohn Co., and William Jordon, Jr., banker.

However, the key to the entire program—its administration—was still lacking. Many colleges were interviewed, but in most cases, the college had numerous projects and problems of its own and could not give this new project the time and attention it needed. In other cases, the college administrator lacked vision and/or ability.

It was at this point that the project was brought to my attention. I suggested contact with Nasson College, in my congressional district at Springvale, Maine.

As a result, Mr. Lukens spent several days at Nasson and was greatly impressed with its spirit, its academic aims and capabilities of its administrators. He suggested an application for a grant be filed with the National Science Foundation that would enable a "trial run summer session" and the creation of the youth science center.

Nasson College has a regular 4-year liberal arts course. It is a progressive, coed, nondenominational, 48-year-old college located at Springvale, Maine. During the 10 years that Dr. Roger Crowell Gay has been president of Nasson, it has steadily grown academically and physically.

I then got together the principals, Nasson College, and Mr. Lukens, and National Science Foundation, and a plan of operation was approved.

As it is the intent of the National Youth Science Center to be self-supporting after the initial year, a nonprofit corporation, the National Youth Science Foundation, was started to provide funds from private sources which it will give to the college administering the program.

Included on the board of directors of the National Youth Science Foundation are four Nobel prize winners, Dr. Edward Calvin Kendall, former Mayo Foundation

biochemist; Prof. Percy William Bridgman, Harvard University physicist; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, medical doctor, College of Physicians and Surgeons; and Prof. John H. Northrop, chemist, University of California. Other directors are Dr. Harold A. Edgerton, psychologist, head of the consultant firm, Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co., Inc., and Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, former board chairman, Bell Telephone Laboratories and now special consultant to president, International Business Machines.

The initial phase of the project was announced in my office last Wednesday, April 13, when the National Science Foundation formally presented the grant to Nasson College for the purpose of administering the program. This grant covers 50 youths for a 6-week summer session. At the outset, the facilities of the college at Springvale, Maine, will be used and later the entire project is expected to be moved to nearby Science Island as facilities and additional funds are made available.

No youngster will be accepted for the National Youth Science Center unless he is qualified by ability. Once accepted, he will be given a "campship" to Science Island for 4 or 8 weeks during the summer. Any American industry, union, association or individual can sponsor a campship through the National Youth Science Foundation.

After the initial year of operation, the National Youth Science Center is expected to be self-supporting with the bulk of its income derived from the campships. The National Youth Science Foundation will provide funds for the operation of the center.

Another favorable aspect of this grant is that it recognizes the intent of Congress in having a Government agency aid in starting a project which can be taken over and supported by private sources, rather than perpetual Federal handouts.

The objective of the National Youth Science Center is to uncover America's most able youngsters in their most formative secondary school years and provide opportunity, guidance, and inspiration to become worthy and dedicated scientists.

In my opinion, this project is an outstanding example of democracy at work in its best and fullest sense.

The Federation Employment and Guidance Service: 25 Years of Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the month of April marks the 25th anniversary of the Federation Employment and Guidance Service of New York City. Through the years this fine organization has pioneered in efforts to find gainful employment for many citizens who might otherwise have been denied the opportunity to work.

Of particular significance is the manner in which the service has kept up with the changing needs of the times and New York's labor force. These and other attributes of the service were outlined in an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times on April 16. As the Times so well states, "This organization has served a valuable service in our community, and has been a source of hope and aid to many persons who might otherwise have been forgotten."

Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Federation Employment and Guidance Service on the completion of 25 years of dedicated service and to wish all concerned continued success in carrying on its outstanding activities which are contributing so much to the welfare of so many people in New York.

I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times editorial I have referred to printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 25TH BIRTHDAY

It is a please to salute the Federation Employment and Guidance Service, 42 East 41st Street, New York, on the observance of its 25th anniversary this month. This organization has served a valuable purpose in our community, and has been a source of hope and aid to many persons who might otherwise have been forgotten.

A quarter of a century ago, when unemployment was an acute national problem and one of its most distressing aspects was the atrophy of industrial skills of men and women out of work for extended periods, the Federation Service was founded. Its aim was to help workers maintain their specialty and assist them in finding jobs.

Since then, through a program that has been broadened to meet changing needs, the service has helped the mature worker, the handicapped and the hard-to-place pensioner and parolee. To them have been offered vocational guidance, vocational rehabilitation and job placement, services on a nonprofit, nonsectarian basis. We look forward to a second quarter century of community services on the part of this fine agency.

A Newspaper Reporter Looks at the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in common with many other Members of Congress, my distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANK IKARD, who represents the 13th District of Texas, gets out a weekly newsletter. The current issue reports the opinions of a newspaper reporter, Mr. Dan McCrary, of not only the operations of the House of Representatives but also the personalities that make it tick. It is worthy of study by every Member of Congress and every citizen of our beloved Nation. The newsletter follows:

NEWS FROM THE CONGRESS
(By Dan McCrary)

(The following was written by Dan McCrary, a newspaper reporter, who is spending a year in Washington as a congressional fellow of the American Political Science Association. This association provides funds to send about 15 journalists and political science teachers to the Capital each year to learn more about how Congress functions. They divide their time working in congressional and senatorial offices. Dan, who is originally from Michigan, has worked in my office since late December. I thought you might be interested in some of his observations.)

Newspaper reporters, like anyone else, can get in ruts. They can become so accustomed to the atmosphere in which they work that they become a part of it. I think there's plenty of evidence that members of the Washington press corps represent good examples.

There's little doubt that there are so many topnotch reporters per square mile anywhere as in Washington. Newspapers and press services send only their best men to report from the Capital where news breaks constantly and in volume. And somehow, each day, reporters manage to surmount this mountain of news and get it in print.

But reporters here have become so closely identified with the Government that they stick primarily in their writing to what is done here, and mostly overlook how things get done.

Take, for example, the unlikely combination of pomp and confusion with which the House of Representatives conducts its business. To a casual observer it must be amazing indeed that the House accomplishes anything at all. Members mill about on the floor, converse with their colleagues, and apparently pay little attention to the course of business. Yet things get done, and you can be sure that some Member is on the floor, alert and ready to jump on skulduggery, whether it be real or imaginary. This flavor, feeling, or what have you, with which the House carries out its duties, is mostly missing in news dispatches.

Any seasoned congressional reporter can relate anecdotes by the hour dealing with the wondrous process that is Congress. But few stop to insert the colorful, vibrant atmosphere of the place into their news stories, even when they do have time for this extra twist.

There's one thing, for instance, which this inexperienced observer of a few months has noticed about the House which rarely worms its way into news dispatches. This is the two-headed nature of Congress. One head is an institution. It is bound up tightly in a set of written and unwritten rules, customs, and precedence. Some of these rules are undoubtedly outdated; some are awkward; some don't seem to make much sense. But they serve a vital function in a democratic body, and, significantly, they're double edged. They recognize that the will of the majority is the will of Congress, and they protect this majority from a militant few who might force their way. At the same time, the rules protect the minorities and recognize their right to assert themselves. The rules are designed to avoid undue haste in the passage of legislation, but they can be bent to meet clear-cut emergencies, and bills can move through the House quickly and effectively.

This is one head of the House: a black and white, unsympathetic, unyielding creature of rules. But on the other hand, the

House is a creature of men, and it is when these two ingredients—rules and men—are blended that the Congress takes on its depth and resilience. The men and women who are Members seem to be pretty much like men and women you'd meet anywhere else. Some are brilliant; some boil with ideas; some are wheelers and dealers; some mediators; some are dull and uninteresting. Put together they produce a personality strong enough to make itself felt throughout the Nation; a man-sized accomplishment, when you stop to think about it.

I'm sure experienced congressional reporters are more aware of the makeup of the House than I am. And I recognize that in the usual meaning of news, the trappings of Congress aren't newsworthy in the daily flood of happenings. But I have been amazed at the processes of Congress, and I think that others, also uninitiated to the body, would feel the same.

As a footnote, I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. IKARD for his help and guidance during my 4 months here. In my opinion, the 13th District of Texas sends to Washington a Representative who is as able as any in the House. Voters can feel proud of their choice.

International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, yesterday bipartisan legislation was introduced which would authorize the establishment in Hawaii of an international center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West.

There is increasing interest and recognition of the need for such a center to better human relations between the East and the West.

The Washington correspondent of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Mary Chilton Abbot, reported last Saturday, April 16, that ignorance lends itself to mistrust among nations. She has stated that the clouds of mistrust could be disspelled through education at a center such as that proposed for Hawaii.

I wish to commend this article to the attention of other Members of Congress and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IGNORANCE SEEN KEY IN MISTRUST—CENTER TO BRING EAST, WEST TOGETHER EYED IN CONGRESS

(By Mary Chilton Abbot)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Many of the international problems which plague the world stem from a basic misunderstanding between peoples of the East and peoples of the West.

Many of these misunderstandings, of course, have their roots in ignorance, which breeds fear and mistrust.

A proposal made to both Houses of Congress in recent weeks should go a long way, if it is adopted, toward dispelling some of the clouds through education.

It would establish in the newest State a center to promote the interchange of the two cultures and to broaden contacts and friendships between Asians and Americans.

The proposal was made by Hawaii's two Senators, Democrat OREN LONG and Republican HIRAM FONG, and by its Democratic House Member, Representative DANIEL INOUYE. The idea has been brewing for some time, however. Senator Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON discussed the project at the editor's dinner given by the Women's National Press Club last April.

Legislative authorization came during the first session of the current Congress, when the Secretary of State was directed to submit a plan and program for such a center.

The center's backers envision it as a meeting ground for scholars as well as for students from the East and West. They hope that sufficient grants, fellowships, and scholarships will be available to seet up programs of higher learning and technical training which will be mutually supporting.

The center, to be administered under the existing facilities of the University of Hawaii, would contribute to the promotion of understanding and better relationships between Eastern and Western peoples, its backers say, and also would provide top-level educational facilities.

Asian students would have an opportunity to acquire English as a second language, to study American traditions and customs. American students would find Asian language studies available along with courses in problems special to the area.

The programs would rely heavily on the personal contacts between the Asians and Americans, both students and faculty, at the center. Similar programs are being carried on, in a limited way, by the International Cooperation Center in Hawaii which has assisted more than 3,000 foreign participants from 30 different countries during the last 4 years.

The center would be organized into two principal units, the International College and the International Training Center. The former would coordinate all the services of a university. The latter would provide nonacademic training in technical and specialized skills along with opportunities for on-the-job training.

Scholarship grants would be large, to cover the cost of travel to the center and the expenses of living in Hawaii over a 2-year period. It is estimated that $3 million would be needed for the scholarships to provide grants to 75 Asian and Pacific students and 25 American students. Some of the money could doubtless be provided in foreign currencies to cover travel costs for students coming from other countries.

Grants would cost $135,000 each year for five Asian or Pacific and five American scholars to be combined with grants from other sources.

The proponents of the plan foresee that the center would attract additional supporters and participants and would create a core around which related projects could gather, thus broadening its scope and increasing its usefulness.

While the money needed to establish such a center may appear, at first glance, excessive—particularly to opponents of Federal aid to education—its backers believe that the contributions it would make to world peace and to international understanding will be worth many times the cost.

The proposed sums for operating expense and capital improvement during the first year add up to almost $11 million. The second year would cost more than $9.5 million, the third more than $15 million and the fourth more than $17 million. All these figures are maximums.

Already there has been editorial comment in favor of the proposal from the other side of the world. A Korean newspaper, the "Republic," called it a "great inspiration" and said it would fulfill "an important and increasing need." The paper cited the racial tolerance found in Hawaii and pointed out that peoples of all colors and creeds live in the islands "in harmony and without discrimination."

If the center achieved no other goal than that of racial harmony which would prove to the rest of the world that diverse races need not fear one another, it would justify every penny of the cost. We would like to see an even broader program projected into the future for the center. We would like to see it made a truly international seat of learning not limited just to Americans and Asians but welcoming all peoples from all parts of the world to exchange knowledge and culture.

Maryland Sixth District Weekly Newspapers Win Statewide Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my pleasure to report the exceptional quality of weekly newspaper publishing which exists in the Sixth District of Maryland.

This year the annual better newspaper contest for all daily and weekly newspapers members of the Maryland Press Association was judged by representatives of the West Virginia Press Association.

First prize for general excellence was won by the Montgomery County Sentinel of Rockville. Roger Farquhar is the editor. Hugh Gillespie of the Sentinel won first prize in "News Photography" for the second successive year. The Sentinel also won first prize for "Best News Photo," and placed third in "Community Service."

The Suburban Record of Silver Spring, published by Dr. John R. Steelman, carried off first place honors in community service. It also placed third in general excellence. Thomas Y. Canby, Jr., is the editor of the Record.

The Maryland News of which Byron Sedgwick—Wick Byron—is the editor won second place for its editorials. In being so recognized, it topped all other weeklies in the category. In addition, it received second place for typography.

Mr. Cy M. Campbell is president of the Sentinel and Maryland News publishing companies.

For weeklies with a circulation of under 5,000, the Blade Times of Brunswick placed second in news pictures. It took third place for best editorials in competition with all other State papers. James Bryan is editor of the Blade Times.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

"The press is the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being * * *. Where the press is free and

every man able to read, all is safe," so said Thomas Jefferson.

The first amendment to the Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom * * * of the press." Each State in the formulation of its State constitution has been cognizant of this freedom. It was high on the list of liberties for which our forebears fought. Today it is basic in our priceless heritage of democracy.

The most important and dramatic victory for freedom of the press in colonial America occurred in 1734. Any discussion of the subject would be incomplete without mention of the Zenger trial with which I am sure you are all familiar with.

John Zenger, printer and journalist, was arrested for seditious libel and after 9 months in jail was put on trial for writing and printing political attacks on the Governor of New York, William Cosby. Zenger, defended by Andrew Hamilton, of Philadelphia, was acquitted by the jury. In defending Zenger, Hamilton pointed out that it was pretty clear to him "that in New York a man may make very free with his God, but he must take special care what he says of his Governor." While the main point at issue in the trial itself, had been the question of what constituted a libel, the point really gained was the assertion by implication of the right of the people to criticize the government. Hamilton's speech, in Zenger's defense, has been referred to as one of the greatest oratorical triumphs won in the Colonies; and most important it pointed straight toward the American Bill of Rights. Following Zenger's trial the liberty of the press was secure from assault and the people became equipped with the most powerful weapon for successfully exposing and opposing arbitrary power, that is, the right of freely criticizing the conduct of public men.

Thoman Erskine was probably England's greatest courtroom lawyer and most eloquent defender of freedom of speech and press. In 1792 Erskine defended Tom Paine in an attempt to uphold the right of an Englishman to criticize political institutions. In his defense Erskine laid forth an underlying principle for freedom of the press which always has and always will underlie this freedom, that is the most valued privilege of the people of a country is to watch over everything that affects their happiness, whether in the system of government or in the practice—for this purpose the press must be free. Since this has been so, much evil has been corrected by it. "If the government finds itself annoyed by it, let it examine its own conduct, and it will find the cause—let it amend it and it will find the remedy."

Freedom of the press means not only freedom for but also freedom from. Although the press must be free from external compulsions, to demand that it be free from any pressure which might distort or warp its utterances would be to demand that our society be void of contending forces and beliefs. Persisting and distorting pressures—financial, popular or institutional—must be known and counterbalanced. The press must be free for the development of its own conceptions of service and achievement; free to make its contribution toward the maintenance and development of a free society. The press must also be held accountable—accountable to society for meeting the public need and for maintaining the rights of citizens. In this modern era of advance communications the faults and errors of the press have ceased to be private whims but have become public dangers.

In an article published in the New York Times magazine, Henry Commager said: "Freedom of the press we must keep ever in mind carries with it responsibilities—the responsibility to present news fully and fairly, to restrain from the merely sensational, the merely trivial, the merely partisan, to refrain from spreading lies and hatred. * * * Freedom involves a positive responsibility to contribute to further freedom, to enlightenment, to truth."

Our Government at all times has been striving toward perfection. A free press has examined and detected its errors, and the people have, from time to time reformed them. This freedom has alone made our Government what it is; this freedom alone can preserve it. The liberty of speaking and writing is the basic liberty which guards all other liberties.

As Jefferson said to President Washington: "No government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free, no one ever will."

U.S. System Viewed as "Revolutionary"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Communists continue to try to convince the world that communism is a new system; that it can best provide for the necessities of life and progress of a people; that it will excel freedom and free enterprise; that it is the political and economic system of the future.

To us, who believe in freedom, however, these are not truths, but falsehoods—the pretexts under which a philosophy of state dictatorship—old in world history—again attempts to maintain its power and extend its influence and control.

As a nation, however, we recognize that our free system is in competition with the Communists. Also, the so-called uncommitted countries of the world—including millions of people and vast land areas and natural resources—are avidly watching the competitive battle.

As the East-West struggle tosses to and fro—in the propaganda, political, economic, psychological contests, with the nations at a standoff militarily—the world, I believe, could well benefit from a clearer, comparative picture of the Communist and free systems. Among other things, this could result in swinging the so-called noncommitted nations to the side of freedom.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published a thought-provoking article by George Telfer, entitled "U.S. Systems Viewed as Revolutionary." Presenting a useful comparison of our own, and the Communist systems—in terms of their historical significance, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SYSTEM VIEWED AS REVOLUTIONARY

(By George F. W. Telfer)

BOSTON.—The American way is more revolutionary than Communist statism, and the Communists today are fighting a ghost, George C. Lodge, assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, said here April 14.

Addressing the Municipal Bond Club of Boston, Mr. Lodge, son of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., present U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and former U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, also said, the American way "renders the Marxian view of capitalism, socialism, and communism obsolete.

"The exploitative capitalism that Mr. Khrushchev boasts he will bury has long since died in the United States—if in fact it ever actually existed. We have produced instead the most effective and egalitarian social and economic system the world has yet known, and it is still evolving, providing an ever-widening distribution of wealth."

ELEMENTS NAMED

Recognizing that the American system has evolved under extraordinarily favorable conditions, Mr. Lodge named three revolutionary elements through which laissez-faire capitalism was contained, controlled, and transformed in the United States, without blowing up the whole system.

These were the professionally managed corporation, organized labor, and refusal of the people to let the Government become an expression of the ownership class as Karl Marx forecast in the 19th century.

Mr. Lodge cited great and diversified natural resources, early political democracy, universal suffrage, and abundant food supplies as among the favorable conditions. Also, he said, "We have never been subject to the terrific strains of overpopulation. * * * Our greatest strength may well be the fact that we never had to suffer the feudal system."

ENLIGHTENMENT URGED

Earlier, Mr. Lodge told this writer he felt U.S. citizens who go abroad should be better informed about this country's economic system. In this way they can better answer criticisms or questions posed by inquisitive persons they meet abroad.

His special concern, he said, was with people in the Government service who travel overseas for the Government. But this was to be the first of many public appearances he would make around the country, carrying essentially the same message.

"But Americans have difficulty communicating our experience to others," Mr. Lodge said. The problem is that foreigners, undazzled with our wealth, see little relationship between our horn of plenty and their immediate problems.

FOREIGN VIEW NOTED

"The system by which our horn has been filled is simply known to them as capitalism, without qualification.

"In many foreign countries a capitalist is thought of as the economic descendant of the feudal lords who once were their rulers; as the representative of monopoly business, depositing his profits in foreign countries, with little sense of social justice or community responsibility. Capitalism is also a word associated with colonialism and exploitative land tenure.

"There is little understanding abroad of the role the U.S. Government plays in protecting the public against abuses of economic power."

The system in this country has been evolving so fast, Mr. Lodge continued, "there has been no time to articulate for it a proper classical philosophical base." But he tried:

"Its essential characteristic is efficient, competitive production causing economic progress through social justice by democratic means. It is * * * pragmatic,. responsive to the will of the people and subject to countless checks and balances imposed internally by labor, management, and competition, and externally by government.

"The public consensus is the final arbiter of power in the American economy. If the public consensus is not recognized, the Government intervenes to assure its recognition."

EXAMPLES GIVEN

Mr. Lodge gave examples of what he called regular invasions by the Government of the normal sphere of private enterprise. He cited the monopoly-curbing Sherman Anti-Trust Act, the Pure Food and Drug Act, Securities and Exchange Act, Interstate Commerce Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Rural Electrification Authority, as well as President Truman's indication in 1949 of his readiness to put the Government into the business of making steel when there was a critical shortage.

"It is important to note," Mr. Lodge pointed out, "that this sort of governmental activity is not a matter of doctrine or ideology. It is rather the pragmatic voice of the people speaking through the State."

There is little awareness abroad, "even in Western Europe," Mr. Lodge said, of governmental expenditures for social security, public welfare, health and medical care, child welfare, veterans' aid, housing and education, unemployment compensation, agricultural programs, and Federal power establishments.

Finally, Mr. Lodge spoke of the graduated income tax, the corporation tax, the role of small business in spite of great corporations, and nonprofit cooperatives.

"Every bank clearinghouse, rural telephone and electric coperative, mutual building and loan association, mutual insurance company, mutual savings bank, credit union, and cooperative apartment" is evidence that "people in a free society demand and have achieved freedom to organize for their own best economic interests."

A Challenge That Can't Be Ducked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excellent editorial that appeared in the April 16 issue of Business Week on the subject of "Health Insurance for the Aged."

The editorial follows:

A CHALLENGE THAT CAN'T BE DUCKED

Health insurance for the aged is fast becoming the No. 1 issue facing Congress this year. And there's political dynamite in it: Any candidate suspected by the millions of old people (and those concerned about their health problems) of taking a cold or know-nothing attitude toward the issue is likely to be in serious trouble this election year.

One thing about the issue is clear. Although plenty of politicians may see it as a vote-catching device, there is nothing synthetic or phony about the problem. Everyone who has seriously studied the situation has concluded that the provision of better health care for the aged is a serious—and growing—problem. Thanks to medical progress, the number of aged is increasing rapidly. In 1930, there were 6 million people over 65 in the United States; today there are 16 million.

For far too many of these, long life has meant shrunken incomes, increased sickness, loneliness, and the shame of being a candidate for a handout from society. Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Flemming, in his thorough report to the House Ways and Means Committee last year, concluded that 3 out of every 4 aged persons would be able to "prove need in relation to hospital costs." That is to say, they would be able to prove that they simply could not afford to pay for the care they needed when taken seriously ill.

The issue, then, is not whether there is a problem but rather how to meet the problem.

TWO APPROACHES

Representative AIME FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island, has proposed to deal with it through a system of compulsory Federal insurance within the framework of the Social Security Act. The Forand bill would provide insurance covering 60 days of hospital care, or 120 days of combined hospital and nursing home care, together with surgical services, to all those eligible for old-age insurance benefits. It would be financed, initially, by boosting social security payroll taxes one-half percent—divided equally between employees and employers.

The Forand bill has been attacked for a number of reasons by various groups, especially the American Medical Association, which sees it as the camel's nose of socialized medicine coming under the tent.

But the main weakness of the Forand bill, as specialists in the health field see it, is not that it does too much but too little. They condemn it as too narrow and as an encouragement to "hospitalitis"—the tendency, inherent in many of our present voluntary insurance programs, to put the sick into hospitals because there are no provisions for covering treatment at home or in doctors' offices.

The bill sponsored by Senator JAVITS, Republican of New York, strikes at this weakness. As JAVITS points out, though hospitalization costs comprise a large part of an aged person's annual medical bill, the average older couple spends $140 a year on health costs unrelated to hospitalization. "One out of every six persons 65 years and older," says JAVITS, "pays over $500 in medical bills annually." Yet 60 percent of the old people have annual incomes under $1,000 and can't afford home or office care that might cut down the length of hospitalization or eliminate it altogether.

JAVITS would deal with the problem by a voluntary program that would combine Federal and State subsidies, contributions scaled to income by the aged themselves, and both commercial and nonprofit insurance companies such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The program would not become operative in any State until the State put up the money, arranged with the insurance carriers, and agreed to certain standards for the program.

Although the Javits bill makes a hard effort to provide a "voluntary" (and heavily subsidized) program, it does not appear to meet the test of practicality. The program would take a very long time to negotiate with 50 individual State governments and with the insurance carriers—assuming that it would be possible at all to get them involved in a program whose costs are unpredictable.

Indeed, after studying Flemming's able report, and the arguments on all sides of this issue, we are forced to conclude that the voluntary approach simply will not do the job.

The problem basically is that the aged are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem, therefore, is to spread the risks and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly. By comparison with the heavily subsidized schemes, this approach has the advantage of keeping old people from feeling that they are beggars living off society's handouts.

We do not pretend to know all the answers to the problem of enlarging the social security system to include a health insurance program for the aged. Even a modest study of the problem immediately convinces anyone of its difficulty and complexity. At this point, we don't think that the complete answer to it has emerged.

Nevertheless, no democratic government can refuse to grapple with a problem of such demonstrated urgency and importance. The issue cannot be evaded and, before it becomes a political football, the politicians of both parties should accept responsibility for finding the best possible answer in the shortest possible time.

Tribute to the Late Aubrey Steen McLeod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the April 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, there appeared an article entitled "A Story of Courage" by David Lawrence.

This is a story about Aubrey Steen McLeod, an unknown American soldier who passed away a few days ago. Mr. Lawrence points out how at the age of 23, this soldier lost both his legs fighting for our country, and yet had the courage and enthusiasm to accomplish great things in life, and to inspire other disabled veterans to do the same.

I knew "Mac," as he was called, personally, and I am among the many people who admired and respected him. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's article concerning the unfailing courage of an outstanding American be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STORY OF COURAGE

(By David Lawrence)

Aubrey Steen McLeod passed away a few days ago. To the vast majority of the American people he is an "unknown soldier." For the epic of his courage is the untold story of a man who, at the age of 23, lost both his legs above the knees but managed in the 43 years thereafter to achieve a success in life.

"Mac," as he was called by his friends, was one of the first half-dozen Americans wounded in an air raid in France in World War I. He was a volunteer with a U.S. Army ambulance unit which reached France in May, 1917.

Here, in a letter written from a base hospital in France in October, 1917, to his parents in Indiana, is young McLeod's own description of his experience:

"Practically three weeks I have been lying on my back at the hospital and although it is very tiresome, I cannot complain, for I am exceedingly lucky to be alive.

"On the night of September 4, I was on guard with nine others and was sleeping in the reception tent when I was awakened by an explosion. No sooner was I on my feet than a bomb exploded across the street, and then one exploded just 5 feet from me. It shattered my left foot and filled both my legs with shrapnel, a piece passed through the fleshy part of my side. Added to this, it was a poisonous shell.

"They amputated my left foot that night. Then gas poisoning set in, and they had to

take off both my legs near the hips in order to save my life. If it had happened on the battlefield, I probably would not have lived. I was very fortunate being hit low, for five of our men were killed that night near here. I am receiving the best of care, and my legs are getting along splendidly.

"If everything progresses favorably, I should be home about November 1. Now please don't worry about me, for I am getting along fine. I shall be given artificial legs and will be able to get along OK."

The wounded man was treated at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington for 11 months and then was transferred to a Boston hospital, where he was fitted with artificial legs. He decided to continue his studies. He graduated in 1921 from Massachusets Institute of Technology as a chemical engineer, and then earned a master of arts degree in economics at Harvard in 1925. He attended classes in a wheel chair and took part in social activities as if he were as able-bodied as the rest of his classmates. He once said, as reported in the Boston Globe during his college days:

"The way I look at my case is this. There are numerous people who, in the excess of sympathy just at present for a wounded man, wish to do everything for him; but in the years to come, when the enthusiasm has dropped, the man has got to be able to make something for himself.

"So, as I lay in the hospital for so many months, I decided that I would gain the best education I could and not let my misfortune interfere in the continuation of my studies which were interrupted by the war. I made up my mind I would go on as though nothing had happened and to let nothing make me sour or discontented.

"I eat well, sleep well, and have all kinds of ambition and optimism. I want every wounded or disabled man back from the war to take note of my case. There could hardly be a more used-up man than I am, and yet I want the boys to take heart and go to work and make men of themselves.

"Why, a disabled man can do many things and, very often, can fit himself for a place in which he can earn more money than he ever earned when he was sound."

"Mac's" excellent judgment on investments enabled him to accumulate a small fortune. He became one of the most expert of forecasters of business conditions. He was appointed Actuary of the U.S. Treasury Department and served there from 1930 to 1937. He was noted for the accuracy of the estimates of future tax receipts which he annually gave to congressional committees.

Never did "Mac" falter. Never did he refer to his handicap as a barrier to anything he wanted to accomplish in life. Two years ago he lost his wife, the high school sweetheart who married him atfer his return from France. She, too, lived a life of courage. The parents, moreover, instilled courage in their only child. Norman Bruce McLeod, who volunteered in World War II for the hazardous duty of a U.S. Navy "frogman," and later was awarded the Silver Star.

Nearly 20 years ago, "Mac" joined the staff of this magazine as an economist. At the time of his death of a heart attack on April 9, 1960, in a Washington hospital, he was chief of the economic unit of U.S. News & World Report.

We salute an able economist, but we salute as well a man of unfailing courage. May his fortitude and determination always be an example to all who suffer physical handicaps. For, while the body may be maimed, the spirit of a man can be invincible.

Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent is predominantly agriculture. In it, we have many well established farmer cooperatives. They are, to the best of my knowledge and information, operated scrupulously by and for their members. They are the truest form of such organizations and I almost never have any kind of a complaint in regard to them. These members view with considerable concern the operation of some so-called cooperatives, none of which incidentally are located in our area but which encroach on many fields far removed from their intent. They escape taxes which competing private organizations must pay and if they are permitted to continue they could conceivably prejudice the entire cooperative program.

This morning I received a letter from the Texas Federation of Cooperatives. It reads, in part, as follows:

Just a note to remind you that the farmer cooperatives of Texas are still steadfast in their position that legislation related to taxation of farmer cooperatives and their patrons should be passed which would put into effect the intent of the 1951 law.

In brief this 1951 intent was (1) that patrons refunds, when made pursuant to a preexisting obligation are excludable from income at the corporate level regardless of whether such refunds are made in the form of cash, capital stock or other media, and (2) that all such refunds should be taxable to the patron at par value for the years received regardless in what form received.

I believe you are in general agreement that this is a sound, just and equitable tax program. I hope you will continue to maintain the position that these principles be clearly embodied in the statutes, the Internal Revenue Code and in the regulations of the Internal Revenue Service.

The farmers and ranchers of Texas through their 525 self-owned processing, marketing, and service institutions will support and assist you in every way possible to get this type legislation enacted.

There also came to my desk a copy of an editorial which appeared on April 11, 1960, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. This also I submit for the consideration of the Congress. Perhaps some of the thoughts contained will be helpful in providing the proper protection and ensuring the continued operation of the pure and altogether praiseworthy farmer cooperative which operate in the Ninth Congressional District of Texas:

The Nation's co-ops, launched a few generations ago to help local groups of little farmers, have now become big, flourishing business. One reason is because they have found a gaping loophole in the income tax laws, a gimmick by which many of the co-operatives escape paying millions of dollars in Federal taxes yearly.

It's all legal enough, but the result is a flagrant injustice to Government and to private enterprise, into whose fields the co-ops have heavily expanded. Private concerns must pay corporate income taxes up to 52 percent. The amount rendered Uncle Sam by the co-ops is generally no more than a token payment.

There is no reason why cooperatives should not be taxed as other business is taxed. Most particularly is this true in manufacturing fields, where the co-ops have widely encroached under their tax-free status.

It has been reliably estimated, during recent hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, that at least $400 million of net co-op income goes free of Federal taxation annually. Taxing this income would produce between $150 million and $200 million.

This testimony was offered by Roswell Magill, a tax expert, in behalf of the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association. Mr. Magill was named by President Roosevelt Undersecretary of the Treasury. He is president of the Tax Foundation, a private research organization.

Orginally cooperatives were born among small groups of farmers, who intelligently banded together to purchase farm machinery they could not individually buy. Or they joined in acquiring grain storage space so they wouldn't have to dump their harvests on the market at depressed prices. They lumped their resources to purchase seed, fertilizer, and other necessities at discounts for large purchases.

But that was 40 years ago. At present co-ops are often massive business operations, covering a State, or a region embracing as many as 16 States.

The estimated gross business of farm cooperatives in 1957 was $13 billion. Mr. Magill suggested this gross now bulks in the neighborhood of $15 billion a year.

That total would approximately equal the combined sales of such giant companies as A. & P., International Harvester, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and National Dairy. These four corporations paid $540 million in Federal income taxes in 1958. The tax payment of co-ops, doing about the same business volume, paid only a nominal tax.

Like other large industry, the co-op has diversified its operation into all kinds of areas. It acquires, processes, and sells cotton, dairy products, grains, wool—handling virtually every kind of farm product, from the field to the consumer.

The co-ops supply building materials, paint, brick, fuel, feeds, hardware, fertilizer, gas and oil trucks. They handle about 25 percent of the country's fertilizer business.

They are in the grocery business, selling retail meats, furniture, appliance, drugs, cosmetics and office supplies. They operate auto repair shops, barbershops, beauty parlors, even funeral establishments.

In addition cooperatives have been buying private businesses, like Welch Grape Juice, eliminating competition and further taxes.

All this is accomplished usually with little or no Federal burden—while other corporations pay taxes through the nose. Such a condition obviously is an injustice, not merely to taxpaying competitors but to every individual taxpayer who has to pay his share up to the hilt.

The reason for the co-ops' tax loophole is simply because the legislation passed by Congress in 1951 was a sleazy job. The intent was to have cooperatives pay income tax—at the source if they retained net earnings, or

through patron members if earnings were distributed.

The law didn't work that way. Co-ops devised a system of distributing certificates of holdings. These certificates bear no interest and are not negotiable. Federal courts held them nontaxable.

The result—co-ops can hang on to their earnings for tax-free expansion. And neither they nor their members have to pay income levies.

The double tax on private corporations—at the source and against investors—is a rank injustice. It should be abandoned for all corporations. But the co-ops should be forced to pay Federal taxes on held earnings, or their members on cash disbursements.

The preferred status of co-ops, with their built-in tax loophole, should be changed by this Congress. There are too many exemptions and inequitable concessions in the hodge-podge tax structure. Federal levies should apply equally to every taxpayer.

Address of Floyd E. Dominy Before Oklahoma Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, Oklahoma was honored on April 5 by having the Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd Dominy, in our State to address the annual meeting of the Oklahoma Reclamation Association.

His address was very informative and points to the need of careful study of the use of our limited water supplies, in light of increased population and accelerated per capita uses.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION FLOYD E. DOMINY BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION AT ALTUS, OKLA., TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1960

It was just a year ago that I was here in Oklahoma to address a utility association meeting, the members of which wanted to know something of the water resources development opportunities in your State. At that time, I said, I was gratified to receive the invitation because it indicates a growing awareness of the importance of water in Oklahoma's future. The reactivation of the Oklahoma Reclamation Association and its active participation in and sponsorship of reclamation in the State is another evidence of determination to push ahead with needed and vital resource development.

In the year since I was last here, you have seen a very good crop grow to maturity even when dryfarming is practiced. You also have come through a winter in which repeated storms have swept over the State with more moisture than could be used at that time. Right now every indication is that you have another good crop year ahead. But do you?

No one can tell positively that this will be another year in which the rains will come at the right time to supplement the moisture now in the ground. I am a farmer, grew up on a dryfarm in Nebraska, spent many years in county agent work in Wyoming, and have a farm now in Virginia, so I know the ups and downs of seasonal changes and the despair that comes with long stretches of cloudless sky. I have not yet found a way to tell, in December, whether I am going to have enough rainfall in July and August to mature my crops. But because I have worked in reclamation territory most of my life, I am aware that something can be done about those dry years. I know that if that reservoir back in the hills, in which I have a big interest and a firm water right, is full in the spring, I will be able to pull through. I know the importance of proper conservation and use of our water resources. I know that it pays.

And so, today, I want to talk a little with you about the reclamation situation in Oklahoma and what you can do about increasing your usable water supply.

As a matter of history, Oklahoma Territory was included as one of the original reclamation States in the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902. This was the act of Congress that made the United States a participant in the development of the water of the arid West. Oklahoma is not a truly arid State. You are in the subhumid belt or twilight zone of water supply. Nevertheless, even in those early days, various preliminary studies were made throughout the State by the Reclamation Service to make a determination of the need for, and possibilities of, reclamation projects. It is worthy of note that some of these early investigations were made by the late Dr. Charles N. Gould, who later became head of the department of geology at the University of Oklahoma, and also became director of the Oklahoma Geological Survey.

In 1903, the Reclamation Service made fairly extensive investigations in southwest Oklahoma. They mapped the Mountain Park Reservoir site on Otter Creek, and studied the possibility of diverting water from the North Fork in the vicinity of the present Altus Reservoir, eastward to lands in Kiowa and Tilman Counties.

But nothing further was done until 1917, when the Lawton project in Comanche County was authorized by the President. Upon entry of the United States in World War I, water that would otherwise have been available for irrigation was placed at the disposal of the War Department for use by Fort Sill. The project was later deauthorized because an assured water supply was no longer available.

Little further work was done in Oklahoma until 1924, when C. T. Pease, of the Bureau of Reclamation, wrote a report on "Proposed Irrigation Projects in Southwestern Oklahoma." He concluded that the Lugert project was the most promising of those investigated. He did have reservations as to the advisability of attempting irrigation projects at that time, as there was little local interest evidenced in irrigation. In general, the feeling was that Oklahoma had not reached a stage of development justifying expenditures necessary to create an irrigated agriculture. They were having good weather years then.

The drought of the thirties brought a change. In 1937, under the sponsorship of Jackson County citizens, ably led by the late Judge W. C. Austin, who lived right here in Altus, an investigation was made. The project, which we know today as the W. C. Austin project, was authorized in 1941 and construction was carried out in that decade. Most of you are familiar with this project, but let me state briefly that it consists of the Altus Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork of the Red River and a distribution system for irrigation of about 48,000 acres of land in the Lugert-Altus district. It also provides water supply to the city of Altus and the nearby Air Force base. The reservoir provides flood control and substantial fish and wildlife benefits to an area seriously lacking in such opportunities. Also, your fine Quartz Mountain State Park has been established at the reservoir.

Project farmers are using irrigation as a tool to obtain fine crop production and real agricultural stability. Over $6,500,000 worth of crops were produced on a harvested irrigated crop area of about 40,000 acres in 1958. This is an average return of about $160 per harvested irrigated acre, which is well above the returns from dry-farm operations. In years of drought, of course, the difference is even more sharply defined. In the dry years irrigation is the difference between success and failure.

Since irrigation started about 1946, the project has produced crops worth approximately $50 million. We estimate that at least $33 million of this is new production over and above what would have been realized without irrigation.

Based on studies in a similar area, an increase of $1 in crop production creates an additional $1.10 in local labor income. This, in turn, creates $1.50 worth of increased labor income in the regional trade area. Thus, the increased production of $33 million created by the project has created $36 million in local labor income and $50 million in regional labor income since 1946.

These figures relate only to the irrigation phase. The benefits of having a more assured water supply for Altus and the Air Force base and the recreational and fishing use of the reservoir have been of inestimable value.

Let me note here also that the W. C. Austin project is in the hands of the irrigation district, which has done an excellent job of operating and maintaining the facilities. It is our policy to get project operations into the hands of the water users just as quickly as possible.

The W. C. Austin project is a blue-ribbon example of what can and is being done in other parts of Oklahoma.

The Washita Basin project was authorized in February 1956 and construction initiated early in 1958. The Fort Cobb Dam was completed last fall, and the reservoir has stored sufficient water to meet the total contracted water requirements of the Fort Cobb Reservoir Master Conservancy District for several years. The aqueduct system for delivery of water from Fort Cobb Reservoir to Fort Cobb, Anadarko, and the Western Farmers' Electric Cooperative generating plant is under construction. We expect it to be completed during the coming summer and clear water of good quality will be available to that area.

Construction is well advanced on Foss Dam and will be completed next year. We plan to start work soon on the Foss aqueduct. Foss Reservoir will furnish water to Clinton, Bessie, Cordell, Hobart, and the Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base.

The Fort Cobb Dam and aqueduct will be completed at a cost substantially below our estimate, and we believe there will also be a saving in the cost of Foss division.

We are studying the irrigation phases of the Washita project, but are confining those studies to a project size we believe could be served under any reasonable adjudication decree. The extent to which irrigation may be developed depends entirely upon the quantity of water the court determines is available for this purpose.

The Norman and Canton projects in Oklahoma are now before Congress for authorization.

The Canton project on the North Canadian has been before Congress since 1954. Plans contemplate about 16,000 acres of land for irrigation in the vicinity of Geary, Okla. Water supply would be provided by the Canton reservoir which was constructed by the Corps of Engineers and has been used primarily for flood control since the 1940's.

The Canton Irrigation District was organized in the mid 1940's with the intended purpose of providing an organization to contract with the United States for repayment, but the Congress has not as yet acted on the authorization.

The principle unresolved problem is lack of agreement as to a firm allocation of reservoir storage capacity for irrigation purposes throughout the repayment period. There is a lesson in this—we must always look ahead and develop the full water supply potential of a reservoir site so that all beneficial purposes can be served. We can no longer afford construction of single, or limited, purpose reservoirs. I hope that this problem can be resolved as landowners in the Canton Irrigation District have worked long and faithfully to obtain project development. The area is capable of providing a fine irrigated agriculture.

The Norman project in Oklahoma and Cleveland Counties is the other reclamation project now being considered by Congress and several Oklahomans testified at hearings in Washington only 2 weeks ago. The project consists of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Little River about 13 miles east of Norman, Okla., and pipelines to provide water to Norman, Midwest City, and Del City.

Sponsors of the Norman project completed organization of the Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District last fall. This master conservancy district, which has been organized under Oklahoma law, has the authority to contract with the United States for repayment of reimbursable costs. It seems that good progress can be expected on this project.

There are several other projects in the State on which feasibility investigations are now being completed or are underway. The Waurika and Arbuckle project investigations are now being completed. Sponsors of both have cooperated by providing funds and furnishing other assistance needed.

The Waurika project consists of a multiple-purpose reservoir on Beaver Creek to furnish municipal and industrial water supply to nearby communities and cities, and irrigation of about 2,000 acres of land. It will also provide flood protection to valley lands and the town of Waurika, and recreation and fish and wildlife opportunities. The report on this project has already been completed and submitted to my office for review before it goes to the Secretary of the Interior for consideration.

The Arbuckle project is on Rock Creek in Murray County, Okla. The reservoir as planned will provide water supply for Ardmore, Davis, Wynnewood, and Sulphur, and will include flood control storage to provide flood protection to limited areas downstream. The reservior site is in a picturesque area and will provide excellent recreation and fish and wildlife opportunities.

A draft of the report has been prepared but final completion has been delayed because of indecision by some potential water users as to how and on what basis they will participate.

Projects require united area support, particularly by the water users who must pay the bill. Progress can only be as rapid as is consistent with the wishes and support of local interests—where there are conflicting uses, it is essential to compromise differences and reach agreement.

The Mountain Park project is also currently under investigation. It will provide for a reservoir on Otter Creek about 25 miles east of Altus, a diversion canal from Elk Creek, and conduits to supply water to the city of Altus, the Air Force base, Snyder, and Frederick, and possibly Roosevelt. The project will also provide flood control and other benefits, including recreation and fish and wildlife. This investigation is another one that will require the continued cooperation of project sponsors and the State in order to work out the best plan possible.

Investigation of the Mangum Reservoir on the Salt Fork of Red River was initiated back in 1938 as a possible supplemental water supply for the W. C. Austin project. The investigations were carried forward through 1942, when detailed study of the project was suspended because of the war.

The investigations were resumed last year, and geologic investigations are being made of the reservoir site to determine its suitability for storage of the flows of the Salt Fork River. If current geologic studies show that the reservoir would be watertight, the Mangum reservoir would be capable of materially increasing the water supply of the W. C. Austin project.

However, the Salt Fork of the Red River is an interstate stream, and development upstream in Texas could affect the water supply that would be available at the Mangum Reservoir site. We are currently studying potential developments on the Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork in Texas. Final decision on developments in the Salt Fork Basin should be preceded by a Red River compact. This is now under negotiation between the affected States.

Another project investigation that we have underway here in Oklahoma is the Liberty Bottoms project in southeastern Oklahoma, immediately below Denison Dam. Current investigations are being directed toward developing a plan for irrigation of several tracts of land by pumping from Red River. A project-type irrigation system will make it possible to reach a larger part of the available irrigable lands than would be possible through development by individuals who own lands more favorably located along the river.

This brings us up to date on reclamation development in Oklahoma. I should mention, however, the hexadecanol tests conducted at Lake Hefner, near Oklahoma City, in 1958 with the cooperation of the city and many State and Federal agencies. These tests were the first large-scale field experiments in research which may lead to materially reducing the evaporation losses from our ponds, lakes, and reservoirs. The Geological Survey has estimated that we lose more than 24,850,000 acre-feet of water annually by evaporation from open water areas in the 17 Western States and if we can save even a fraction of that, we will save the equivalent of a good-sized reservoir full of water for beneficial use.

Now let's try to look ahead. The national population is ever increasing. Latest projections show that our national population will increase to some 230 million people by 1975. Not only is the population increasing, but our ever-rising standard of living and changing habits create new demands for goods of all kinds. Consumption trends show that people are eating more, particularly specialty, health-giving foods, which are principally the products of irrigated land.

It is obvious that our Nation must provide many new industries to supply products for our people, increased agricultural production to feed and clothe them, and many, many new homes so that they may be housed. Where this expansion occurs depends to a large degree upon resources that are available and how effectively these resources are developed—how intelligently they are used.

Water is one of our key natural resources. Your State's future growth and economic stability depend to a large degree upon how wisely available water resources are used.

There is a tendency to oversimplify a problem such as water resources development. Here in Oklahoma, you have an average of some 37 million acre-feet of water flowing out of the State each year, including those waters which flow into and across the State from neighboring States. The average precipitation for the State of Oklahoma as a whole is about 33 inches. All this sounds fine because we are using average figures but don't be misled by averages.

There are wide variations in annual amounts of rainfall and runoff. As I have mentioned, no one can predict in December what the rainfall will be next summer. The recent drought that began in 1951, and continued until the spring of 1957, has brought into clear focus the problems of water development and utilization.

It is axiomatic that when rainfall is low, needs for water are greatest. Yet it is during these periods that available streamflow, and even ground water, is in shortest supply.

Here in Oklahoma, streamflow is extremely erratic. Although an average of some 37 million acre-feet of water flows out of the State annually, there are years when the runoff falls far below this figure. During the last 5-year drought period, the average outflow from the State was approximately 18 million acre-feet, or less than half the long-time average.

Even more significant is the fact that about two-thirds of the total runoff occurs in the eastern one-third of the State. It follows that water supplies in the more arid western part of your State are most erratic. Pollution is another complicating factor that causes streamflow at many points to be unsuitable for most uses.

We must recognize that development of the additional water supplies needed to support your growing municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements is becoming more difficult and expensive. You will need to think big in setting your goals in water development and formulating a wise water policy. Then you must display a forceful unity of purpose in developing plans and excuting them in a logical manner.

An overriding factor is that remaining undeveloped streamflow must be conserved and be made available for beneficial uses to the maximum extent possible. I underline and emphasize beneficial and maximum. Thus far Federal reservoir projects constructed in your State by most Federal agencies have provided storage capacities principally as added capacity for conservation and water supply purposes in conjunction with flood control. That is natural because, until recently, the greatest water problem here in Oklahoma was flood control.

I know from talks that I have had with your State officials and leaders in resource development that a new era in reservoir planning is at hand. The Bureau of Reclamation has long advocated the multiple-purpose development in connection with developing the water resources throughout the West. I am confident that this is the only sound basis for achieving development which will most likely meet the needs of your State. Our scarce reservoir sites should be developed to the optimum capacity and should serve the maximum purposes possible. Provision must be made for the safeguarding and development of the fish and wildlife resources. Recreation opportunities should be utilized at any reservoir site where practicable as there is an ever-increasing need for this type of activity by the growing population. Flood and pollution control and other purposes which a reservoir site may serve must not be overlooked.

The Water Supply Act of 1958, sponsored by your senior Senator from Oklahoma, is a far-reaching step in providing for conservation storage in reservoirs throughout the United States. This act allows inclusion of conservation space for future use, and deferring repayment of that part of the cost of conservation storage which may not be required immediately.

Of course, conservation of water does not mean the indiscriminate storage of water at every site where a dam can be constructed. Impoundments must be planned so they do not result in unnecessary losses through transpiration and evaporation. Such lost water may be sorely needed at other points.

Finally, let me emphasize that it has been and continues to be the policy of the Bureau of Reclamation and its parent agency, the Department of the Interior, to operate within the framework of State water laws. However, the water laws and the climate in which they are administered must be attuned to development needs. This is of particular importance in your own State. You must take a positive approach to the development of water supplies for beneficial purposes.

Oklahoma has reached a point where intelligent and firm decisions must be reached concerning your water resources and the manner of their development and priority of use.

Your association has a primary interest in the water resources development of the State and is in a position to set the path for a useful future. In addition to the very important function of liaison between local interests and State and Federal agencies, you can do a great service to your State in helping to develop and support a sound water policy.

Fundamental in such a policy is legislation which will permit water development to proceed in an orderly manner by the clarification of water rights and establishing priority for the important uses which are essential to the future growth of your State. You have our best wishes and support in your endeavors.

Hoosier Majority Favors Federal School Support—Seven Indiana Congressmen Take Strong Position on Federal School Support for Construction and Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following article from the March 1960 issue of the Indiana Teacher in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article makes clear the strong support of a majority of Hoosier Congressmen for increasing our national investment in education by using our Federal funds in support of State and local efforts to build more classrooms and improve teachers' salaries.

The article follows:

HOOSIER MAJORITY FAVORS FEDERAL SCHOOL SUPPORT—SEVEN INDIANA CONGRESSMEN TAKE STRONG POSITION ON FEDERAL SCHOOL SUPPORT FOR CONSTRUCTION AND SALARIES

President Eisenhower likely will have on his desk, before this session of Congress adjourns, a Federal support for school construction bill to sign or veto.

The House Education Subcommittee has reported out Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.'s moderate-size school construction bill which, party leaders hope, will win the approval of the House Rules Committee which has had the Murray-Metcalf bill bottled up since last session.

The New Jersey Democrat's school construction bill (H.R. 10128) calls for $325 million a year for the fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963. The States are required to match their grant dollar for dollar. Indiana's share at $260 per classroom unit would be $8,300,000. This would help to alleviate the critical shortage of classrooms in Indiana which William E. Wilson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, says now stands at 3,000 classrooms.

The Thompson bill does not call for any of the Federal moneys going for teachers' salaries as the Senate bill 8, the McNamara-Clark-Monroney bill passed several weeks ago, provides.

Indiana Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS of South Bend, a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, helped to write the House bill.

Speaking of the urgent need for additional sources of funds for needed school construction in Indiana, Robert H. Wyatt, ISTA executive secretary, says that a Federal support must be passed " if we are to avoid a real strangulation of further progress in Indiana growing out of the squeeze play that is now on State and local funds."

He cited the fact that property tax rates in some Indiana communities have passed the $10 mark which means an annual tax payment of over 10 percent of assessed valuation. Prospects for more money from the State are dim, he says, because so many State services are absorbing the money raised by the State gross income tax.

Seven of Indiana's 11 Congressmen have expressed themselves as being in favor of Federal support for schools. Here are their statements following the Thompson bill's release from the House Education and Labor Committee:

MADDEN reiterates support: "I have been a consistent supporter in other sessions of Congress for Federal legislation that will relieve the school crisis as it exists in so many metropolitan and some other areas throughout the United States. In the last session, by reason of the coalition between the Republicans and southern Democratic leaders, we lost the school construction bill by only six votes. I do hope that a satisfactory school construction and salary bill will pass this session"—RAY MADDEN.

BRADEMAS pushes bill: "Because State and local revenues are inadequate to provide the increased investment necessary for American education, I believe we must make use of Federal funds to build more classrooms and improve teachers' salaries.

"I am confident that the McNamara-Clark-Monroney bill will go a long way toward meeting the Nation's needs in education without infringing on State and local control of our school systems"—JOHN BRADEMAS.

ROUSH pledges support: "From the beginning of our country's history the initiative and responsibility for educating our youth has rested primarily with local and State groups. Congress recognizes this, but it also recognizes its own responsibility and, where, in the national interest, the need for adequate and equal educational facilities is not being met Congress should act; and I have every confidence it will act"—J. EDWARD ROUSH.

WAMPLER, exteacher, says: "From the standpoint of personal knowledge and actual experience as a former educator, I have in the past and will in the future give my wholehearted support to legislative proposals designed to aid our Nation's school system, particularly in view of our current and continuing need for high levels of education, skills, and training to fill national defense requirements.

"The bill, S. 8, which provides a $1.8 billion, 2-year program of grants to be matched by the States under a variable formula, and to be used for school construction or teachers' salaries or both, would, in my opinion, constitute meaningful legislation.

"I think the necessity for such legislation can be clearly demonstrated when one considers that the State of Indiana currently is suffering from a classroom shortage of more than 1,500 rooms, has about 20,000 pupils in excess of normal capacity, and approximately 3,000 teachers operating on substandard credentials"—FRED WAMPLER.

Congressman DENTON's support: "I strongly favor legislation providing for Federal help to improve our educational system. In order to meet the Soviet challenge, we must improve our schools. While education is primarily a local responsibility, and must so remain, the States cannot do the job alone. States and localities are already overburdened with taxes. The Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the States in carrying out this important function. Federal help in this area is a necessity if the United States is to continue her world leadership role."—WINFIELD DENTON.

Congressman HOGAN writes: "Increased school enrollment and spiraling construction costs have placed heavy burdens on the shoulders of local taxpayers who are endeavoring to provide the best possible educational advantages for their youth.

"The school construction bill recently reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee will provide much-needed relief to the local taxpayer if amended so that the local community can decide how the funds will be used—either for school construction, or for teachers' salaries, or for a combination of both."—EARL HOGAN.

Congressman HARMON says: "It has long been my opinion that the local communities have failed to have adequate schoolrooms, operation moneys, or adequate salaries for our fine career teachers. I will try my very best to support a bill that will meet the requirements and approval of the very fine people of Indiana. I am hopeful that when this bill comes to the floor of the House, the necessary amendments and deletions will be made in order that the much-needed aid will be forthcoming."—RANDALL HARMON.

Aloha Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, last week six "aloha ambassadors" left Hawaii on a privately financed, 80-day good will mission to the Orient. They were former Senate President Herbert K. H. Lee, Duke Kahanamoku, State Senator Kazuhisa Abe, and their wives.

Before he left, Mr. Lee wrote about the objectives of the trip. I ask unanimous consent that his article, published in the Honolulu Advertiser of April 13, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX ALOHA ENVOYS' GOAL: SHARE SPIRIT OF HAWAII

(By Herbert K. H. Lee)

On the event of our departure, with the many good wishes of our friends, the "aloha ambassadors" were frantically getting their respective business straightened out for an 80-day tour of Asia and India.

At several of the parties, discussions ranged long into the night about the East-West Center—how the people of Hawaii could help make this symbol a reality and whether the "aloha ambassadors" might develop soundings during the tour as what this type of

institution would mean to the countries of Asia.

It was generally conceded that the purposes and objectives of the tour represented a definite manifestation of our people to share the spirit of Hawaii with the peoples of Asia.

I am reminded of our mission:

That the people of America and Hawaii all came from immigrant stock—immigrants who came to America and sought to improve their economic position and obtain religious freedom.

That it will be our job to reveal that America is not a land only of one racial stock but that Americans of foreign extraction battled for the rights of the individual to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

That Americans of foreign extraction fought in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and World Wars I and II. That very fact helped to make Hawaii a State today.

That Hawaii for the first time has established the fact that a majority of its citizens have ancestral ties with Asia—rather than in Europe.

That this is the reason for the spontaneous desire of a group of people to share this understanding of America with a people seeking the same things that the immigrants who came to America sought—the opportunity to advance to the limit of their individual capacities in a free society.

We will expect to find this same desire to exist on the part of one-third of the world's population we will be visiting.

We will be going to countries bearing a mental vision that most of the people of Asia are illiterate, ill-fed, ill-housed and for hundreds of years have been exploited by people with white skins.

The lure of the Communists' utopia propaganda will be compared with the fact of what actually happened in countries which believed such propaganda, as compared with the actual destiny of Hawaii, sometimes in the past called a colonial possession by our opponents.

The records of Hawaii's progress in the field of human relations will be a wonder to all of these people. And it will be our duty to show that America's reality of today was nothing but a dream in the year 1776 just as theirs are today.

These are the thoughts that buzz through our minds as we prepare for our departure tonight by Pan-American jet for Tokyo.

A Legislative Program for the Aging in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of policy adopted by the Public Affairs Committee of the New York Democratic State Committee on January 28, 1960:

A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE AGING IN NEW YORK STATE

One of the more challenging problems of our time is that of an aging population. Facts and figures concerning the increase in the human life span are now well known to everyone. Fifty years ago those who had reached or passed the age of 65 represented only 1 out of every 30 in our population. Today in New York State 1 out of every 10 persons has reached or passed that age, and the proportion of older people is still climbing.

Longer life is now ours, thanks to science and medicine. What is still not ours is disposition on the part of government, and particularly the Rockefeller government in Albany, to do what is necessary to make that life more productive, satisfying and enjoyable. The basic needs of older people are the same as the basic needs of all people. The ability to satisfy those needs by one's own efforts, however, tends to diminish in later life. Government should lend a helping hand if other resources are unavailable.

Older people are faced with problems of income maintenance; employment; health, medical care, and rehabilitation; housing; education and leisure-time activities. It is estimated that about 75 percent of aged couples in New York State have family incomes of less than $3,000 a year; and 65 percent of aged men and 89 percent of aged women incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

An historic beginning in extending the helping hand was made by the Harriman administration. It was a Democratic Governor who made the problems of the aging a central concern of State government by appointing a special assistant to deal with these problems and by establishing an interdepartmental committee, composed of commissioners heading up his departments, to aid him in the task.

During the 4 years of Democratic administration under Governor Harriman, the State of New York became the Nation's undisputed leader in the field of the aging. This leadership was expressed in bold, enlightened programs of legislation; it was exemplified as well in the type of thoughtful, concerned and interested administration without which even the best legislative programs are apt to founder.

Here is a partial listing of the State's new and expanded programs, activities, benefits, and protection for our senior citizens, during the 4-year period 1955–58:

Increase of job counselors for the 45-plus.

Widening of employment opportunities for older workers.

Banning of age discrimination in employment.

State aid for recreation for the elderly.

Nursing home certification.

Establishing new fire and sanitation standards for homes for the aged.

More State aid for infirmary care for the aged.

Extension of rehabilitation services.

Sheltered workshops for the aged.

Improved care of senile psychotics.

Expansion of treatment facilities upon admission to mental institutions.

Research programs in arterio-sclerosis and geriatric psychiatry.

Establishment of a Bureau of Chronic Disease and Geriatrics.

Establishment of an Interdepartmental Health Resources Board.

Improving quality of home care projects.

Physical checkups for old age assistance clients.

Improved facilities for teaching rehabilitation in medical schools.

Meals-on-wheels for "shut-ins" at home.

Day-hospital care.

Expansion of cancer reesarch.

Chronic Disease Research Institute, with facilities for screening of patients, and pilot grants to communities in this field.

Nursing home supervision workshops.

Health insurance for State employees.

More low rent housing for the aged.

Limited profit housing program for the aged.

Special exemptions for the aged in eligibility for public housing.

Extension of social security benefits to public employees.

Reemployment of retired teachers.

Public employment of retirees.

Supplemental pensions for civil service and teacher retirees.

Special service retirement for teachers.

Preretirement counseling services.

Special income tax exemptions for the elderly.

The people of the State were led to believe that this record of accomplishment would be continued by the Republican Rockefeller administration. In his annual message of January 7, 1959, his first message on becoming Governor, Mr. Rockefeller declared:

"For older persons advances must be made in programs of employment, retirement income, health, housing, and recreation. The activities of all the departments and agencies of the State government will be coordinated from the Governor's office to help achieve this."

No pledge to the people ever was more highhandedly and unceremoniously broken. The office of the special assistant on aging was abolished. The interdepartmental committee became a pale replica of its former self, whose sole function has been to get out a new edition of a Harriman brochure on State services for the aging and have Rockefeller take credit for all that was accomplished, as he also did in an article in Life magazine. In matters of the aging things were restored to the situation that prevailed under Governor Dewey, when do-nothing was the policy—with one exception. Federal law calls for a White House Conference on the Aging in January 1961, with prior conferences in the various States. Federal funds have been provided the States for such preliminary conferences. Governor Rockefeller is cooperating to the extent of allowing a temporary consultant in the social welfare department to arrange the conferences. In Albany today the dead hand of inaction is guiding the destiny of the aging.

If life and vigor is to be restored to the State government in the field of the aging, it will have to be done by the Democrats, even though a minority in the legislature. It is the Democrats, and they alone, who will have to press a reluctant Republican legislative majority and Governor to act in the interests of the people.

New York is the wealthiest and most productive State in the Union with an outstanding record of past performance and the promise of an even more outstanding record for the future. The deficit-mongers, calamity-howlers, and budgeteers, invoking the principle of "pay as you go" to sanction the illegitimate practice of paying out of current revenues the prospective costs of capital projects in use 30 or even 50 years hence, threaten to stop governmental progress in this State dead in its tracks.

The people of this State and Nation will not be persuaded by these Republican Cassandras—of whom Governor Rockefeller appears increasingly to be one—that America today is faced with potential disaster because of the cost of our public services. Science and technology have given us the tools to create economic abundance. We have the resources to establish a way of life undreamed of in any other period in human history. What is lacking is not the means, but the will, the courage, the imagination and the good sense to find a socially responsible way of mobilizing the great economic abundance now within our grasp. An aging population is a drain on the public treasury only to officials of narrow vision who are unable to visualize the vast contributions to the Nation's health, wealth and even taxpaying capacity that can be achieved from a more intelligent utilization of our human resources among the aging.

The following is the program we recommend as the Democratic legislative program for action in the field of the aging, for

charting a course to break the existing freeze on programs of deep concern and interest to the people of this State:

1. Legislation should be introduced to increase the State job counselors for the 45-plus. While it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide funds for State employment service programs, these funds have not been sufficient to support the necessary State programs for the counseling and special placement of older workers. In 1956 and again in 1957 and 1958, Governor Harriman requested and received additional State funds for these purposes. The additional funds enabled the State to assign 38 older worker counselors to offices in 17 communities in the State.

These specialized job counselors have helped to increase employment for older workers. By 1957, the placements of persons over 45 years of age had risen to 28 percent of all placements. In addition, during the first 6 months of 1957, the special older workers counselors were able to find employment for 2,988 men and women in the "hard core" category, who had suffered long-term unemployment principally because of their age.

Governor Rockefeller withdrew State support of this program in the very first year of his administration. The only specialized placement and counseling programs for older workers in the employment service today are those supported by Federal funds.

As a start, we propose legislation to restore the number of State job counselors and offices that existed in 1958, the last year of the Democratic administration.

2. Legislation to provide State grants to private agencies for experimental research on job placement. Under legislation passed and approved in 1956—and again in 1957 and 1958—State funds were made available to private nonprofit groups for experimental research in such fields as group counseling, placement of retired persons in part-time jobs, and other related projects to aid older job applicants. This legislation has enabled five private nonprofit agencies to undertake pilot projects to aid older jobseekers.

The private nonprofit agencies have been able to provide vocational counselors and placement specialists for these older jobseekers. Projects of community education have been successful in obtaining the support of employers in widening employment opportunities for older workers.

Governor Rockefeller has withdrawn State grants to agencies engaged in these projects, and they are scheduled to end on March 31, 1960. Again, as a start, we propose legislation making possible this important work of job counseling and broadening employment opportunities for older workers.

3. Legislation to provide State aid for sheltered workshops for the aged. In 1956 cities were authorized to equip and maintain "sheltered workshops" established by nonprofit organizations for persons who could not find remunerative work elsewhere because of age or physical handicaps. And in 1957 the State social welfare department helped the city of New York to establish a sheltered workshop for retraining and economic rehabilitation of persons over 40 years of age.

Self-support is vital to maintenance of health and dignity, and economic rehabilitation is the avenue to self-support. As has been demonstrated time and again, money spent by Government for rehabilitation is returned ten-fold in decreased expenditures for welfare and increased tax receipts from the individuals who have become self-supporting.

We recommend legislation to provide State aid for sheltered workshops for the aged.

4. The law enacted in 1958 barring discrimination in the hiring of older workers today is receiving the same unimaginative and lackadaisical attention of the Rockefeller administration that was accorded discrimination on the basis of race, color, and creed by the Dewey administration. New vigor in administering this law is required. In addition, consideration should be given to expanding its application.

We Democrats are opposed to discrimination in hiring; we are just as much opposed to discrimination in firing. Careful study should be given to proposals to outlaw rigid systems of compulsory retirement. Such systems serve only too often as a modern equivalent for age discrimination in firing. They are inconsistent with the principle that a man or woman capable of doing a particular job should not be prevented from doing it by reason of age alone.

5. Legislation to support multipurpose day centers for the elderly. Under legislation sponsored by the Democrats in 1956, cities providing or maintaining approved recreation projects for older men and women as a regular municipal service were entitled to State aid based on a matching formula of $1 for each 10 persons over 60 years of age. Under the program 13 cities initiated or received help for recreational projects or day centers for older persons. In 1958, under Democratic leadership, legislation was enacted to broaden the program to towns as well as cities, and to increase State aid for leisure-time activities from 10 cents to 25 cents for persons 60 years of age and over.

These centers provide a great deal more than mere recreation. They contribute to mental and emotional health by providing opportunities for socializing, hobbies and crafts, and education in new fields. To the limit of their abilities they also provide preretirement counseling and necessary referral services for welfare, housing, and medical care. The relatively small cost involved for the operation of these centers is saved many times over in decreased expenditures for State mental health services alone.

The time has come to recognize the unparalleled services these centers can provide and to set them up as multipurpose day centers ministering to the health and medical care, housing and employment needs of older persons. No public service for older persons can be more important for filling their varied needs in a central setting. At the present time they are required, with rare exceptions, to go hither and yon, under great difficulties and expense, to secure the public services they require.

6. Legislation to provide State funds for the aged who are medically indigent. The State contributes funds for the medical care and hospitalization of recipients of public assistance. It contributes nothing for medical care and hospitalization for the medically indigent—for the most part, older individuals who have been self-supporting except for medical and hospital bills that have reduced them to public relief. At the present time municipalities and volunteer agencies are compelled to shoulder the entire medical and hospitalization costs for the medically indigent older person without even partial reimbursement by the State. This situation should be corrected by appropriate legislation.

7. Legislation to enable the State health department to purchase prescription drugs and medicines in large quantities for resale at cost to older individuals with limited incomes.

The vast majority of individuals begin at age 65 a period of lower income and increased medical need. The cost of present-day prescription drugs is high for almost anyone; it is prohibitive for those who require these expensive drugs day-in, day-out, as recent congressional hearings have brought out.

The Federal Government has provided for its own needs for drugs and medicines by wholesale purchases at considerable discounts from manufacturers. Public assistance and social security involve similarly huge expenditures of public or quasi-public funds. The marketing leverage of these funds in terms of obtaining lower prices should not be wholly lost.

We, therefore, propose that a study be made of ways in which drugs can be made available at lower prices to persons receiving social security benefits or to those whose gross family income is less than $3,000 a year. In this regard the interests of the retail drug industry should not be overlooked, and their cooperation should be sought in determining the best procedure to follow.

8. Legislation exempting assets in the amount of $1,000 to qualify for public assistance. In order to qualify for public assistance in this State an individual must be a pauper or be reconciled to becoming a pauper. He is expected to be without assets of any value. This is unfair and unrealistic, particularly in respect to older individuals who have spent a lifetime in accumulating the few resources they may still have. As some other States have done, New York State should exempt $1,000 of a family's or couple's assets in determining whether they qualify for public assistance.

9. Legislation to provide State aid for home care, day hospitals and rehabilitation for older persons. The Democratic administration of Governor Harriman undertook a series of pilot demonstration projects dealing with older persons in order to determine their feasibility prior to encouraging municipalities to embark on mass programs financed in part by the State. The pilot demonstration projects in home care, day hospitals and rehabilitation were most successful and the time has come to make the services provided to some individuals available to all who are in need of such services.

The purpose of the State aid home care program in Westchester was to provide hospital-type care for residents in their own homes at a cost they could afford, thus relieving overburdened hospitals of patients who could be treated at home. Home Care, Inc., with State funds, provided nursing, medical care, speech therapy, nutrition, family counseling, drugs, appliances, and sickroom equipment. Costs of home care average less than $5 per day; costs in a hospital, $30 or more a day. Even when hospital charges to patients amount to $21 for a bed that costs $30 to maintain, the difference, borne by the taxpayers, is more than home care would cost.

As the day hospital demonstration project in Schenectady showed, day hospital care is also far less expensive than ordinary hospital care and, in addition, provides a needed supplement to overtaxed hospital resources.

Rehabilitation for older persons on public assistance is obviously of tremendous value, both in human terms and in terms of the saving of public funds. We recommend legislation to provide State aid on a matching basis for home care projects, day hospitals, and rehabilitation for older persons. Here again we believe that the expense of such a program would be more than offset by resultant savings in other public and quasi-public expenditures.

10. Legislation to expand cancer and heart research. The Democratic administration of Governor Harriman established a bureau of chronic disease and geriatrics in the State health department, and provided the funds necessary for expanded research in cancer and heart disease, the two dreaded killers in middle and old age. Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo is one of the foremost cancer research facilities in the world; the Chronic Disease Research Institute is a leader in the study of coronary artery diseases. These magnificent State institutions received wholehearted support from the previous Democratic administration, undertak-

ing new programs of research vitally important to the welfare of the people.

We urge that legislation be enacted to assure that these research programs be expanded and developed to the extent practicable, within the limits imposed by the availability of the proper trained personnel.

11. Legislation to provide health and life insurance protection for senior citizens. "In too many cases," Governor Harriman declared in a special message to the legislature in 1958, "persons who have had group coverage before retirement have lost that coverage thereafter, just when they needed it most. Also, in too many cases aging persons with badly needed individual policies had their policies canceled." The Governor thereupon submitted 11 recommendations for legislation to provide wider insurance coverage for our senior citizens and necessary protection from the hazards of cancellation or termination of such insurance. The program would also have eliminated any gap in health insurance coverage at time of conversion and insured a more moderate premium after conversion.

This program was turned down by the Republican leadership in the 1958 legislature (which put through a wholly inadequate substitute), and Governor Rockefeller did nothing to revive it in the 1959 session, although as a candidate he had promised to take action in this area.

Adequate legislation to protect our senior citizens from unfair cancellation and termination of health and life insurance is urgently needed.

12. Legislation to prescribe housing for the aging. Progress was made by the Democratic administration in increasing from 5 to 10 percent the number of dwelling units in public housing for senior citizens and in providing specially designed units with community facilities for congregate activities; in encouraging the setting aside of dwelling units for older people under the Mitchell-Lama limited profit housing program; in liberalizing the income eligibility requirements for low-income aged in public housing projects; and in sponsoring the $200 million housing bond issue ratified by the voters in 1958.

The housing problems of older persons of low or middle income are not receiving the measure fo support they deserve from the Rockefeller administration. Whatever interest there has been is exclusively on dwelling units for older persons in connection with hospital or nursing facilities, and even such facilities have yet to be planned, let alone built. There is a place for such facilities in a rounded and well conceived housing program.

What is more important at the present time, however, are dwelling units for older persons who are able to get around and live as members of the community. It is necessary to assure that housing facilities for the aging be provided within the normal framework of publicly aided housing—both in subsidized and limited profit developments. Wherever practicable, such facilities should include a variety of ancillary services enabling the aged person to live independently in a household of his own— such personal services as homemaking and housekeeping, help with shopping, meals on wheels, and help with heavy cleaning; counseling service for everyday living problems, help in securing part-time employment, recreational facilities, and referral services for placement or for care in nursing homes.

13. Legislation to provide $50 million in State loan funds by State referendum for nonprofit nursing home facilities attached to hospitals and medical centers. A larger proportion of our aged population live to a longer, if not riper, old age; the onset of prolonged infirmity often makes home care impractical, if not impossible. The type of care provided by private nursing homes often leaves much to be desired and the cost of the best care in the proprietary homes is prohibitive to large numbers of older people and their families.

There are 1,245 nursing and convalescent homes and domiciliary institutions in the State with a combined capacity of 53,509 beds. Of these, 14,341 beds are in voluntary nonprofit, 5,671 in church operated, 15,284 in public and 18,213 in proprietary institutions. Of the 1,245 institutions, 963 are of the type usually referred to as nursing homes. Many of them operate in nonfire-resistive structures, many in converted private dwellings, and most have meager bed capacities. It is estimated that the cost of care of 50 percent of their patients is met by public welfare funds. Most of these institutions neither have nor envision the provision of comprehensive medical service or working relationships with their respective community general hospitals and their organized medical staffs. Thus is posed an acute problem for those charged with the care of the chronically ill and aged and the establishment of sound, modern rehabilitation procedures and services.

The Federal Government has sought to meet these problems in the expanded Hospital Survey and Construction Act—the so-called Hill-Burton Act. Unfortunately, the annual allocation for nursing home facilities in New York State has been pitifully small—a little over $144,000.

Voluntary hospitals in this State have expressed interest in nursing home facilities for older patients who do not need the expensive treatment facilities of a hospital and yet are unable to take care of themselves at home. These facilities would be operated by hospitals, with medical and surgical attention always available in event of need. Capital funds for such nursing home facilities should be provided in part by State loans to voluntary, nonprofit hospitals and medical centers, repayable over 50 years.

A $50 million loan fund would provide approximately 7,500 additional beds—by no means all the modern beds required. The provision of these much needed modern beds would serve as a stimulus to raise standards throughout the State, however, and encourage the proprietary nursing homes to provide better services at lower cost.

14. Legislation providing partial reimbursement by State for care of older persons with demonstrable mental symptoms in homes for the aged and nonprofit nursing homes. The average age of the clientele of nursing homes and homes for the aged has gone up considerably in recent years. These institutions now provide custodial care for an ever-growing proportion of our aged population with demonstrable mental symptoms. This service is a function imposed by the deterioration in the mental health of older residents and by the lack of appropriate facilities, public or private, to which they might be sent.

Some of the better voluntary homes and nonprofit institutions provide some specialized care for these people, although there is some risk involved in this where the individuals are recipients of old-age assistance.

The problem of providing adequate facilities for older persons with demonstrable mental symptoms has been complicated enormously by the U.S. Social Security and Public Assistance Act which denies old-age assistance for the mentally ill. State social welfare departments have been reluctant to provide the facilities and services required by these older persons for fear of jeopardizing Federal aid in this category amounting to many millions of dollars.

As far as public responsibilities are concerned, therefore, the situation is as follows: The State is obligated to provide for the mentally ill; the Federal-State-local governments jointly for old-age assistance to the nonmentally ill. The older person who is senile, confused, disoriented but nonpyschotic, who is harmless both to himself and to others—in a word, the older person who is neither sane nor insane but falls somewhere in between—is not provided by law with services or facilities addressed to his needs. All too frequently such individuals are committed to a State mental institution, to the chagrin of family, friends, and committing judge, for want of a more appropriate facility to which they might be sent.

The time has come to implement by legislation the studies made since 1956 by the consultant on services for the aged of the State department of mental hygiene, the substance of which is that under proper safeguards certain types of mentally sick older persons can be properly cared for in community facilities for the aged rather than in State mental institutions.

As one step, the legislature should memorialize Congress to amend the Social Security and Public Assistance Act so as to prevent the loss of Federal funds to States providing treatment facilities for recipients of old-age assistance who might be regarded as mentally ill. For its part, the State has a positive duty of encouraging the development and expansion of such facilities by providing partial reimbursement for care of older persons with demonstrable mental symptoms in homes for the aged and nonprofit nursing homes, and legislation to that end is needed.

15. Legislation to permit more extensive public employment of retirees. Retired State and local employees and teachers are permitted to earn up to $1,800 a year in public employment without losing any retirement benefits if these do not exceed $3,500 a year.

In view of the shortage of trained personnel in many categories, the rise in the cost of living, and the contribution it will make to the health and well-being of older persons, we recommend legislation extending to all retired State and local employees and teachers the privilege of earning up to $2,500 a year in public employment. In the case of both retired teachers and civil service employees, there should be no loss of any retirement benefits upon such employment if benefits do not exceed $4,000 a year.

16. Legislation granting deferred vesting of pension rights for State and local employees. Employees of the Federal Government have been granted deferred vesting of pension rights—that is, even though they have left the Federal service before the normal retirement age, when they reach that age they are entitled to draw a pension from the Federal Government based on their years of service beyond a set minimum of 5 years. Analogous retirement features operate for workers covered by social security.

The time has come to grant similar deferred vesting of pension rights to State and local employees.

The argument is sometimes made that if deferred vesting were introduced, many valuable employees would leave the public service. This problem should be met by the payment of realistic salaries, not by the continuation of a kind of modern peonage.

In order to minimize any sudden fiscal effects, we recommend that deferred vesting be introduced on a gradual basis, with a minimum of 5 years of service, ultimately, for enjoyment of such rights.[1]

17. Legislation establishing a center for human resources development in the State University. The problems of the aging pose a series of complicated practical issues which permit only ad hoc solutions until additional knowledge is developed. We have accumulated a great deal of knowledge in

[1] Following the issuance of this report, a limited proposal for vesting has been made by the Rockefeller administration.—Ed.

recent years, but there has been a lag in making this knowledge available to those who are in need of it, and there is much knowledge still to be developed.

The primary functions of a center for human resources development would be the organization and direction of an interdisciplinary committee for research on aging; the review and recommending of support for research proposals; the stimulation of interest in research in the various units of State University; the securing and channeling of grants from agencies and foundations for research in aging; the provision of advance instruction and training through courses, conferences, institutes, and workshops to those with professional responsibilities in the field of the aging; the preparation of programs of general instruction in human development and aging for nonspecialists, college students and the general public.

There is great need within the framework of the State University for a center devoted to teaching and research in vital areas of human resources development.

18. Legislation to establish a permanent Commission on Aging in the Executive Department. The almost complete cessation of interest in problems of the aging on the part of the Rockefeller administration serves to underscore the need for a formal, permanent State agency equipped to deal with these problems—a State commission on the aging.

Such a commission would operate in a manner not unlike the State Youth Commission in its field. Its primary purposes would be to assist communities in the development of comprehensive plans for meeting the needs of the aging; to channel State aid for planning and other purposes; to promote cooperation among private and public agencies in programs for the aging; to foster educational programs to enable the aging to find productive employment and integration with the rest of the community; to develop a center for the collection of information on all problems of the aging; and to coordinate the activities of other State agencies in the field of the aging.

The need for such a commission on aging is clear. It would provide leadership, guidance, stimulation and assistance to local communities in their programs. It would assure the continued progress and expansion of such programs. It would explore areas of noninstitutional services, such as job retraining, sheltered workshops and adult recreational and educational services, and it would assist in developing these services in communities where they do not exist.

19. Legislation to supplement pensions of retired teachers and other public employees affected by inflation. The postwar inflation has caused acute distress to former teachers and other public employees who retired on fixed pensions many years ago. Supplemental pensions enacted during the Harriman administration contributed to easing the plight of retirees who in many instances were dependent on public relief to make ends meet. There has been no general adjustment of retirement allowances to correct for the ravages of inflation. One-time relatively modest retirement allowances are now in many instances inadequate for basic needs. Legislation should be enacted to supplement pensions of retired teachers and other public employees to correct for the changes produced by inflation by establishing a sliding percentage based on year of retirement.[2]

We submit this as a proposed Democratic legislative program on the aging in the knowledge and faith that it is in the best interests of all the people.

[2] It is gratifying to note that action in this area was taken by the Republican administration in Albany following the issuance of this report.—Ed.

The Mutual Security Program: A Central Pillar of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are now engaged in the annual debate on our mutual security program. This is one aspect of our foreign policy in which the Congress plays an important and direct role. Foreign aid has become increasingly controversial, and some of the arguments in opposition to it seem to be increasingly irrelevant.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a brief but convincing statement from five distinguished Americans, Will L. Clayton, William H. Draper, Jr., Hugh Moore, Lithgow Osborne, and Hans Christian Sonne. These men insist that the Congress provide for the full mutual security program requested by President Eisenhower and they point to the new needs and challenges we confront to sustain their conclusion.

I agree with them when they assert that our mutual security program is an "essential element" in our grand strategy for survival and for peace. It is important to note that these five men speak not only for themselves, but also in behalf of the U.S. signers of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity which was made 6 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement on the mutual security program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the U.S. signers of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity, we urge the Congress to provide for the full mutual security program requested by President Eisenhower.

Six years ago the original 244 signers of the declaration from NATO countries stated: "This is no time for half-hearted measures."

During these 6 years our situation has grown even more critical. Communist capabilities to apply military, political, and economic pressures have been greatly expanded. The future of the Atlantic Community and our own liberties at home depend, in major degree, upon whether the underdeveloped countries of the world maintain their freedom or are forced into the Communist bloc. Progress, and even freedom in the West, cannot continue if the ramparts of the free world crumble elsewhere.

This year of unprecedented negotiations with Soviet Russia is crucial. It is a year in which we must support the strength of our allies and friends, and maintain our forward defenses, not weaken them.

As the report of the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program stated: "The only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch."

The mutual security program has long been a central pillar of our foreign policy. It has been the foundation of the success of NATO. It has preserved, the frontiers of freedom in Asia. As an investment in security it has provided us more defense per dollar than our military expenditures at home. With its predecessor, the Marshall plan, it has made possible the recovery and present prosperity of Western Europe. It now affords our best hope that the newly independent developing countries will remain free.

Crippling cuts in this year's mutual security program would jeopardize all these gains of the last decade. They would undermine the common defense efforts of NATO and reduce the effectiveness of our other defensive alliances. They would weaken free institutions in the developing countries and increase their vulnerability to Communist pressures.

We must all face up to the fact that our mutual security program is an essential element in the continuing effort we are compelled to make to survive as a free nation. Our country must either go forward on the road it has followed since 1947, or retreat in weakness. To go forward effectively in this critical year requires carrying out the mutual security program in full.

WILL L. CLAYTON,
WILLIAM H. DRAPER, Jr.,
HUGH MOORE,
LITHGOW OSBORNE,
HANS CHRISTIAN SONNE,
U.S. Sponsors, Declaration of Atlantic Unity.

David A. Cheavens Marks Quarter Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. David A. Cheavens, son of a Baptist missionary, married to the daughter of one of the most learned Baptist ministers of all time in the Southwest, and in his own right the author of religious texts, has been honored for 25 years of service with the Associated Press.

Mr. Cheavens has been capitol correspondent for the Associated Press at Austin, Tex., in the State Capitol, since 1942. In this key position, his influence on Texas politics, Texas political campaigns, and Texas government has been considerable.

Before going to the Associated Press, Mr. Cheavens worked on newspapers from El Paso, Tex., to New York City.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Dallas Morning News of April 6, 1960, entitled "David A. Cheavens Cited for His 25 Years With AP."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID A. CHEAVENS CITED FOR HIS 25 YEARS WITH ASSOCIATED PRESS

AUSTIN, TEX.—David A Cheavens, Associated Press correspondent at the State capitol, was presented a gold pin Tuesday marking 25 years of service with the Associated Press.

The presentation was made by Gov. Price Daniel in behalf of Frank J. Starzel, New York, general manager of the Associated Press.

Daniel remarked that he thought it was fitting for him to make the presentation to Cheavens since Cheavens gave the Governor his first newspaper job—as reporter on the Baylor University student newspaper. Cheavens reminded the Governor of the salary paid for the reporting job—"you got two passes a week to a second rate movie, but I got a first rate job."

Cheavens has been capitol correspondent of the Associated Press in Austin since 1942. He began covering sessions of the Texas Legislature in 1938 while he was on the Associated Press staff in Dallas.

Before joining Associated Press in 1936, Cheavens had been managing editor of the Marshall News-Messenger and had worked for the Baptist Standard, New York Morning Telegraph, Waco-News Tribune, El Paso Times, and El Paso Herald (now the Herald-Post).

Establishment of a New York State Commission on the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the State of New York on April 12 established a New York Commission on the World's Fair to prepare for the active participation of the State in this exciting and far-reaching international event to be held in New York City in 1964.

The planning and operation of a World's Fair is indeed a difficult and complex endeavor. As each step along the way is completed, the excitment and activity of the fair comes closer to being a reality. I enthusiastically look forward to the 1964 New York World's Fair and am heartened by the progress that is being made towards the fulfillment of this goal.

The establishment of a New York State Commission on the World's Fair is another and significant step in preparing for the fair. I am delighted to call attention today to the setting up of this important commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's memorandum filed with the bill establishing this commission be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 12, 1960.

Memorandum filed with Senate bill, introductory No. 3509, print No. 4461, entitled "An act creating a temporary State commission to prepare for participation by the State in the World's Fair to be held in the city of New York, and making an appropriation therefor."

This administration measure establishes the New York State Commission on the World's Fair.

The commission will prepare for active participation by the State in the World's Fair to be held in New York City during 1964 and 1965.

It is most appropriate that a commission be established at this time to start the necessary detailed planning for an event as important as the forthcoming World's Fair. The fair will make a valuable contribution to the cultural, educational and economic life of the people of New York and, it is to be hoped, will constitute a significant step toward achieving greater international understanding and friendship.

The bill is approved.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Opening the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway for its first year of deep-draft operation heralds a new economic era for the Great Lakes region.

We recall that—even though the Seaway was dedicated about midway in the navigation season in 1959—the trade and commerce expanded substantially.

We realize, of course, that attaining maximum traffic through the great waterway will not be clear sailing.

To the contrary, we can expect problems that will need to be resolved, not only for the Seaway itself, but also in terms of encouraging the expansion of the flow of traffic through the Seaway, resolving pilotage problems, encouraging good labor-management relations, and generally promoting a climate in which the nation can best benefit from its great—and well justified—investment in this significant waterway.

As the 1960 navigation season gets underway, the Nation, I believe, needs to take a realistic look not only at the promises, but also at the problems ahead.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article depicting the outlook for trade and commerce through the waterway in 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, together with a brief statement by myself, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY YEAR MAY BE BIG—THERE IS AN "IF"

The deep draft St. Lawrence Seaway will start its second season Monday amid expectations of a gain in cargo volume * * * "if."

That was brought out Saturday in an Associated Press survey.

Some port spokesmen coupled their predictions of better business with the qualifying "if"—if no labor or other troubles develop.

Some officials speculated that more freight would be carried by fewer ships.

In its first season, the new seaway carried 20,103,767 tons, a big increase, but 5 million tons below advance estimates.

OUTLOOK TERMED BRIGHT

Martin Oettershagen, deputy administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., described the 1960 outlook as bright. He forecast substantial movement of iron ore and grain and an increase in general cargo.

Oettershagen said the trend was toward larger, more efficient vessels. Many small canal boats will drop out of the traffic, he said.

Clusters of vessels at the Welland canal and some ports at times last year caused delays. The salt water ships also found inadequate loading and unloading equipment and shortages of skilled hands at some docks. New facilities and other improvements at some ports, plus a year of experience, should add up to smoother operations this year.

REPORTS FROM CITIES

Here are brief reports from port cities:

Chicago: Maxim Cohen, general manager of the Chicago port district, commented: "If we're not tied up in labor trouble, we should do as well as last year and have a reasonable increase." George Weiss, a steamship agent: "Without question, there will be a further expansion of cargo volume through the port of Chicago."

Detroit: Fewer ships but a larger gross tonnage are expected. Labor relations are stable. Several additional lines will serve the port.

Cleveland: William J. Rogers, port director, estimated volume would be 20 percent higher than last year, provided there were no strikes or other unforeseen developments. Rogers figured that, within the overall increase, there would be more oversea shipping and less domestic cargo.

Toledo, Ohio: Shippers said volume would be heavier. Their estimates of gains range from 15 to 50 percent. The Army Transportation Corps, which has Great Lakes headquarters in Toledo, said it would ship 20 percent more oversea cargo through lake ports. In 1959 it shipped 91,333 tons, mostly vehicles.

Erie, Pa.: Calvin Dingler, port director, predicted that tonnage would be doubled. State of Pennsylvania has appropriated $500,000 for improvements this year.

Duluth (Minn.)-Superior (Wis.): Exporters predicted grain shipments of 125 to 150 million bushels this year compared with 86 million in 1959. General cargo volume outlook is uncertain.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The 1960 navigation season promises to be the greatest shipping year in the history of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes Waterway system.

Dedicated in June 1959, the completed Seaway during its first year of operation experienced greatly increased traffic; oversea traffic stepped up; port incomes jumped; waterfront employment expanded; and, overall, the flow of trade and commerce increased promisingly.

In 1960, traffic is expected to be even greater.

As a sponsor of the Seaway law, I am naturally delighted with the brightened economic outlook created by the deepened, improved and modernized waterway.

In addition to economic benefits, however, we can expect to face serious, though not insurmountable, challenges. Among these may well be: Need for further modernization of port and harbor facilities, including better docks to accommodate ships, equipment for handling incargo, warehouses for goods, and other facilities; hitting the target date of 1962 for deepening and improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels—to bring Wisconsin—and other States west of Lake Erie, the full benefit of deep-sea shipping as early as possible; dovetailing water traffic with highway, rail and air transportation systems—to assure expeditious handling of traffic; searching for new markets for the products of our farms and factories to better utilize this less-expensive trade route to

the world; encouraging cooperation between labor and shipping interests—so as to stimulate, not handicap—the expansion of trade. Why? To create more jobs, as well as economic health; and finally, we need to be alert to head off efforts to kill off the Seaway by its long-time enemies—who have special interests elsewhere in the country.

Overall, the challenge is great. However, the promise of reward is even greater.

If we vigorously, practically, and creatively carry forward constructive efforts to resolve the problems, the economic benefits—I am confident—will prove the Seaway a sound investment for the American people.

County ASC Employees Are Entitled to Full Benefits of Federal Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. T. Norris, of Marks, Miss., is president of the National Association of County ASC Employees. He is doing an excellent job in behalf of this new organization.

Under unanimous consent I include his recent testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The House of Representatives must not fail to give the county ASC employees all the benefits of other Federal agricultural employees.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, APRIL 12, 1960, C. T. NORRIS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is C. T. Norris. I am the county office manager of the Quitman County (Miss.) Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Office. I am also president of the National Association of County Office Employees. This organization represents the employees of county offices in 44 States, comprising over 95 percent of the county office employees in the United States, in matters concerning general welfare of these employees. It is in this capacity that I appear before you here today.

Our concern for the welfare of county office employees is of long duration. I have been a county office employee for over 22 years and I believe that I am entitled to be recognized as a Federal worker. It is for this reason that we ask this committee to so recognize all Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Office Employees as Federal employees and so designate them in the language of your H.R. 9–833 or whatever bill adopted.

In order to show you why we are so absolutely convinced that we are fully Federal workers and therefore should be recognized as Federal employees for purposes of pay raises for Federal employees, for retirement purposes, and for low-cost Government life insurance and health insurance, my colleagues and I would like to familiarize you with the background of the working conditions of county office managers and other employees. We think this is particularly pertinent in view of a past report to your committee by the Civil Service Commission, which report we in no way agree with.

To begin with, we say that we substantially meet the three guide rules laid down by the Civil Service Commission for Federal employees. The only area in which we do not meet this would be in employment by the local county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee who are not recognized as Federal officers, even though they sign an oath of office the same as you do. Even so, they cannot hire an office manager who is not approved by the State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation personnel (Federal officers) and one who meets the employment requirements as set out in State and National instructions.

We do meet the other two requirements because:

(1) We are under the direct supervision of State office employees. A farmer fieldman visits county offices at regular intervals to review and help plan and direct the county office work. State office reviewers, or auditors, make regular visits to county offices to determine the adequacy of county office operations and to recommend the necessary corrective action if deficiencies are found. CSS auditors visit county offices at least once a year to determine the correctness of its operation. All work instructions and regulations are forwarded by State ASC offices for county offices to follow. Certainly this constitutes supervision and direction of a Federal officer.

(2) The third item used by the Civil Service Commission to determine a Federal employee is whether he is engaged in the performance of Federal functions under authority of an act of Congress.

Gentlemen, attached to the back of your copy of this testimony is a picture of county office instructions which I, as a county office manager, must follow to the dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t." The first four of these books cover our administrative work such as management standards; county administrative handbook, secretary's regulations, and incentive award handbook, all issued by USDA, CSS; and the Mississippi State ASC office instructions. The fifth book covers fiscal operations; the next three books cover the agricultural conservation program. The next two cover the farm storage facility loan program and the next four cover the various marketing quota and acreage allotment programs enacted by act of Congress. The 15th book covers determination of performance on allotment programs. The next eight books cover the various price support programs authorized by Congress; and the last three books cover the soil bank program. Gentlemen, there are approximately 3,750 pages in these 25 books which my clerks and I must be so thoroughly familiar with that we can answer questions of our farmers without going to the book, and yet be right so that the programs authorized by Congress may be properly carried out. All of these program functions were authorized by Congress or by an Executive order. Those are all of the instructions we have. We do no other work than that authorized by you or an Executive order and whenever a new action program is authorized by Congress it usually winds up in the county ASC office for administration.

To further show the direction of our activities by a Federal officer let me point out the following examples:

Book 1 states that it is the responsibility of the county office manager to see that programs are carried out effectively and efficiently, to keep the committee informed on program development and the operation of the county office; advise the State office of budget needs; to see that funds are properly safeguarded and accounted for; to see that fiscal records are carefully and accurately prepared and maintained; that the office is efficiently organized; to hire, train, and properly supervise good employees; for seeing that farmers and others receive necessary information about programs; for seeing that the public is dealt with fairly, understandingly, and courteously; for making sure that reports are accurate and on time; that Federal and State procedures are properly maintained; that files and records are kept in accordance with a system prescribed by the State office; for seeing that the extension agent, SCS technician, Forestry Service representative, and the FHA county supervisor are adequately informed about ASC programs (incidentally these are all recognized as Federal employees and the instructions for operation of all of their programs combined are not one-half those shown here). These instructions further require that county office employees should, of course, strive to build a high degree of public confidence in the county office and the programs authorized by act of Congress. The county office manager is also responsible for properly receiving, accounting for, and disposing of all Federal funds, including negotiable instruments, coming into custody of the county office. In Mississippi, county office manager applicants must have completed 4 years of study in a recognized college or university unless waived for demonstrated ability and experience requirement.

Book 16 states that the county office manager, or an employee designated by him in writing, shall approve all CCC loans, purchase agreements, loan repayments, loan settlements, and all forms and documents involved in the loan program. He also has the responsibility for issuing certificates of interest and sight drafts on Federal Reserve Banks. This, plus additional responsibilities for this program too voluminous to detail here. We disburse millions of dollars of Federal funds under this Federal function.

One of the most recent agriculture acts of this Congress was Public Law 86–80, making nonrecourse price support available to any person in excess of $50,000 on any designated 1960 field crop only if it is found he has made the necessary reduction in the acreage devoted to the commodity to qualify. The operating procedure issued by USDA, CSS, for this program is referred to as 5–PS(60) and states "the county office manager in the county in which an application is filed shall be responsible for fully explaining the provisions applicable to the exemption, for providing application forms upon request, for assisting a producer in his application; for the determination, review, and approval of the data within his applicable county, and for distributing the forms in accordance with the applicable instructions."

Gentlemen, these are but representative examples of the designated responsibilities and duties of an office manager as outlined in these instructions.

How, then, can anyone say that we do not work under the supervision and direction of a Federal officer, and that we are not engaged in the performance of Federal functions under authority of an act of Congress or an Executive order.

As to our need for the salary increase I would like to point out the comparative salary of other agricultural workers in my home country. I believe these are fairly representative. These workers will get the increase for designated Federal employees if the Congress passes the legislation being considered.

	Per annum
County ASC office manager	$6,450
County FHA supervisor	6,485
County SCS technician	7,080
County extension agent	8,250

I receive as much salary, I'm told, as any office manager in Mississippi. Our work requirements and qualification requirements are as high as those for these other employees. Certainly our responsibility is as great or greater. The requirements of

my family for living expenses are as great. Certainly it appears to me that this committee, out of fairness to our approximately 15,000 coworkers, should put into your legislation a designation that we be considered Federal employees for the purposes mentioned above and stop once and for all time the injustices created by the delay in our pay increase such as occurred 2 years ago when we were delayed for 18 months in getting our increase, resulting in a loss of about $900 for office managers and a corresponding loss to all other ASC employees.

We earnestly petition you gentlemen to consider our plea and grant us equal consideration with other Federal workers. We ask nothing more than to become legitimate members of USDA after 26 years of hard work. Gentlemen, we thank you for your time and when Mr. Payne has presented his testimony we will be glad to answer any questions you may have. Seated in the committee room are the State association presidents from Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Georgia, and California. I am sure they would like to join us in answering any questions concerning this problem.

Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

(Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee in this matter. I am as conscious of the fact that we need a new hospital in northern California as any man present. I have long worked for it. But when these hospitals are constructed, I want to see them located where they will best serve the interest of veterans and for no other purpose. I offer a challenge to anyone to say that the site selected for the hospital at Martinez is the logical one or one that meets this criteria.

I have before me a letter dated March 23 from the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in which he tells me that three times they have investigated this hospital and they find that the Martinez site is not the proper site for it. The hospital presently is located in Oakland and the only reason it was moved to Martinez, which is on the periphery of the district to be served and not in the center of it is because at the time the matter first came up there was an order issued by the Office of Civilian Defense that you could not locate such a hospital in a so-called target area. Oakland, Calif., because of its strategic position, was designated as a prime target area. So were Washington and Cleveland. The restriction has been removed from these cities.

Attitudes Toward Governmental Participation in Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recognized urgency of securing immediate passage of the Forand bill, I would call to the attention of all Members a most enlightening report recently brought forward by Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen. I feel this report provides useful and valuable insights on the way in which Americans as a whole, and residents of a large metropolitan community like Wayne County—Detroit—Michigan, view the necessity of Federal assistance to reduce individual medical costs.

Prof. Cohen headed a select study group in conjunction with the University of Michigan coordinating committee on Medical Care.' This well-documented released a report entitled: "Attitudes Toward Governmental Participation in Medical Care." This well-documented study is the result of careful analysis of data gathered from two recent surveys; one based on a national sample of all U.S. residents 21 years of age or older, and the other based on a sample of all adult residents of Wayne County—Detroit—Michigan. These surveys sought to impartially determine citizen attitudes toward Federal aid to reduce individual medical expenditures.

As a general conclusion, drawn from both surveys, the committee found:

A majority of adults in both the United States as a whole and in greater Detroit favor governmental assistance in the provision of low-cost medical care. In view of earlier research, this finding is not surprising. Several national studies and a 1952 survey of greater Detroit have shown general support for some form of governmental action in the field of medical care.

In summarizing some of the major findings, it is noted that:

A majority of the American people and the residents of Wayne County (Detroit) favor governmental action to help finance low-cost medical care.

Fifty-five percent of all adults in the United States believe the Government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost; 25 percent oppose such action; and 20 percent are not sure or have no opinion on this issue. Stated somewhat differently, of those Americans who express a specific attitude, two persons are in favor of such Government support, for everyone who is opposed.

As compared with the United States as a whole, Detroiters are somewhat more likely to be in favor of the principle of governmental assistance (64 percent). They also are less likely to be unsure of how they stand on the matter, or to have no opinion at all.

A substantial proportion of the American people believe present governmental aid for medical care is not enough.

Aged persons in the United States overwhelmingly favor Government aid for low-cost medical care. Over 6 out of every 10 Americans aged 65 or older favor governmental aid for low-cost medical care.

In the age group 21–34, the proportion is 50 percent. The likelihood of favoring assistance consistently increases with age. It should be noted, however, that the proportion favoring governmental aid is at least 50 percent or more for every age group.

The results for the United States are as follows:

Attitudes toward the principle of governmental assistance

Age group	Favor	Oppose	Not sure; no opinion	Total	Number of cases
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	
21 to 34	50	27	23	100	576
35 to 44	53	28	19	100	485
45 to 54	57	27	16	100	367
55 to 64	56	25	19	100	257
65 and older	63	15	22	100	229

It is significant that the general results presented above are similar to those of an independent survey taken in 1957 by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago in cooperation with the Health Information Foundation. In the NORC study, Dr. Ethel Shanas reported that a majority of aged respondents (54 percent) declared themselves in favor of Government insurance paying doctor and hospital bills; a somewhat smaller proportion (43 percent) of the older population were not in favor of this. Only 3 percent of the sample used in the Shanas research, however, had no opinion on this issue.

Older residents with large medical care requirements clearly would benefit from any governmental program. The relationship between increasing age and increased approval of governmental aid which is discussed above is therefore not surprising. Of perhaps more interest, however, is the absence of this relationship in Wayne County. Detroiters over 65 years old are no more likely than are very young adults to be in support of or in opposition to, the principle of governmental assistance in meeting medical costs. However, since the proportion of all persons under age 65 in the Detroit area favoring governmental aid was higher than those in comparable ages in the entire United States, it may be reasonable to assume that a 60 to 63 percent favorable response represents the effective limit of favorable opinion on this subject. It should also be noted that the proportion without an opinion, or not sure, in the Detroit area was somewhat less than that for the country as a whole.

There is a tendency for political "conservatism" to increase with age in the Detroit area as elsewhere. The substantial proportion of the older groups in favor of some governmental participation in medical care is thus of significance. It indicates that older persons who mighth otherwise favor a smaller role for government in general make an important exception to this principle when it comes to financing medical care costs.

The principle of governmental aid has wide acceptance among the middle socioeconomic groups. Both nationally and in greater Detroit, the "middle class" levels of the population are much more likely to favor than to oppose governmental participation in medical care plans. In fact, majority op-

position to the principle of governmental assistance appears only among those residents of Wayne County whose incomes exceed $10,000.

The Nation's farmers are in strong support of governmental aid for medical care. Nearly two out of every three farmers in the United States state that they are in favor of governmental aid. Farmers are at least as much in support of this principle as are urban workers.

At least three times as many Democrats favor governmental aid as oppose it, whereas only slightly more Republicans favor it than oppose it. The survey points out that political party preference is strongly correlated with attitudes toward governmental assistance in meeting the costs of medical care. Republicans in the Nation and in Detroit are considerably more likely than Democrats to be in opposition to aid. Even among the Republicans, however, the number of supporters of this principle is slightly larger than the number of opponents. But Democrats, either in Wayne County specifically or in the Nation as a whole, are much more likely to approve than to disapprove governmental assistance. It may also be noted that among those with an opinion a rather large minority of Republicans (43 percent in the United States and 37 percent in Wayne County) feel that the present extent of governmental aid in meeting the costs of medical care is not enough.

In explaining the methods employed in making the surveys Professor Cohen's committee pointed out:

The use of terms such as "compulsory health insurance," "socialized medicine," or "socialism," was purposely avoided in the wording of the questions in these surveys. The amount of controversy which has centered on these concepts in the past indicated that their use in a study of this type would not aid in any analysis of the medical care problem. It was noted in the Detroit area study's survey whether or not the respondent used terms such as the above. Fourteen percent of the Detroit residents spontaneously employed the term "socialism" or "socialized medicine" in answering the question. Almost all of those Detroiters who used these labels were in decided opposition to governmental participation.

Moreover, it appears that many Americans simply do not know what the term "socialized medicine" means. In a national poll taken by the Gallup organization as early as February, 1949, respondents were asked what the term "socialized medicine" meant to them. About 40 percent didn't know, gave no answer, or gave incorrect or vague answers. Moreover, of those replying to a question of whether they would approve or disapprove of socialized medicine for this country, nearly as many said they approved it as said they disapproved it.

These data indicate that "socialized medicine" is neither as widely understood nor as widely opposed as its opponents believe it to be.

How the surveys were conducted, the sources of data, questions used, footnotes, tables and relevant statistics are included in this excellent report.

In my judgment, this report demonstrates that the majority of our citizens recognize the necessity of increased Federal aid in reducing medical costs. Our older citizens especially are faced with the specter of failing health, increased need for hospital and medical care just at the time when their earning potential is lowest. Common decency demands we join with the thinking of most of our citizens and act forthrightly upon this serious domestic issue. Let us take the Forand bill out of committee in time for it to be enacted into meaningful legislation before this session of Congress adjourns.

Money, Trade, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, we have good reason to be concerned by developments in trade, money, and economics. There has been kaleidoscopic and rapid change in our entire economic and trade position and posture, and in our international balances and monetary stability. Our gold supply has gravely diminished and huge claims are now pending against it by foreign interests. If these claims should be called at any time, it is estimated that we would have something like $6 billion or less left in our reserve gold supply, or less than enough to serve as a basis for the 25-percent minimum gold cover required for currency in circulation.

Bankers and experts do not believe that foreign countries will withdraw these balances, but the fact that we are operating our economy and our currency system at the sufferance of foreign debtors who could, if they chose, demand payments in gold and cause this Nation some real perplexing monetary difficulties is not reassuring.

Some people are of the opinion that within the next 3 years we will have to devalue the dollar. One European banker, so a reliable report goes, has wagered a case of champagne with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that the dollar will be devalued within 3 years.

If our gold continues to be drained off into foreign hands, that will bring about a situation never seen in America before, not even in the depression, because it would break confidence in the dollar at home and abroad and in the stability of our Government as well.

Some people have suggested that we repudiate further demands for gold payments. Can you imagine what would happen if this great Nation were to repudiate its debts and commitments? This would, in truth, be likely to cause chaos in international exchange the like of which we and the world have never known.

If the Soviet Government decides to cash in on the weakness of our position it could by the judicious use of gold in various foreign markets cause us incredible harm and produce the greatest of confusion, anxiety, and economic chaos.

Can we afford to leave our financial or economic affairs at the mercy of international manipulators?

How long can we continue to conduct trade at the sufferance of the shrewd foreign monetary and exchange experts?

I do not profess to be an expert on monetary questions, but I have given them a great deal of study, and I am genuinely concerned about present trends and believe if they are not reversed, this country could very well face a crisis in our foreign trade, monetary exchanges, and in our domestic economy.

Why is our real export trade falling off? Obviously it is for one understandable reason—because American goods have been priced out of the market by high production costs and also because some cheaply produced foreign goods are flooding foreign markets and have been permitted to come into this country under the reciprocal trade treaties almost indiscriminately.

The country is flooded with cheap goods of all kinds and they have already wrecked great segments of the textile industry and they are well on their way to wrecking other industries.

We are taxed at a higher rate than ever, probably paying more taxes than have ever been paid before in the history of mankind.

We have poured billions of dollars into foreign countries subsidizing trade and adding the tax burdens of other countries to those already being carried by the American people already struggling under a gargantuan and virtually unbearable tax load.

We have not only sent money overseas in huge bundles, we have sent goods of every kind, modern machinery, modern equipment, modern know-how, modern technical services and assistance which have enabled foreign countries to steal American markets in every part of the world and to outcompete domestic industries in the American markets.

While all these fearsome and awesome economic events are taking place we have very conveniently reduced our tariff rates so that they are now 80 percent below what they were 25 years ago, notwithstanding the fact that many foreign countries are drastically excluding or greatly limiting imports of American goods and have resorted to high tariffs, blocked exchanges, import licenses and other harsh, anti-American measures to stifle American competition in their respective countries.

Some of our Massachusetts production industries which were originally the strongest, most enthusiastic sponsors of reciprocal trade treaties and free trade on the theory that their business would be improved are now becoming the worst threatened victims of increased imports. Automobiles, steel, sewing machines, typewriters, and so forth, have now experienced sharp declines in exports and have become net importers.

Some of the so-called sophisticated American capitalist entrepreneurs who set up very costly plants in foreign countries to try to bypass trade barriers have also come croppers and are threatened with the loss of their investments; in fact, their only chance to be bailed out is through mutual aid funds, and that is now their great drive in Washington. I will not mention the large beneficiaries of the mutual aid programs, because in

many respects they are not the peoples of the countries we are seeking to help. They are vested, privileged interests, big banking and related groups in many countries who are infinitely enriched from this multi-billion-dollar handout that has cost the American taxpayer almost $100 billion since World War II.

Automation is a factor, and will be an increasing factor, not only in foreign trade, but in domestic trade. There is unquestionably pressure for more rapid automation in order to compete with cheap imports. Anyone with sense knows that other countries are doing the same thing; that there has been a widespread, wholesale migration of industry skills, techniques, and know-how all over the world as a result of recent policies of this Government; and that any unemployment that comes out of automation is likely to last a long while. The transition period is bound to be attended by mischievous maladjustments.

Subsidies and bounties for foreign marketers, foreign distributors, and foreign producers have been widely placed, and now we are paying the price for shortsighted policies that set up the very competition of which we now complain, and allowed it to roll across the United States like a huge economic tidal wave.

The end is not in sight, let me assure you. If we do not find some way of checking cutthroat foreign competition, the drain on our taxpayers and the various trade, economic, and monetary manipulations that are dissipating our assets, dwindling our gold supplies to the danger point, reducing the prestige and value of the dollar abroad, threatening us with devaluation, we will live to rue the day.

High interest rates here are attracting some money from abroad but here again our own producers, our own businessmen, particularly our small businessmen, are paying the price—because money that should be available in our own loan markets is being sent overseas thus creating scarcities here that have stepped up interest rates causing dislocation and downward trends in some American business and unemployment in the midst of prosperity and plenty. There has been no special aid program for the suffering and unemployed people in parts of our own country.

Now the proposal is to empower GATT in the next 2 years to still further reduce our tariff rates and thus start further complications and worsen the conditions that plague us at present. If we yield to this type of unsound economics we will be cutting our own throats and leaving more and more of our industries, businessmen, and loyal workers at the mercy of foreign cutthroat competition.

This country needs a realistic trade policy that will encourage mutually advantageous foreign trade and drastically check cutthroat trade. In fact, we may not have many more chances to prevent the flow of cheap foreign imports that are destroying American markets and American industry and threatening the jobs and well-being of sincere, earnest and hard-working men and women.

In a word, this country needs to get down to fundamentals. The economic binge of the past 20 years and its frightful hangover of debt, headaches, costs, taxes, upset social and political conditions ought to be enough to convince the average American that it is time to call a halt and get back on the track of sanity.

It is about time we gave more thought and attention to the welfare of our own people and our own country. I think we should put foreign aid on a solid basis that would eliminate waste and extravagance and eliminte the multiple aid that has been spread injudiciously and indiscriminately around the world which as one great American said, "is like pouring money into a rathole and at the same time producing serious and grave economic problems for our economic system."

If we do not cope with these great trade, monetary, debt and wasteful giveaway programs to my way of thinking the American Nation could well face great economic peril before long.

The present situation is fraught with gravest possibilities because if we fail to resist and reverse current social and economic trends, the end of the free enterprise system may be only a question of time.

It is for us now, while the opportunity is at hand, to decide whether we intend to maintain here for the benefit of ourselves and for the world a great, free, liberal democracy committed to the transcendent importance of the individual, or whether by neglect and inaction we will allow conditions to develop here which will usher in and establish the despotic absolutism of totalitarian government and suppress personal liberty for centuries to come.

Undertakers Versus Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 I inserted in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Indiana Funeral Directors Association, Inc., opposing the Forand bill, H.R. 4700.

A few days later I received a telegram from the National Funeral Directors Association stating it has taken no position on the bill and that the Indiana group had acted without contacting the parent organization.

As a part of my remarks I include the following telegram:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 2, 1960.*
Congressman AIME J. FORAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Statements about your bill leave the impression the funeral directors of the country are opposed to it. The National Funeral Directors Association made up of more than 14,000 members objects to this because our group has not and will not take a stand on this measure. As far as we know only one State funeral directors association has opposed your bill. This was done without contacting us. In fact we did not know of the resolution until we read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We hope this telegram makes the record straight.

ARTHUR E. TAYLOR,
National Funeral Directors Association.

Sun-Sentinel Born—Our Aim: To Fulfill Area News Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure Monday to attend a breakfast in honor of a new morning newspaper in the Sixth District of Florida.

This paper, to serve the fast growing area of North Broward-South Palm Beach Counties, actually could trace its origins back 31 years to the establishment of the Gore Publishing Co. by Gov. R. H. Gore, Sr. This company has published the Fort Lauderdale News since 1929 as an afternoon paper, and now adds the Sun-Sentinel as a morning paper to serve the area north of Fort Lauderdale.

At the breakfast Monday Executive Editor Fred Petijohn presented the men who will lead the new paper in the years to come. The list included several whose families have been connected with the Gore Publishing Co. through the years, such as Ted Gore, president of the Gore Publishing Co., and Jack Gore, editor and publisher of the Fort Lauderdale News, sons of R. H. Gore, Sr., and Bob Dickey, son of J. W. Dickey, chairman of the board of the Gore Publishing Co.

Editor Harvey Call pointed out the aims and policies of the new paper and introduced his staff. In a front page editorial in the first edition Monday the editor stated the ideals which will guide the policy of the paper. Because his words reflect the kind of new enterprise we welcome in Florida and indicate the faith in the future held by our people I would like to include his editorial here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUN-SENTINEL BORN—OUR AIM: TO FULFILL AREA NEWS NEEDS

(By Harvey A. Call)

The Sun-Sentinel makes its bow today abounding with ambition to fulfill completely the morning news needs of this fast-growing, dynamic area.

We aim to do that by providing a thorough coverage of local news, happenings of the nation and world, last minute lively sports coverage, reports of business and full stock market lists, the women's interests and all that goes to make up the history of the day.

Anything less would fail to do justice to the varied interests of nearly 100,000 people.

Into this edition has gone the experience the Gore Publishing Co. gained in 31 years of continuous service devoted exclusively to this area.

Every effort has been made to provide a newspaper featuring the very latest news in one complete, orderly package for enjoyable reading.

The Sun-Sentinel is a companion publication of the Fort Lauderdale News which has been providing constantly expanding coverage in this area and will continue to provide afternoon news coverage.

Readers who want to keep abreast of everything that is going on 24 hours daily will find, however, the two newspapers will be entirely independent editorially.

The Sun-Sentinel editorial policies will be formulated at our new quarters, 1530 N. Federal Highway, Pompano Beach, and attuned strictly to the interests of the community.

In the coverage of the local scene, we will provide news and features through our staff of experienced, able reporters, special writers, and editors.

Locally and nationally, we will present reports dealing with all walks of life and philosophies. We will not close our eyes or ears or our minds to things merely because we may not agree, because an idea is new or because of other personal feelings.

In our editorial expressions, however, you will find us adhering to the basic principles that have made America great, ideals that have contributed to its advance and development under a system acknowledging man's dignity, individual freedom, and right of self-determination.

We will present our views entirely as we evaluate the facts in any given instance, and our prime concern will be the interests of our readers, the State and the Nation.

Politically, our position will be nonpartisan as we will evaluate the performance of all officeholders and candidates for public trust individually.

We cannot and will not subscribe to the belief any political party has a monopoly on brains, ability or the exclusive right to represent the people.

We do believe fervently the actions and programs of all public servants constitute news the public has every right to know.

We are cognizant of our responsibilities and alert to the vast opportunities to serve our readers and the communities.

Within these rather broad, general areas, the Sun-Sentinel aims to bring to your door each weekday morning the best newspaper we can put out.

Persecution by Chinese Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the distinguished Secretary of State, our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, and the State Department for interceding so strongly to try to effect the release of Bishop James Edward Walsh who has been sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment by the Chinese Communist regime, and other Americans in a similar predicament.

It is encouraging to note that the State Department has expressed its revulsion about the unconscionable imprisonment of Bishop Walsh and has lodged the strongest possible protest with the representative of the Chinese Communist regime.

Very many people in the Nation and throughout the world will applaud the State Department for the efforts it is making to free Bishop Walsh and his colleagues.

As the Department points out, the rest of the world joins in condemning the action taken against a citizen of the United States and a distinguished member of the Catholic clergy.

It is true as the Department asserts that his only mission was religious, and his personal devotion to the spiritual welfare of his fellow Catholics was so deep as to compel him to remain on the Chinese mainland despite the persecution of his church by a godless regime.

I am pleased to have the assurances that the Department will continue to seek by every feasible means the release of Bishop Walsh as well as the four other Americans still held in prison by the Chinese Communists in violation of the 1955 pledge to free them. As pointed out, these five men are in effect political hostages of the Chinest Communists who refuse to release them regardless of all humanitarian considerations.

I know that a great many people in this country as well as in the world will be thankful to Secretary Herter, Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., Ambassador Beam and other leaders in the State Department for their intercessions and efforts to free Bishop Walsh and his fellow political prisoners being held captive by the Chinese Reds.

Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics has told you about the NASA organization. While it is true that it is a new organization in name it is not in anyway a new organization in fact. The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, its predecessor, antedated the war. It did a great job in the field of aeronautics.

When NASA was set up, its entire organization was transferred to NASA. Then, also transferred to it, was the group at Huntsville known as the Von Braun team. If this team, one of the greatest groups in the country, headed by one of the greatest scientists, the man who developed Jupiter, the first successful missile that we attained, if this team, I repeat, is to be fully utilized to the maximum, you have to give it the space, the tools, and the facilities with which to work. That is what you are denying him when you cut $16 million out of the proposed construction appropriation for NASA. I ask you to consider very seriously the effect this will have upon the program that some people in the United States are critical of because they say we are not moving fast enough. That we should be doing more in overtaking the lead that the Russians now have in this field.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is not the action before us contrary to the recommendations of the committee in considering the authorization bill, and also contrary to the President's budget?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. It certainly is.

Letter to the Editor of the New York Times Protesting Birmingham Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times, in which I point out certain glaring errors, distortions, and exaggerations which appeared in his newspaper in a series of two articles written by Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury last week. Mr. Salisbury's articles were entitled, "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," and, "Alabama Shaken by Racial Issue." These articles were highly inflammatory and I can only come to the conclusion that they were written for the sole purpose of slandering a community of decent people.

No doubt, many Members of Congress read the Salisbury articles when they appeared in the New York Times and, naturally, came to the conclusion that they represented an accurate report of the race situation in Alabama. I urge that all Members of Congress read my letter to the editor of the New York Times, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith, in order that they may see for themselves that the articles are not good reporting but, on the contrary, represent a very severe example of journalistic irresponsibility.

My letter to the editor of the New York Times is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1960.

EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It is shockingly ironic that, only days after the New York Times was selected by certain editors and publishers of the American press as the newspaper which best lives up to the high journalistic standards

set forth by Joseph Pulitzer, the Times should print the purported factual reports by Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury on Birmingham, which two articles constitute, in fact, gross falsehood.

Sadly, there will be those who, because of the generally excellent reputation the New York Times has always enjoyed, will accept the innuendos, half-truths, and totally unrealistic conclusions of Mr. Salisbury as pure truth.

Birmingham is my lifelong home and, with surrounding Jefferson County, comprises the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama which I have represented since 1955. I spend a considerable portion of each year in the city, have visited there quite recently, am in constant touch with friends and family (including the hundred or more constituents who write me daily), read every Birmingham and Jefferson County daily and weekly newspaper consistently, and can state unequivocally that the picture Mr. Salisbury has painted of the community and its racial problem bears no semblance to reality.

I protest most vigorously against such irresponsible reporting and against the practice of publishing such slander against a decent community which is, with sister cities throughout the South, now faced with and working toward the solution of a most serious problem. Surely, the result of Mr. Salisbury's inflaming words can but increase southern resentment against those who have never been sympathetic with the South and its efforts to solve its own problems, and can but harden our conviction that hypocrisy reigns over the minds of many members of the northern press when racial problems are considered. These two articles contain so many statements which are at variance with the facts that it would be impossible to refute each of them in such a communication as this. My pointing out several examples of Mr. Salisbury's fallacious reporting will perhaps serve the purpose.

Given great prominence as an indication of typical Alabama politicians and a typical southern attitude was the example of Adm. John G. Crommelin. Mr. Salisbury states that though the extreme viewpoint of Mr. Crommelin is deplored by many "violent segregationists," it seems to have wider acceptance than many Alabamians will admit in public. Admiral Crommelin ran for Governor in 1958 and in the secrecy of the voting booths only 2,245 persons cast their votes for this man whose views, according to Mr. Salisbury, are typical, out of a total vote of 618,000. Further, in Jefferson County, where Mr. Salisbury would have it believed that he enjoys wide popularity, he received only 218 votes.

Mr. Salisbury claims there are "schemes" in Alabama to undermine the electoral college system to enable electors on the Democratic ticket to vote against election of a Democratic presidential nominee. This is not a "scheme." It is a legal effort and will be put to a vote of the people next month. Eleven electors are running as loyalist Democrats. Eleven are running as States rights Democrats who, if elected, may or may not cast their electoral votes for the Democratic nominee. The people of Alabama, with all the facts available, will vote on these two slates in May. It is not by any means a "scheme." It is a wide-open, hotly debated, completely legal issue to be decided at the ballot box and not, as intimated in the article, by politicians in a smoke-filled backroom.

The article mentions volunteer horse patrols and likens them, through implication, to self-appointed vigilantes. In two or three towns in the State, responsible citizens who own horses have been deputized for a special purpose or situation, but to imply that such a practice is voluntary in the sense of being unwanted, unnecessary, or unconnected with the established law enforcement machinery of the community is incorrect and to state that it is an extralegal device is patently untrue.

Another strange innuendo contained in Mr. Salisbury's article is that local newspapers attempted to whitewash the serious and exceedingly regrettable incident of a young 16-year-old Gadsden boy's attempting to bomb a synagogue and attack the congregation. Newspaper articles did describe the youth as a "clean-cut blond youngster devoted to his parents and his stamp collection," but this was by way of pointing out into which circles the poison of neonazism could reach. The entire Gadsden community has through various and public means made it quite clear that they do not in anyway condone such attitudes and actions and the Alabama press, in toto, has strongly condemned that particular incident and the ideology which inspired it, thus voicing the thoughts of the people of the State.

Mr. Salisbury asserts it is not inconceivable that the whole county structure of the State might be modified in a gigantic gerrymander, or redivision of boundaries, to create stable white majorities in each county unit. May I point out that in New York and other States, congressional districts have been so redistricted as to put incumbents outside the district which they represented. Reasons for gerrymandering an area are numerous and quite often honorable, and most assuredly they always seem so to the people who use this implement. Otherwise, it would not be done.

To imply that Birmingham law enforcement officers have not done everything within their power to apprehend those responsible for bombing of synagogues and churches is slanderous. After the attempted bombing of a synagogue in Birmingham, which was charged to be a part of a pattern extending over a large area, city officials met with those of other southern municipalities and cooperated with Federal officials in an attempt to catch the criminals and to break up any ring which might be sponsoring such outrageous practices. There is absolutely no truth whatsoever in Mr. Salisbury's indication that telephones have been tapped by Birmingham officials, nor in his charge that mail has been intercepted and opened. Especially if the latter were true, as Mr. Salisbury well knows, postal authorities would be forced to investigate thoroughly and Federal authorities would promptly be called in. If Mr. Salisbury has facts to back up this charge, he should certainly feel compelled to make them known to officials of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Salisbury mentions that Alabama has not reapportioned its legislature since 1901. That is true. But this has nothing to do with the racial issue. Nor is Alabama alone in this failure. This is strictly a political issue in which the rural and now smaller counties refuse to surrender their legislative power to the cities. The problem is not peculiar to Alabama. This situation is acute in many States, including New York.

Many of the examples Mr. Salisbury cites in his arrogant attempt to justify the ridiculous thesis that Birmingham is a "community of fear" are completely erroneous. He mentions a "white pastor" being mistreated at a local bus depot while in the company of a Negro minister and his wife. The incident to which Mr. Salisbury alludes occurred in 1957 when a person who previously was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment for the violation of Federal laws, and who certainly is not a minister of the gospel, continued his history of lawlessness in a professional and preannounced attempt to agitate racial violence by violating local statutes. Mr. Salisbury's references to tampering with the mails must have been confused with this man's conviction on such a charge.

In citing some of the errors of Mr. Salisbury's report, mention should be made of the most glaring error of ommission of many to be noted. He failed for some peculiar reason to state clearly that of the major southern cities which have recently been troubled with "sitdown strikes," Birmingham is practically the only one where there has been no violence whatsoever. Is this not very much to be commended?

To repeat, it is impossible in a letter of this sort to refute all the inaccuracies and misstatements which have been proclaimed as fact to the people who read the Times. It can only be hoped that intelligent persons will not be utterly misled by the writings of a man who has obviously begun with the point he wanted to prove and grabbed up such stories, true or untrue, as he thought would apply to embellish on his preconceived and immediately recognizable intention.

It is also to be hoped that the city of Birmingham will continue, despite such inflammatory attacks, to maintain the peace and order and lack of violence which prevails now, in contrast to other cities, including some Southern communities, and especially, including such cities as New York itself where violence and racial discord are commonplace.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Hospital Aid for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of April 19, 1960, entitled "Hospital Aid for Aged":

HOSPITAL AID FOR AGED

There is now a realistic hope that Congress will adopt a measure to provide some degree of medical help for the aged before its Members scatter to take part in a national election campaign. It is no disparagement of the health insurance proposal to say that it is politically motivated. Support of social security was politically motivated at its inception 25 years ago. Support of most social legislation is politically motivated in the sense that it represents a response to a felt and forcefully expressed national need. Health insurance for the aged is just such a need; and it is high time for Congress to be responding to it.

The response, as is so often the case when some innovation is involved, will be but halfway—for the time being. The Democratic Party leaders in the House and the Senate are apparently willing to provide through compulsory social security taxes for a modified version of the controversial Forand health insurance plan which will cover the hospitalization of retired workers and their dependents. They are unwilling to go so far as to cover the costs of medical or surgical care. Why prepayment of hospital care is less "socialistic" than prepayment of medical or surgical care has not yet been made manifest to us.

Nevertheless, insurance which will take care of hospital costs in retirement years is a giant stride forward, the success of which, we have no doubt, will insure before very long a second stride to take care of the inescapable medical and surgical expenses which are the unhappy incidents of age.

That neolithic lobby of the medical profession, the AMA, insists upon regarding security as synonymous with socialism. For the time being, therefore, the doctors will have to be left out of the health program. They will be obliged to care for the elderly indigent as they have done so generously in the past, without being paid for doing so. And the elderly indigent will be obliged for a while longer to accept the humiliation of this medical philanthropy. But the arrangement will prove so burdensome to both that it is bound to be abandoned.

The Eisenhower administration has still to come forward with a health insurance plan of its own. The President has voiced adamant opposition to any compulsory insurance system. But no other system seems to have any capacity for meeting the national need. If the President chooses to veto a compulsory social security tax passed by Congress, he will furnish just the kind of political issue which ought to be taken to an electorate in an election year.

Ralph A. McAlister, Water Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning the Honorable Ralph A. McAlister, of Nacogdoches, Tex., departed this life. I have lost a good friend, and water conservation has lost one of its most faithful and strongest supporters. To his wife, daughter, and other relatives I express my deep sympathy. I join with his many other friends in mourning his passing. All of us will miss him.

I ask that the accompanying two items from the Daily Sentinel, Nacogdoches, Tex., for April 8, 1960, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

R. A. McALISTER DIES SUDDENLY

Funeral services for Ralph A. McAlister, 58, of 308 East Austin Street, Nacogdoches, will be held Saturday morning, April 9, at 10 o'clock in the Cason, Monk Chapel with the Reverend Charlie Lamb, pastor of the First Methodist Church, officiating.

Interment will be in Sunset Memorial Park in Nacogdoches.

Mr. McAlister died Friday morning at 3:45 o'clock at his home. Death came suddenly, although Mr. McAlister had felt slightly ill Thursday night and had had a visit from his physician.

Born February 15, 1902, in Woodville, Mr. McAlister was the son of Samuel McAlister and Margaret Ann Young McAlister. He was married May 12, 1927, to Sarah Vaughan McAlister who survives him.

An attorney, Mr. McAlister did prelaw work at Marshall Junior College in Marshall. He attended the school of law at the University of Texas in Austin where he was an outstanding member of the baseball team.

In 1926 Mr. McAlister came to Nacogdoches to begin the practice of law and became a partner of the late Moss Adams.

Shortly after he came to Nacogdoches, Mr. McAlister became interested in water conservation and was one of the founders, a director, and a former president of an organization now known as the Neches River Conservation District. The organization's principal project through the years has been the construction of McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir. The reservoir, which will be the largest man-made lake entirely within the State, is expected to be complete in the next 4 years.

Mr. McAlister practiced with the law firm of Adams and McAlister until 1940. From 1940 to 1943, he practiced alone and in 1943 he formed a partnership with F. I. Tucker. In 1954 Mr. McAlister's son-in-law, Ed Benchoff, was taken into the firm and in 1955 Mr. Tucker withdrew from the firm.

For a number of years after coming to Nacogdoches, Mr. Alister was secretary-treasurer of the Piney Woods Country Club. He was instrumental in many civic enterprises in Nacogdoches, serving many times in an advisory capacity. He maintained a lifelong interest in politics from the view of the constituent.

Mr. McAlister was a member of the State Bar Association and of the Nacogdoches County Bar Association. He was a member of the Methodist Church.

Survivors are his wife, Mrs. Ralph A. McAlister of Nacogdoches; one daughter, Mrs. Ed Benchoff of Nacogdoches; five sisters, Mrs. Floyd Smith of Lohn, Mrs. Hugh Perry and Mrs. J. R. O'Daniel of Forth Worth, Mrs. Don Carnes of San Antonio, and Mrs. Edgar Phillips of Woodville; one brother, Sam McAlister of Woodville; and two grandchildren, Ed Mack Benchoff, 4, and Sara Elizabeth Benchoff, 2, of Nacogdoches.

Pallbearers will be Ed Morgan, Edward Tucker, Jr., Branch Patton, Roy Blake, S. M. Adams, Jr., and Fred Tucker, all of Nacogdoches, and Paul Colley of Henderson.

Cason, Monk & Co. Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

DOTS AND DASHES

(By Victor B. Fain)

He led the way: With the passing of our longtime friend, Ralph McAlister, water conservation in deep east Texas lost the most persistent supporter it has ever had.

If there should be a list of those who pioneered the movement in our area, Ralph's name would have to be right at the top.

He talked for it, fought for it, worked for it, and led the way for saving our water long before such action became popular. He was always from 10 to 20 years ahead of the general thinking on the subject. Passing of the years and adoption of projects and practices which he preached so devotedly proved that.

Probably no other man, living or dead, had as much to do with bringing McGee Bend Dam this close to reality as Ralph McAlister.

Eventually, it would have been built, maybe; but because Ralph took the leadership in the thirties and forties, the project was kept alive and finally overcame the strong opposition which certain interests built up against it. Otherwise, McGee Bend Dam today would still be in the planning stage.

In our mind, McGee Bend Dam and its reservoir of water forever will be a living memorial to Ralph McAlister.

We are glad that he came along in our time.

The Needs of the Nation for Special Education and Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by my friend, Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, at the annual conference of the American Personnel and Guidance Association held in Philadelphia on April 13, 1960. In his address, the gentleman from Indiana comprehensively set forth needs of the Nation for special education and rehabilitation and the work which the Subcommittee on Special Education has been doing to meet these needs. For the past year and a half, I have had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman on this subcommittee, and I now deem it a privilege to draw the attention of this House to his fine address, which follows:

THE NEEDS OF THE NATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION

"No man is an island, entire of itself," said John Donne. "Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

Those of you whose chief responsibility is the education and care of the handicapped will appreciate more than most persons the meaning of the phrase, "I am involved in mankind," for John Donne's lines nobly express the sense of responsibility which the members of a humane and civilized society ought to have toward those who are in some way handicapped or in need of special attention.

Because of my own concern about the general problem which is the subject of our discussion here today and because of my high regard for the man who asked me to be with you, my distinguished colleague of the House Education and Labor Committee, the chairman of the Special Education Subcommittee, CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama—in my judgment, one of the finest public servants ever to sit in Congress—I am pleased to take part in this annual conference of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

CONGRESS RESPONDS TO NEEDS OF HANDICAPPED

As the American people have come to understand that the handicapped have both special needs and special potentials, the Federal Government has responded with programs to meet these needs and potentials. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1920 to help the handicapped who were employable to reenter the labor force. The Social Security Act contains various provisions for handicapped persons. More recently Congress has made possible supplies of materials for the blind through the Library of Congress and the American Printing House for the Blind. The 85th Congress enacted legislation to provide Federal funds for the training of the mentally retarded.

In the first session of this Congress over 100 different bills have been introduced to deal with the problems of one or more of the categories of the handicapped.

Those who deal with the difficulties of the various types of handicapped persons have come to see that many of these groups have similar needs. All of the groups apparently require more trained personnel, more clinical diagnosis and treatment, more educational materials and more research into the causes and effects of the handicapped.

Some of the bills introduced during the 86th Congress have reflected this perception of the similarity of needs and have attempted to fashion one piece of legislation which would meet the more critical requirements of the several groups. The basic philosophy underlying these proposals is that every handicapped person should receive the best possible special education and rehabilitation services in order to be able to achieve the maximum development of which he is capable.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION DEFINED

Let me pause for a moment to make clear what we mean by the phrase, "special education." To quote the recent inventory of services published by the House Special Education Subcommittee, we mean "education for those, who in order to reach full development, may be in need of special services, equipment, facilities, curriculum, and specially trained personnel. The field studied includes all physically and mentally handicapped, emotionally and socially disturbed, and the gifted."

In the same study Congressman ELLIOTT defines rehabilitation as "the restoration of disabled persons to the fullest physical, mental, personal, social, vocational, and economic usefulness of which they are capable."

Although the major emphasis of rehabilitation programs has been to assist the employable, a bill introduced last year by Congressman ELLIOTT and Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, would provide for independent living services to help those severely handicapped persons who may not be able to achieve vocational rehabilitation but who may, by means of the services afforded in the proposed program, achieve a significant degree of independence.

HOUSE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE SETS STUDY ON NEEDS OF HANDICAPPED

In view of the many bills now before Congress and the question of whether a comprehensive approach or piecemeal legislation directed to each type of handicapped was preferable, the House Subcommittee on Special Education last year determined to carry out a special education and rehabilitation study. The objectives of the study were three: (1) To discover the unmet needs in these areas, (2) to review the adequacy of services now available, and (3) to recommend legislation to meet the needs.

Because the subcommittee felt that no individuals were better acquainted with the needs of the handicapped than the people who worked with them, it set up workshops to be held in each region prior to the scheduled subcommittee hearings. These workshops included representatives of public and private agencies, organizations, clinics, and schools from throughout the region who met to consider the various problems of handicapped individuals. The workshop groups then presented their reports on urgent needs and their proposals to the subcommittee at hearings.

WORKSHOPS HELD THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES

The first such workshops and hearings were held in New York City in mid-October 1959. Representatives from throughout New York State assembled for 2-day workshops on the blind, the emotionally disturbed, the gifted, the mentally retarded, people with hearing and speech impairments, the neuromuscular, orthopedic, and chronic handicapped, and those with limited vision. Each workshop group presented virtually unanimous reports to the subcommittee at hearings on the following day.

Since the first hearings in New York City, workshops and hearings for the New England area have been held in New Haven, Conn.; in Atlanta, Ga., for representatives from 14 Southern States; Philadelphia, Denver, San Francisco, and in Portland, Oreg., with a visit to Chicago scheduled for mid-May. I believe you can see that Congress will have the benefit of a nationwide survey.

I should like to devote the rest of my time today to discussing the reports of these various workshops on the Nation's needs for special education and rehabilitation services for our handicapped citizens.

Wherever they have met in the United States, the workshops have consistently found the same problems and the same shortages which are causing heartbreak and despair and the loss of human dignity and self-respect.

Because the workshops studied the needs in the three areas of personnel, services, and research, I shall organize my remarks along the same lines.

NO. 1 PROBLEM: SHORTAGE OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

Without any doubt, the most consistently cited problem during the workshops was the critical shortage of trained personnel. In virtually every geographic area, and in every handicapped category, there is a serious lack of trained teachers, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses, doctors, and clinicians. For example, the New York workshop on speech and hearing impairments reported that there are currently at least 30,000 deaf children of school age in the United States. If the minimal educational needs of these children are to be met, said the workshop, we need approximately 500 specially trained teachers each year. Yet there are only 150 persons training in this field.

The New England workshop estimated a current need in New England for 1,027 additional teachers for those with speech and hearing impairment. The Southern regional workshop reported that in 9 Southern States there were 350 actual vacancies for speech correctionists alone—positions where money and facilities were available but no personnel.

TRAINING FACILITIES LACKING TO PREPARE SPECIALISTS

There are several reasons for this shortage. One is the lack of training facilities to prepare specialists. Workshop after workshop cited the need for additional funds so that our colleges and universities can expand their programs of training to supply personnel.

But the problem is not that simple. In many areas there are facilities and teachers available for training such personnel, but no students apply. The workshops have reported an urgent need for scholarships and fellowships to enable the student to undertake the extra period of training necessary to become a qualified worker in the field.

Yet even scholarships would not be enough, according to the workshop reports. Part of the problem is that personnel available to work with the handicapped are generally untrained in and unaware of the special problems and techniques of each handicapped person. Group after group stated that the social worker or the clinical doctor or nurse or the persons responsible for aid to the disabled were not familiar with the special problems of the blind, the deaf, or the chronically ill, and therefore were unable to give them maximum assistance. The workshops therefore suggested programs of in-service training, short-term intensive workshops, and increased circulation of written material on the needs and problems of our various handicapped groups.

NO. 2 NEED: MORE SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

Perhaps most critically in need of such assistance are our regular classroom teachers who are increasingly faced with severely handicapped children in their schools, and the social case workers, who are often the only persons available for contact with the family of the handicapped person. It was apparent to virtually all participants in all of the workshops held so far that this lack of trained personnel was resulting in overhandicapping millions of our citizens. It seems clear that many persons can be cured completely, and many others enabled to lead more productive lives if only more trained personnel were available to work with them.

LACK OF TRAINED PERSONNEL OVERHANDICAPS MILLIONS

The second and perhaps most obvious general area of need indicated by the workshops was that of services to these individuals. The workshops stated, first of all, that there was a wide range of difference in both the number and the quality of the services available in the different areas of the country. Invariably the urban centers were more adequately served than the rural or semirural communities. In areas of more scattered population the incidence of any one type of handicap is frequently too small to make special facilities economically possible. But even in our urban centers the lack of services from infancy to the aged is critical. Almost every workshop group stated that we need more facilities for clinical diagnosis, treatment, counseling, and assistance to the preschool handcapped child and his family. The New York Workshop on Limited Vision, in describing its own requirements, spoke to the general need of all handicapped children with this statement:

"There is a great need for care finding of infants and preschool children with visual defects. Many ocular defects are easily remediable during early childhood; these same defects may be resistant to all forms of treatment during the rest of an individual's life."

EARLY DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND COUNSELING ESSENTIAL

The groups who work with the blind, the deaf, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded, the gifted, and the orthopedically, neuromuscularly, and chronically handicapped—all the groups—regarded early diagnosis, treatment, and counseling as prerequisites to better education, treatment, and rehabilitation as well as to better mental and emotional adjustment by the child and the family.

The need for increased physical facilities for the handicapped student is equally crucial. Not only is there a lack of trained personnel at this level, but there is an even greater shortage of instructional materials and equipment, and even of information as to the best techniques and approaches to the education of these children.

A CLEAR-CUT NEED: COORDINATION OF VARIOUS TYPES OF AID TO HANDICAPPED

It is perhaps at this point in our discussion that we ought to focus on a need that is clearcut—coordination of all forms of assistance to all types of the handicapped.

In our specialized society there is no one group of workers who can even remotely attempt to fulfill all the needs of the handicapped. Handicapped persons require help from teachers, social workers, medical personnel, and clinical technicians. Unfortunately, in most areas the services of these various groups are in no way coordinated. The duplication of the services of public and private agencies, organizations, and schools means a waste of valuable resources and facilities.

I should also report that there is little coordination in the dissemination of information to these various groups concerning the best means of diagnosis, treatment, education, and rehabilitation of the handicapped. Virtually all of the workshops called for increased Federal, regional, State, and local efforts in improving coordination of existing programs.

Let me speak of another related problem to which the workshops gave considerable attention: The lack of facilities to assist in the difficult transition of the handicapped child from school to the outside world. It is obvious that we must have much closer cooperation in this respect between school counselor and rehabilitation workers. Many groups called for an expansion of sheltered workshops and halfway house facilities

to assist in this transition. The pioneer work done with these two types of facilities has been most promising, but they are only a minute beginning.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION SHOULD INCLUDE MORE OF HANDICAPPED, GIVE GREATER ASSISTANCE

Finally, the workshops gave voice to the feeling that existing Federal legislation should be broadened to include more of the handicapped and to give them greater assistance. Groups already helped, such as the blind, felt that the restrictions placed on aid were too tight and pinned the recipient down to a bare subsistence level of existence. Other groups such as the emotionally disturbed and the visually impaired found that they were generally not included in Federal assistance programs at all.

We have been making considerable progress in rehabilitating those who can potentially be gainfully employed. We have however, woefully neglected the adolescent or the adult who is not capable of working but who can be trained to care for himself and to meet the general needs of living in society, so that institutional care or attendant care in the home is no longer necessary.

We need substantially to increase the services available to every type of handicapped person if we are to realize our hope of helping him to reach his maximum potential.

NO. 3 NEED: MORE RESEARCH INTO PROBLEMS OF HANDICAPPED

The final general area of need cited by the workshops is research. The sense of inadequate effort in this field is represented by this conclusion of the New York. Workshop on the Blind:

"The pressure of meeting basic, rudimentary, educational needs has been so great that little study has been possible."

These research needs are many and varied. First is the need for investigation of better methods of prevention and of early diagnosis of these various handicaps, and publication of the results of such studies. Listen, for example, to this startling statement of the New England Workshop on the Mentally Retarded:

"We feel if the information we already have were disseminated, perhaps 25 to 40 percent of the defects that are occurring at birth could be eliminated."

We also need to study the best methods of treating the actual impairment or handicap itself so that its effects can be minimized. This effort would include the developing of new machinery, new materials, and new techniques, and then bringing these developments to the attention of the public.

We must learn about techniques, methods and philosophies for educating the handicapped child. We must develop and make available appropriate instructional materials.

Research is needed to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the various approaches and techniques used to rehabilitate the adolescent and the adult. Very few studies have been made and very little has been published on many of these methods.

And finally we must begin to gather accurate statistical data on the incidence of the various types of handicaps. At what age do handicaps occur? What types are most prevalent? In what geographical areas are the needs most pressing? There is no accurate statistical data at all with respect to many types of handicaps. In other fields, the relevant information is outdated or incomplete. We cannot adequately prepare to meet a problem when we do not know what the extent of the problem is.

WORKSHOPS HOLD FEDERAL FUNDS ESSENTIAL TO MEET CHIEF NEEDS

In recommending proposals to help meet these three areas of needs, the workshops generally felt that Federal funds were essential in nearly every area. Federal scholarships and fellowships would help more persons to receive training. Federal grants-in-aid are required to enable the schools to expand their existing programs or initiate new ones. Federal assistance would help make possible the in-service training and short-term workshops so urgently called for.

Federal funds are needed to increase the physical facilities of clinics, schools and hospitals. Many groups suggested the expansion of such existing legislation as the Hill-Burton Act to include funds for such purposes. Federal assistance is needed to make educational and rehabilitational equipment and material readily available.

FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR RESEARCH

And finally Federal funds are necessary for research. Many workshops suggested that existing Federal research programs could be broadened to include these fields. They argued that Federal assistance was especially important in the area of research not only because State and local funds were most noticeably lacking here, but also because much of the essential research cuts across lines of specialization—that is, it touches on medicine and education and psychology and other related fields. The Federal Government, it was held, is far more able than any other agency to carry out such collaborative research.

In addition, the workshops proposed that considerable Federal leadership should be offered by the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the National Institutes of Health in investigation, coordination, and publication. Each group felt that either the Office of Education or the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation or both should have a full-time consultant on each of the categories of handicapped people, and should furnish field conultant services to the States and local areas.

Finally a great need was expressed for more State and regional workshops, and for more State and regional cooperation and sharing of scarce personnel and facilities.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF WORKSHOPS

In my time with you today I have attempted to provide you some general indication of the major findings of the workshops conducted across the United States during these last several months to determine what America needs in the fields of special education and rehabilitation.

I have tried to suggest to you what some of your colleagues whose chief concern is special education and rehabilitation believe ought to be done if we are effectively to meet our responsibilities as citizens and as human beings to our fellow-citizens who are in some way handicapped or exceptional.

I have pointed out that there are three areas in which the persons who took part in these workshops believe we stand in most need of serious effort: we need more trained personnel, we need more services, we need more research.

Finally, I have attempted to indicate the appropriate role of the Federal Government in responding to these needs.

AMERICANS MUST HELP HANDICAPPED FELLOW-CITIZENS LIVE IN DIGNITY AND SELF-RESPECT

Those of us who have not ourselves known the tragedy of handicap ought to feel a special sense of concern to help lift the level of life of our brothers in society who are in some way afflicted. If we set both our hearts and our minds to the task, we can, I am confident, use the vast resources of our great country to enable these citizens to live in dignity and with self-respect.

Those of you whose lives are dedicated to helping the handicapped achieve their maximum potential development have the admiration of your fellow-citizens. We must now offer you and the handicapped our fullest cooperation and support as well. For "no man is an island, entire of itself * * *."

New York Times Has Rather Odd Sense of Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, every day this week I have been inserting in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various editorials, newspaper articles, and letters from over the country protesting the vicious slanders against Birmingham which appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, April 12, and Thursday, April 13. These slanders were written by New York Times reporter Harrison E. Salisbury. The first of the two articles was headlined, "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," and the second was captioned, "Race Issue Shakes Alabama Structure." These two articles were gross distortions of the true situation in Alabama and were designed to create an exaggerated and erroneous impression of the situation in our State.

In the article in the Times on Wednesday, April 12, Mr. Salisbury dwelt at length on the deplorable incident at Gadsden, Ala., recently when a 16-year-old boy threw a firebomb at a Jewish synagogue and wounded with rifle fire two of its members. It is interesting to note that the next day, Thursday, April 13, the New York Times, hidden back on page 24, ran three paragraphs, under a minor heading, describing the desecration of a synagogue in Buffalo, N.Y., and threats received by the rabbi.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 18, 1960, issue of the Birmingham News, in which the editors ponder the distinction the New York Times apparently draws between these two similar incidents. The editorial is entitled, "A Rather Odd Sense of Values."

The editorial follows:

A RATHER ODD SENSE OF VALUES

Is desecration of a synagogue in the South a more heinous crime than the desecration of a synagogue in the North?

The Wednesday edition of the New York Times, in an article originating on page one and datelined Birmingham, dwelt at length on the deplorable incident at Gadsden recently when a 16-year-old boy threw a firebomb at a Jewish synagogue and wounded with rifle fire two of its members.

The writer employed the incident to imply that a wave of anti-Semitism is engulfing Alabama and that hatred and bigotry are the way of life in this State. No mention was made of the shock and anger that swept the State following the attack or the reaction in Gadsden, expressed in a community-wide prayer session which overflowed the synagogue.

However, in the Thursday issue, hidden back on page 24, three paragraphs, under a minor head, were given over to describing desecration of a synagogue in Buffalo, N.Y., in the same State in which the Times is published, and threats received by the rabbi.

If we are to accept the New York Times evaluation of news, there must be highly significant differences between desecration of a synagogue in Gadsden, Ala., and a similar incident in Buffalo, N.Y. But whatever the difference is, it escapes us.

For What Avail—If Freedom Fail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the 69th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution convened on April 18, with the opening address being delivered by Mrs. Ashmead White, president general of the organization. This address identified the theme of the congress and issued a call for the preservation of freedom in the American tradition.

Mrs. White, I am proud to say, is a citizen of the congressional district which I have the privilege of representing in the Congress, and because her remarks contain poignant references to the principles of freedom, I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

FOR WHAT AVAIL—IF FREEDOM FAIL?

(By Mrs. Ashmead White, president general, NSDAR)

It is my proud and happy privilege to welcome you tonight to the opening session of the 69th Continental Congress held here in our own Constitution Hall during April's springtime, cherry blossom time in the city of Washington.

We are gathered together for 5 important days and I hope the congress will prove not only an interesting but a happy time for all of us.

Coming as you do from every State in the Union, and from many foreign countries, you represent a great society organized with definite objectives, one of which is "to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom."

Those patriots from whom we are descended had ideals, visions, and a sense of purpose. Because they adhered to these ideals, you are gathered here today.

It is well for us to consider the national and world situation and the existing threats to the ideals underlying the American Revolution. We see those ideals attacked, both at home and abroad, with ever-increasing virulence. It behooves us, therefore, as Daughters of the American Revolution, to support with renewed force and vigor those ideals for which our society stands. To be effective, we must intensify and sharpen our faith in our ideals. To do this, we must study the philosophical basis for that faith. We must understand the theories and tactics of those who would destroy it. We must promote an enlightened public opinion in support of American ideals and institutions.

What are the ideals of the American Revolution? Are they not the firm belief that individual rights of life, liberty, and property, freedom of religion and of the press and the other rights set forth in the Constitution of the United States and the first 10 amendments are conferred upon each individual citizen by Almighty God as the Father of His children upon this earth and that governments exist to carry into effect those individual rights of freedom divinely conferred? This faith of individual freedom is set forth clearly in the Declaration of Independence and is the same today as it was on July 4, 1776.

To protect this individual freedom so dearly won by our forefathers, the Federal concept of a national government of limited powers was devised with specific constitutional guarantees of individual rights protected by independent courts even against the Government itself. Individual freedom cannot long exist without limitations upon the power of government. As President Wilson aptly stated: "The history of human freedom is the history of limitations on the power of government." The process of limitation on the power of government began with the signing of Magna Carta; it came to fruition in the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the first 10 amendments.

The ideal of American individual freedom is essentially a spiritual concept. It sets free the spirit of man to control his own destiny without the control of an all-powerful government. It is not freedom from responsibility, from material want or from the consequences of bad judgment, evil activity or sloth. Rather, it is freedom to plan one's own life, to have the benefit of one's own labor, to enjoy the fruits of hard work, thrift, and personal rectitude. It promotes the best in man and discourages his evil propensities.

It is not by accident that the great enemy of the American concept of individual freedom is communism, based as it is on atheism and dialectical materialism, with rigid control of each individual person by an all-powerful government from the cradle to the grave. That enemy of human freedom now has in bondage 900 million people and is preparing to obliterate human freedom from the face of the earth. It goes without saying that we must study and understand the beliefs and tactics of the Communist conspiracy in order to combat them more effectively.

In addition to the activities of the Communists, however, there are groups in this country which no longer believe in the American ideals of individual freedom. They are willing to give up constitutional guarantees for temporary material security. They are willing to exchange individual determination for Government planning. They prefer Government control and regulation to the free enterprise system. They are unwilling to wait for development by private methods and desire immediate action by the Federal and State Governments to bring their plans into operation. Within the last three decades, these groups have made alarming inroads into the thinking of many Americans. The power and control of Government over the individual is on the increase. This development strikes at the very roots of the American philosophy of individual freedom. We must study and analyze the theories and methods by which these groups operate, on both the national and State levels.

An examination of history, and especially American history, indicates the dynamic quality of human freedom. In less than 200 years it has transformed a wilderness and 13 struggling and bankrupt colonies into the most powerful nation in the world, with more leisure, more wealth, and more opportunity for individual advancement than enjoyed by any nation in the world. In the miraculous success of individual freedom in producing the material comforts of life, we may find the danger to freedom itself. Undue emphasis upon material things, the idea of security at all costs, even at the expense of freedom and justice, may in the end destroy the very freedom which produces the material blessings. As Gibbon, in analyzing the fall of the Athenian and Roman Empires, warns us:

"In the end, more than they wanted freedom they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life and they lost it all—security, comfort, and freedom. When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to society, but for society to give to them, when the freedom they wished most for was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free and was never free again."

The conflict, then, is between the concept of individual freedom, on the one hand, and slavery to the all-powerful state on the other. There can be no compromise in this conflict. One concept or the other must prevail. All that we hold dear is in this struggle. The worship of God, the dignity of man, the material blessings of the free enterprise system all rest upon freedom. The theme of the national society for this year sums it up in a line from Ralph Waldo Emerson: "For what avail—if freedom fail."

The New York Times—"How the Mighty Hath Fallen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, April 17, 1960, issue of the Anniston (Ala.) Star entitled, "How the Mighty Hath Fallen." In the editorial, Col. Harry Ayers, the newspaper's editor, discusses news stories which appeared in the New York Times last week describing in very distorted, exaggerated terms the race conditions in Birmingham, my district. Truly, the "Mighty hath fallen," as Colonel Ayers so ably writes:

HOW THE MIGHTY HATH FALLEN

From time almost immemorial to American journalists of this day it has been the custom to direct the attention of every young reporter to the New York Times as the ultimate authority on good English, honest reporting, and unimpeachable editorial policies.

Those policies were laid down by the late Adolph S. Ochs, the paper's publisher for many years, and to all intents and purposes its founder. He ordered that his paper print all the news that was fit to print "in concise and attractive form, and in language that is permissible in good society."

Moreover, it was the Ochs policy "to give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect or interest involved"; to make his columns "a forum for the consideration of all public questions of public importance, and to that end to invite intelligent discussion from all shades of opinion."

Those are policies that well might be framed and hung on the walls of every newspaper in the civilized world. We felt certain that they would not be violated by the present management. For we had sat beside Arthur Sulzberger, a relative of Mr. Ochs, at his first attendance of the Associated Press annual meeting.

He expressed a fear that the publishers from the South, for some unknown reason, would vote against him as a board member. We assured him that his fears were unfounded, however, as Mr. Ochs had attended many of the meetings of the Southern Publishers Association and was highly admired, as was his paper.

For a long time thence we had no reason to regret the assurance given the new publisher. And when he appointed a native of Mississippi, and one of his ablest assistants,

to become managing editor, we felt more assured than ever before. But in the last few years we have been sadly disillusioned.

For not only has the Times departed from the principles laid down by Ochs, in its news, editorial and advertising policies; but that grand old paper of yesterday which we all loved, has turned its hand against the South for some unknown reason, and has actually violated its ethics in order to punish us southerners.

This about face was made quite evident when the famed Putnam letter to President Eisenhower was submitted to the Times as a matter of public information in relation to the position of this region in regard to the Supreme Court decision of 1954. It even went so far as to refuse the letter as a paid advertisement.

That certainly was not in keeping with the Ochs policies as outlined above, but instead of giving the news impartially, without fear or favor, it was in strict negation of fair play. And in view of the prestige of the Times, other well-known papers, including the Washington Post, likewise refused to present the South's opinion.

It has been the boast of the Times, also, that it practices the highest standards of newspaper ethics even in its advertising columns. Yet, it recently published an ad that was patently unfair to the South and libelous in context. And just last week the paper sent one of its ablest writers down here to defame Birmingham, our largest city.

The gentleman in question is Harrison Salisbury, former Moscow correspondent. He has but recently written a book on Russia that has received considerable attention. We had intended to read it for review in this paper, but after pursuing his articles in the Times we now have been given pause.

There is, of course, a modicum of truth in what Mr. Salisbury has to say in his two page-1 articles, but he stretches the truth to such an extent that it would be difficult to place any credence in anything else he would have to say. Evidently he learned how to lie while in Moscow.

We would not have been surprised if the articles in the famed morning daily had appeared in one of the gum-chewing New York daily tabloids, which are used to exaggeration of the truth; but we believe Adolph Ochs would turn in his grave could he but see what his successors have done to his paper.

Aside from these lapses of the Times, however, that paper and others outside of the South have closed their columns to the Putnam letter and everything else favorable to this region. Hence, the meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors this week in Washington might well disband its committee "On the Right of the People To Know."

Yet in spite of the dereliction of the northern press, Mr. Putnam has decided to print his two letters in book form, with suitable comment. And we agree with him that his second letter was better than the first, as it contains more ethnological reasons as to why the white and the colored races should remain apart in their social relations.

My True Security—The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, checking through our weekly papers, I noticed a reference which was made to an essay delivered by one of the high school girls in my district.

I contacted this young lady requesting a copy of her essay and I received the following letter from her:

JACKSON, MINN., *April 16, 1960.*

ANCHER NELSEN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: I have enclosed a typed copy of my essay which I hope will be satisfactory.

I wish to thank you for your interest in my essay. If it will help to restore even a few people's faith in the American teenage it will be very worthwhile.

Sincerely yours,

CAROL WIDDIFIELD,
Senior Class,
Jackson High School.

After reading the essay, it occurred to me that there is much that all of us could learn from the philosophy represented in the product of this young lady's pen.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this in the RECORD for the examination of the House of Representatives:

MY TRUE SECURITY—THE AMERICAN WAY

About 30 years ago an ugly seed was planted in the sour soil of our depression. The seed grew into a weed sometimes called the insecurity complex. The seed was "suffering" and the weed was "fear." It was, and still is, an ugly and poisonous thing. Fear of failure can cow strong men until they beg for the deliverance of some guaranteed mediocrity. In their search for security men abandon their hopes and destroy their dreams, only to realize that they have lost the very thing which they set out to find. There are many material things in this world which appear to grant security, but true security can come only from self-understanding. You cannot rely upon others for your strength and courage; you have only your God and yourself. A man's real wealth cannot be measured in terms of material things; neither can his true security be measured in terms of wealth. Both should be measured by the faith he has in himself.

This country and the American way were not built upon mountains of gold. Her security is not in her machines, but in the inquisitive, inventive, inconquerable souls of her people—the honest, simple, hard-working people who have placed their faith and self-reliance above all things.

Our forefathers did not come here seeking security as we know it. They sought instead a land in which to build a new nation founded in faith and based upon freedom. They found security in what they gave, not in what they received. They were secure in the knowledge that they had taught their children the way to happiness through their own efforts.

Each successive generation has had its own accomplishments, its own struggles, its own disappointments, and its own security—security, not in receiving, but in giving to America. America is great not because of what she has, but because of what she is and what she stands for.

No other nation has ever given its people religious freedom, civil liberty, freedom of speech, press and security of individual rights in such abundance. "We the people—" states the preamble of our Constitution, a sacred compact binding the dead, the living, and the unborn * * * signed in the snow of Valley Forge—sealed with the blood of the men who gave their lives that this Nation might live. So that men no bigger than you and I might be free.

But this freedom and the security it gives, like all sacred things, is not free; nor is it easy to obtain. We have seen the spirit of the Old World fade away because men traded this sacred freedom for security and eventually—lost both. A man in slavery is secure, but what does this type of security offer?

"Men are slaves," said Berdyaev, "because freedom is difficult; slavery is easy." History is full of people sinking into servitude, because they would not face the hard fight to stay free.

Freedom gives security because we are free, above all, to worship any God we chose, to believe in ourselves and to be as great or as small as we, by our initiative, care to be. Do not destroy your dreams to seek an intangible, unexplainable thing called security. Because this, people of America, is what you have, so long as you have freedom. I feel it is the obligation of every person in America to recognize and preserve this freedom. Because this is our true security—the American way. If this freedom begins to slip away—it is wise for you to remember these words of former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes—"The peril to this Nation is not in any foreign foe—we the people are its power, its peril, its hope."

In Winchester, Ind., stands a monument—atop of which is a Grecian lamp. The inscription on the lamp reads: "Behold, friend, you stand on hallowed ground. For here burns freedom's holy light. This lamp will be kept burning. Always to remind all men that freedom is not permanent unless there are enough keepers of the flame."

The New York Times, the Abolitionist Hellmouths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser on Sunday, April 17, 1960, in which Mr. Grover C. Hall, Jr., editor of the Advertiser, discusses recent actions of the New York Times in printing two scurrilous and slanderous articles about race conditions in Birmingham, Ala., my district. It is urged that every Member of Congress direct his careful attention to Mr. Hall's editorial:

THE ABOLITIONIST HELLMOUTHS

The Commonwealth of Alabama, with its 3 million people, has been painfully and savagely injured by the New York Times.

It is not inflation of grievance to say that the New York Times is misleading the United States and much of the civilized world.

The Times is read more widely and by more influential people than any other newspaper in the world. Not only is the Times heard by the leadership of the civilized world, it serves many American newspapers in syndicate fashion through the New York Times News Service.

One of the newspapers the Times has misled is the Louisville Courier-Journal. The Courier-Journal printed the Times report on race strife by Harrison Salsbury and the frenzied wasps of its afternoon editorial page,

the Louisville Times, swallowed it and denounced Alabama in terms of South Africa—a shockingly superficial and spurious comparison.

With despair is it observed that any list of America's 15 most highly regarded newspapers would have a standard inclusion of the Times and the Courier-Journal.

These papers are owned and guided by dedicated, high-toned gentlemen. The managing editor of the Times is Turner Catledge. He is a Mississippian, a fine person and next week will be elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Harrison Salsbury, the novelist who wrote the series on Birmingham, is a gentleman and a reporter of distinction. The editor debated him once in Chicago and found him winsome, genteel, and rather remotely concerned about race matters.

Barry Bingham, editor and owner of the Courier-Journal, is a man so conscientious that in Asheville once the editor saw him scurry back to put a nickel in the parking meter with only 3 minutes till 6 o'clock. He is as highminded a man in the field of journalism as there is.

The executive editor of the two Louisville papers is a distinguished Georgian, Jim Pope, who will retire in Panama City Beach and who has orthodox Southern views.

The editorial writers employed by Bingham are brilliant but scandalously doctrinaire and dogmatic concerning anything stenciled "liberal." Yet some have Deep South backgrounds and know the truth.

So to say, it is not the systematic abolitionist ragpickers such as the New York Post or Time, the Goebbels memorial news magazine, that have inflicted this painful injury. It is the elite of the newspapers in a stage of dereliction and emotionalism that has done so.

The Advertiser has received no response to its challenge to the Times and members of the committee that signed the lying full-page advertisement about Montgomery. It seems incredible that men of honor could be challenged by a famous Southern newspaper to check the facts and ignore that challenge.

The only response was indirect. A Times editor asked the Times Montgomery correspondent to check the facts. The report went back in the direct quotes of a Negro college president. It made the advertisement out a greater lie than had the Advertiser's editorial.

The Salsbury series on Birmingham naturally went to the outrageous extreme of equating the city with Hitler's Germany.

Birmingham is raw, like any industrial metropolis, and is likewise given to violence; but it is simply untruthful to equate it with Hitler.

Salsbury ignorantly pokes at the independent slate of presidential elector candidates as though it were a stealthy putsch or an attempted Reichstag fire, when as a matter of fact it is a constitutional exercise sanctioned by the Supreme Court. It employs the same election process by which George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and other of our early Presidents were elected.

The explanation here seems to be, considering Salsbury's character and decency, that he won his great distinctions as The Times Moscow correspondent. All of his thinking, we noticed in our debate, is geared to this major experience in his career. It dominates his thinking.

He approached Birmingham as though it were Moscow revisited.

The country has recently seen other Times reporters go sour. A widely publicized case was that of Herbert Matthews, who became the lionized stooge and apologist for Castro and his Cuba.

Government Takes Before It Gives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks the Committee on Ways and Means has been meeting in executive sessions considering amendments to the social security program. One of the issues before the committee involves the question of whether or not a program of medical care should be started within the framework of the Social Security Act.

In the April 25, 1960, issue of Newsweek magazine Mr. Henry Hazlitt in his Business Tides signed signed comment captioned "Age, Needs, and Votes" has made some very well considered observations in regard to the health care issue. As Mr. Hazlitt comments "Security can come only out of production. The policies of the welfare statists penalize and discourage production."

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the Government can give notihing to the people but what it first must take from the people. If we undertake at this time to launch a program of Government paid for medical care, we will be enacting a program that will eventually be a charge on our taxpayers of upward of $20 billion a year. The cost of such an expensive program will have to be paid for by taxes and it is my prediction that the quality of medical care now available to our citizens will deteriorate under the domination of a Government bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include Mr. Hazlitt's editorial comment:

AGE, NEEDS, AND VOTES

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"One of the most intensive and broadly based lobbying operations in recent history has made health insurance for the aged easily the No. 1 issue before Congress this year." So begins a New York Times news story describing the tremendous campaign to promote the Forand bill.

The propaganda and pressure are skillfully organized and timed. They are backed by the Americans for Democratic Action, by Walter Reuther and the Committee on Political Education of the CIO–AFL, by Senator KENNEDY, who has introduced a companion in the Senate to the Forand bill in the House, and by a group of columnists who have begun suddenly and as if on signal to wail and weep in chorus about the plight of the aged. Anybody who doesn't immediately join up is denounced as heartless and cruel. We are back in the revivalist atmosphere of the Townsend plan of 25 years ago—though today $16 billion a year is already being spent on old age and other OASI programs.

THE FORAND BILL

The Forand bill would add hospitalization and surgical insurance to the social security program. It would profess to pay for this addition out of an increase in the OASI tax of ¼ of 1 percent on the employee and ¼ of 1 percent on the employer. Actuarial estimates by the insurance industry are that costs under the Forand bill would range from $2 billion to $2.4 billion for the first year and, by 1980, from nearly $6 billion to more than $7.5 billion a year. This would require a level premium not of ½ of 1 percent, but of 2.32 to 2.97 percent of taxable payroll. Social security taxes are already scheduled to reach 9 percent of payroll by 1969, without any Forand bill, and in later years to soar to 11 to 16 percent of payroll.

These and similar facts were brought out in the brilliant speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24 by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri. At what point, asks CURTIS, will the taxpayers rebel? Some of them are now paying more in social security taxes than they pay in income taxes. The Forand bill has been supported by grossly misleading statistics concerning poverty and need. In any case it would deny benefits to the 4 million aged persons who, through no fault of their own, do not have social security protection.

There are much deeper criticisms,. In 1949, Edna Lonigan, in a pamphlet published by the American Enterprise Association, pointed out how, since 1933, there had been a constant expansion of the concept of the "needy": "A zealous staff in a public-welfare agency can find unlimited opportunities to add to the number of 'needy' families * * * and to the number of 'needs' which must be met by the public through taxes." The last decade with social security "liberalization" in every election year, has confirmed that thesis.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Forand bill is a foot-in-the-door for a complete program of socialized medicine. Walter Reuther testified last July: "It is no secret that the UAW is officially on record as backing a program of national health insurance." After this new aid to people of 65, people of 62 and 63 would want it. Then it would be argued that the medical needs of families with growing children were no less urgent. Finally everyone would be covered.

Socialized medicine is based on compulsory, not voluntary providence. Social "insurance" is a misnomer; individual benefits bear little relation to the individual tax. It is a program for the redistribution of income. The young will have to accept less than they produce in order that the old can get more than they produce. Pressure will build up for reducing an insupportable burden on the young by an inflation that reduces the real benefits of the aged. It is those who today weep most ostentatiously over the plight of the aged who are mainly responsible for the inflation that has already cut the purchasing power of their pensions in half.

"Security" can come only out of production. The policies of the welfare-statists penalize and discourage production. As Bastiat pointed out more than a century ago: "The state is the great fiction by which everybody wants to enrich himself at the expense of everybody."

Congressman Tom Steed Expresses His Views on Greater Opportunity in a Growing Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the committee which has rendered

the most direct service to our colleagues during this session of the Congress is the Special Subcommittee on Problems in the Dairy Industry, of the House Small Business Committee.

The chairman of that subcommittee is the distinguished, able, and friendly gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED.

The current issue of the trade magazine American Milk Review—April 1960—contains a most interesting exclusive interview with Congressman STEED by the American Milk Review's correspondent, Mr. Larston D. Farrar. This interview is so revealing that I am hopeful that my colleague will have time to read it; and it is, therefore, with great pleasure that I include it in the RECORD.

It would be difficult to find a clearer statement of the problem than that given by our distinguished chairman.

GREATER OPPORTUNITY IN A GROWING COUNTRY—NOT TO DESTROY BUT TO GIVE

(By Larston D. Farrar)

LARSTON D. FARRAR. Mr. STEED, in behalf of the readers of the American Milk Review I want to thank you in advance for agreeing to answer my many questions about your work in the dairy industry. We realize how busy you are in your legislative and committee work. We are grateful for this opportunity.

TOM STEED. I am delighted to do it, LARSTON. I feel keenly that the more all of us know about our basic economic problems, the more apt we are to come to agreement on solutions that will be fair and equitable to business and to the consuming public. I am convinced that most of us—and that includes many, if not every one, of our very largest businessmen—want to develop a better America, in every good way, all the time. We want business to prosper and the public to be able to buy at fair prices all the produce of our farms and factories. The problem naturally is how to accomplish these goals. One thing is certain: Sound action comes from sound thinking, which must be based on adequate and reliable information. If we are to find solutions to our problems, we must have more knowledge about them. I congratulate you and the magazine you represent for probing deeply into these issues. I feel that you are fulfilling the function required of a magazine serving a tremendously important industry.

Mr. FARRAR. Speaking of the dairy industry, have you any general statement you would like to make about its problems, and the cooperation—or lack of it—which you have received from the various segments of the industry?

Mr. STEED. As we both know, every American is dependent upon the dairy industry, just as surely as we now are dependent on the automobile, the electricity which powers our homes, and the oil and gas we use in a mulitude of ways each day. Milk is a lifegiving food that is absolutely indispensable to our national good health. The people who raise the cows that give our milk, the companies which distribute it and many auxiliary products which come from milk deserve our encouragement and support. They deserve to make money and to prosper, just as our public utilities, our gas and oil companies, and other industries which serve us vitally deserve to prosper in our capitalistic economy. The charge sometimes is made that those of us in Congress who investigate a particular field have some design other than to strengthen our system. It is not necessary, I think, for me to deny such charges here. We must investigate, in order to build up a body of knowledge so that we can refine our laws in order to keep them in line with the economic realities. We want milk—of course. We want consumers to have milk as cheaply as they can be provided with it economically. But we also want a business community in which there is opportunity for new people to get into business.

More than 60 years ago, when a few companies in other fields unrelated to dairying were gobbling up everything in sight, Congress passed the first of several antitrust laws, designed not to destroy big business or any kind of business, but to give increased opportunities in a growing country to all segments of any business. Certain practices—in other fields—which led to the adoption of those original antitrust laws still are being undertaken, with variations, in distribution of milk and milk products, as well as other food products. If we find that such practices are working against our economic growth, against the development of a diffusion of power among businessmen, and against the long-range interests of the consumer, it is not only our desire as Congressmen to thwart these practices, which tend to promote monopoly, but it is our duty to do so.

The dairy industry today, in a sense, is a very sick industry. I think that I have never investigated one that in many ways, is sicker.

As to the cooperation I have had, it has been all that I, or any Congressman could expect. The gentlemen representing the various segments of the industry we have investigated all have been uniformly courteous and responsive to our desires for information.

Mr. FARRAR. Can you tell us something of the House Committee on Small Business and the makeup of your special subcommittee?

Mr. STEED. The House Committee on Small Business was first a special committee. Several years ago it was made a permanent committee of the House of Representatives. It is in existence because Congress recognizes the need of a continuing flow of information on the various and varied problems of small businessmen in all fields. The committee is not a legislative committee. It cannot report bills to the House for direct action. For that reason, legislation is not referred to it for study. Any legislation which members of the Small Business Committee want enacted must be introduced, referred to another of the standing legislative committees of the House, be considered by those other committees, and reported out by them.

The special subcommittee which I have headed, in investigating the dairy industry's problems, consists of myself as chairman; Representative JAMES C. ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, Representative CHARLES H. BROWN, Democrat, of Missouri, Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York, and Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.

Mr. FARRAR. Just what stimulated your subcommittee's interest in the dairy industry?

Mr. STEED. My first contact with this subcommittee's work began in December 1958, when I interrupted my Christmas vacation at home to lend a hand to the chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, my friend, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas. Mr. PATMAN had scheduled an inquiry into a milk price war in Dallas, Tex., in response to complaints by independent businessmen in that area. Since the hearings were set for December 30–31, 1958, Mr. PATMAN had difficulty finding a committee member available. I attended the hearings as an accommodation to him. Mr. PATMAN was in Texas when the price war flared. He wanted to complete the inquiry on complaints from Dallas before the new session of Congress began in January. We thought at the time that this single hearing would constitute the fieldwork of the special subcommittee.

Mr. FARRAR. What were your original purposes or goals at the time you began your investigation?

Mr. STEED. The hearings had been called because of complaints from small businessmen. These complaints alleged that large distributors had attempted to eliminate small competing distributors through the use of price discriminations, rebates, special allowances, and other unfair trade practices. At the Dallas hearing, we sought to get the facts available about the milk price war as evidence of how abuses can exist, under laws already on the statute books, and how such price wars could prove detrimental to small business. At the time, none of us imagined the long workload ahead for the subcommittee.

Two months after the Dallas hearing, complaints came in from the Kansas City area, relating to a price war that had spread throughout Missouri and Kansas. Again, I agreed to participate in field hearings with Mr. PATMAN, solely because I had become familiar, to some extent, with the problems raised at the Dallas hearings. It was not until after the Kansas City hearings were set that Mr. PATMAN asked me to serve as subcommittee chairman. Pressure of other work prevented him from carrying on. Thus began the chain reaction that has kept me involved in milk price war complaints from Denver to Boston, and many other points in the Nation.

Mr. FARRAR. Have you been surprised at the facts you have uncovered through the 2 years you have headed this investigation?

Mr. STEED. To say that I have been surprised, as we have studied the many complaints reaching us, is putting it mildly. I have been very distressed and dismayed at the widespread evidences of ruthlessness in economic warfare that has swept this vital industry in recent years. Everyone who learns of it must deplore the vicious toll it has taken, especially among the smaller independents. I feel it is a conservative statement to say that the milk industry, in many areas of the Nation, is unstable, chaotic, and upset to a point of economic illness not being experienced by any other segment of our entire economy.

Mr. FARRAR. Just what ground rules did you lay down at the beginning? What or who determines the areas of what you will investigate, or have investigated?

Mr. STEED. We make our investigations only after complaints by local dairies have been submitted to us. These complaints may be made to us directly by mail or by personal visits, or they may be made through the Member of Congress from the district in which the dairy is located.

When we get a request for an investigation, our staff members make field investigations. These are followed by public hearings if members of the subcommittee feel that the situation is of sufficient interest to build up a public record on it for study by the full committee and other members of Congress. The subcommittee confines all its inquiries, during an investigation, to the factfinding level. Particular attention is given to facts that indicate a lack of adequate law, or facts that indicate existing laws may have been violated.

As subcommittee chairman, I have called the attention of the Attorney General to a number of instances in which, my subcommittee feels, the law is being violated.

Mr. FARRAR. What other techniques have you and members of the subcommittee staff used in probing into the economics of the dairy industry?

Mr. STEED. Besides public hearings, the subcommittee obtains a great deal of information by staff inquiries and through questionnaires which we send to companies in areas from which complaints originate. The pricing data studies are of particular interest and importance, I believe.

Mr. FARRAR. What factors determine just where you will conduct a public hearing?

Mr. STEED. Public hearings usually come about in areas in which a number of small businessmen are particularly disturbed, and where it is evident that a public airing of the controversy can be helpful. The public interest is paramount in places where conditions can lead to monopoly and to harmful trade practices, such as curtailment of quality, service and sufficient health safeguards. Price wars never serve to alleviate any of these ills, but rather in the long run, add to them.

Mr. FARRAR. When you do hold a public hearing, are witnesses subpenaed, or do they appear voluntarily, or both?

Mr. STEED. When public hearings are scheduled, witnesses are called both by subpena and by voluntary agreement. Some witnesses, while ready and willing to cooperate by appearing voluntarily, prefer to be subpenaed because of a fear of reprisal if they testify as volunteers. Subpenas also help in providing the subcommittee with company records we deem essential to the studies being made.

Mr. FARRAR. Out of the mass of testimony that your subcommittee has gathered so far, can you discern a general pattern, or patterns? This applies both to complaints and causes of complaints.

Mr. STEED. By and large, milk price wars follow a fairly similar pattern. In almost every instance into which the subcommittee has inquired, the claim always is made that the entry of the gallon glass jug into the market brought about the first evidence of price disturbance. Pressures created by a prolonged oversupply of milk, by the efforts of a new company to break into the market, and by the constant efforts of the large chainstores to increase and expand their share of the market, also show up in almost every case investigated. Only in a few instances did the difficulties involve the distributors in a clash of interest with producers.

Mr. FARRAR. There is a tendency on the part of independent milk distributors to blame the large chain organizations for their troubles. Do you find this to be justified by the evidence you have compiled?

Mr. STEED. The charges by small companies as to the guilt of the large chains in fomenting price wars have never been admitted, of course, by those accused. However, there is an obvious advantage held by the larger companies when price wars break out. So far, we have not been able to find any evidence which would indicate that the larger companies sought to minimize the opportunities that such wars give them, to say the least. Some evidence has been gathered to indicate that the first disturbance arose in retail grocery outlets seeking to use milk as a "loss leader" item, or as a "tie-in bargain" item.

Mr. FARRAR. Just how great a problem—to the independent dairyman—is the private label, or private brand milk?

Mr. STEED. The private brand labels used by many companies do not constitute a pressing problem to the smaller firms, according to what we have learned so far. Fluid milk is sold in many areas under brand names familiar to the local consumer. It is in the field of milk products other than fluid milk that the brand name is used more effectively as a competitive device. This is particularly true of ice cream, cottage cheese, and condensed milk.

The information we have indicates that private label or private brand milk sales for the most part are through the retail stores of some of the largest chain food retailers. For example, Safeway Stores has its private label or private brand milk—"Lucerne." First National Stores, which is a leading chain food retailer in New England, markets milk under its private label, "Brookside." It is obvious that the heavy volume of milk sold by these and other chain food retailers under their private labels reduces the marketing opportunities of individual processors and distributors of milk and other dairy products. However, the information we have also indicates that the total volume of private label milk handled by these few large chain food retailers amounts to only a small percentage of the total volume of milk marketed in this country. It is understood that Stop & Shop, Inc., the second largest chain food retailer in the Boston (Mass.) metropolitan area, is proceeding with plans to market milk under its private label. We do not know how many more are proceeding with similar plans. Obviously, if private label milk should be marketed by all the chain food retailers, independent processors and distributors of dairy products would be shut out of a substantial part of the total milk market in the Nation.

Mr. FARRAR. One of the chief economic and competitive problems in the milk business seems to be sales below cost. There is some difference of opinion as to what cost is, or, indeed, whether it is possible to determine cost for a specific market. Do you have any ideas on this phase of the problem?

Mr. STEED. We recognize that various people have differing opinions about how to determine cost of any particular item, such as milk, in a specific market. Some hold to the view that it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to determine cost. For that reason, laws designed to prevent sales below cost have been challenged as unconstitutional, as being too indefinite, and as making it impossible to express intelligently a lawful course of conduct. Fortunately, we recently have had decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the highest court in a number of the States, dealing with this problem. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association, Inc., et al* (360 U.S. 334), held that the Oklahoma law, designed to prohibit sales at prices below cost, was not too indefinite and was constitutional. Also, within recent weeks, the Colorado supreme court has upheld the law of that State, which prohibits sales below cost. In doing so, the court said that reasonableness must be taken as guide in determining the validity of the standard prescribed by the statute, that cost does not have to be established "with mathematical precision and exactness." The court rejected the contention that it is not possible to allocate costs accurately in industries where accounting is complex.

Mr. FARRAR. The Federal Trade Commission decision in the Ice Cream cases seemed to take the line that trade practices in the dairy industry were not as serious, or as bad, as the independents represent them to be. Does this coincide with the results of your investigation?

Mr. STEED. I'd like to be excused from discussing the findings and decisions involved in pending cases. Therefore, I am refraining from discussing at this time decisions which have been reached in the Federal Trade Commission's Ice Cream cases. I do not hesitate to say that small businessmen in the dairy industry, who have testified before our special subcommittee, have presented evidence about trade practices involving loans, gifts and the practice of providing rent-free cabinets and other equipment by large processors and distributors. It appears from the evidence presented to us that these practices present serious problems to small and independent business concerns in the dairy industry.

Mr. FARRAR. What remedies or corrective measures does your committee suggest?

Mr. STEED. Our special subcommittee has presented two reports to the House Committee on Small Business, both of which were adopted by the full committee without dissent, and submitted to the House of Representatives. Those reports are House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.), submitted January 3, 1959, entitled, "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products," and House Report No. 714 (86th Cong.), submitted July 27, 1959, entitled, "Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry." In those reports the remedies suggested were included in the recommendations made by the special subcommittee. The recommendations included in House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.) were as follows:

1. The Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Agriculture increase and expedite the use of provisions of existing law to bring to a halt the injurious and unfair competitive practices found by this committee to exist in the processing and distribution of dairy products.

2. Congress should enact new legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws and provide relief from the injurious and unfair competitive practices herein found to exist in the dairy industry.

3. Specifically, Congress should enact legislation which would (a) strengthen the antitrust laws by providing that the "good faith" defense of subsection (b) of section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act shall be a complete defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination "unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly;" (b) amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies by providing that violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws; and (c) amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes.

4. The Deaprtment of Agriculture should review the Federal milk marketing orders with a view to taking such action as would be appropriate to remove unjust discriminations in the prices paid by dealers for milk and cream.

The recommendations of the special subcommittee presented in House Report No. 714 (86th Cong.) were to the following effect:

The special subcommittee urges early consideration by the appropriate legislative committee of the Congress of the recommendations of the independent dairymen as contained in the record of hearings to date and the report (H. Rept. 2713, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) of the special subcommittee on small business problems in the dairy industry of the House Committee on Small Business.

These industry recommenadtions, in substance, are as follows:

1. Require publications of prices, discounts, rebates, allowances, commissions, loans, and gifts by all sellers;

2. Prohibit price discriminations which would have the effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly; and

3. Provide for process under the Federal Trade Commission Act for temporary injunctive relief pending issuance of final orders in litigated cases.

These conclusions and suggestions are tentative, but are made at this time in order to get them presented through this interim report for consideration.

Mr. FARRAR. Have these corrective measures been incorporated into proposed legislation?

Mr. STEED. A number of these suggestions and recommendations have been incorporated in proposed legislation. One of the recommendations has been enacted into law. I refer to the last part of the recommendation under No. 3 set forth in House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.), January 3, 1959, for amendment to section 11 of the Clayton Act. This recommendation provides for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders instituted thereunder. The Congress on July 23, 1959, enacted Public Law 86-107 to do what was provided for in that recommendation. A number of additional legis-

lative proposals have been made in keeping with the recommendations I have mentioned. Those additional proposals are pending at this time. They include the proposal to empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders, pending the completion of the litigation in those instances where litigation is prolonged. Bills for that purpose during the last session of this Congress (H.R. 8841, H.R. 8842, H.R. 8843, H.R. 8844, and others) were introduced by myself and other Members of Congress.

On February 8, 1960, Representative PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, introduced H.R. 10235, which provides for a strengthening of the antitrust laws by adding prohibitions against certain types of price discriminations which would have the effect of substantially lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly. Also, Chairman PATMAN introduced H.R. 2215, which would require publication of prices, terms, discounts, rebates, allowances, commissions, loans, and gifts by all sellers.

Mr. FARRAR. What chance do you see for early enactment of any of these bills?

Mr. STEED. I have made reference to the fact that Public Law 86-107 was enacted to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act. It is difficult to predict whether any of these other bills to which I have referred will be enacted before the end of this session of the Congress. I understand that the prospects are good for hearings on some of them.

Mr. FARRAR. Tom, it has been most kind of you to take this time to help our readers to understand these matters, and to be informed as to the situation. I want to thank you again in behalf of them.

Mr. STEED. It has been a pleasure, Larston. I hope that, by thinking on these problems, all branches of the dairy industry can formulate solutions in line with the public good, that will help to ease some of its most pressing problems. We must think of the small businessman, we must think of the consumer, and, above all, we must think of the future, for, as more than one philosopher has pointed out, we are all going to have to spend a lot of time there.

Salute to Marjorie Post May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two newspaper articles which show a wonderful woman, Mrs. Herbert A. May of Pittsburgh and Washington as a woman with a good heart.

I am calling these articles to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people so that they may know Marjorie May for her many civic and charitable interests, and particularly her interest in young America.

The articles follow:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Jan. 31, 1960]

WASHINGTON WONDERLAND—100,000 THANK YOU LETTERS

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Post Toasties Heiress Marjorie Post May is making no comment on rampant rumors that she has willed her fabulous collection of jewels to the U.S. Government for the future adornment of First and Second Ladies.

Her eyes sparkle like some of her own diamonds, however, as she speaks of another of her pet philanthropies that is bringing joy to hundreds of thousands of high school seniors.

"Music for Young America," a project of the National Symphony Orchestra which Mrs. Herbert May underwites to the tune of $100,000 a year, is preparing for its fifth season here in Washington.

The concerts, free to all visiting youngsters, will be held almost nightly between April 21 and May 23, with Mrs. May picking up the tab for the full complement of 86 orchestra members.

PRIZES GIVEN

Schools throughout America are already swamping the Symphony with ticket requests for students who will be pouring into the Capital during the spring tourist season.

They are also busily grooming their most gifted musicians to compete for the "Merriweather Post" prizes which Marjorie awards each May to the three winners in the piano, violin, and cello divisions.

Washington's wealthiest hostess points with pride to more than 100,000 thank you letters she has received from some of the youngsters who have attended the youth concerts in the exotic Pan American Union Building.

She further finds time to take a highly personal interest in the gifted youngsters who have captured the $2,000, $500, and $100 prizes each year since 1956.

TALENTED YOUTHS

Each of the winners, after surviving regional elemination contests, has the unique honor of playing with the National Symphony Orchestra in Washington for the finals.

Thirteen-year-old Abbott Lee Ruskin, a pianist who placed third last year for his performance of Dmitri Kabalevsky's "Youth Concerto," was invited to play with the orchestra in October when Kabalevsky came from Russia to serve as guest conductor.

The excited lad came down from New York, but lacked a first-class piano on which to practice.

Mrs. Post, learning of his plight, promptly invited him to practice at Hillwood, her fabulous establishment overlooking Rock Creek Park which dwarfs all other Capital estates.

"Music for Young America" was the brainchild of Director Howard Mitchell, who figuratively "drooled" at the untapped music audiences every time he saw the hundreds of tourist buses swarming with eager school children from every State of the Union.

"We're muffing a priceless opportunity by not introducing these students to good music," Mitchell remarked at a meeting of the symphony board, as he unraveled his expensive plan.

"I think I'd like to do that," the then Marjorie Merriweather Post remarked quietly, as she excused herself to call her investment counselor."

A few minutes later she returned and announced that she would underwrite the exciting venture.

SHUNS SPOTLIGHT

Understatement is the word for Mrs. May in this Capital where almost everyone else is busily trying to sell himself.

Even her rivals would have to concede that she could effortlessly capture the title of Washington's first hostess, if she cared for the glitter and publicity.

Several times each season she invites a hundred or so of her friends to a square dance—and just about lets it go at that.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1960]

'FIRST WOMAN IN UNITED STATES' PINNED BY B.S.A.—SCOUTS GIVE MRS. MAY PLAQUE

(By Marie McNair)

Because of her many years of personal interest in the Boy Scouts of America, Mrs. Herbert May was guest of honor at a reception yesterday at the Boy Scout Service Center. During the afternoon she received a bronze plaque in appreciation of her generosity to the nationwide organization.

In fact, Marjorie May was largely responsible for the establishment of the service center where the reception was held yesterday.

She also helped to establish and equip a 400-acre Scout Council Camp in Post, Tex., named for her father the late C. W. Post; is actively interested in the Adirondack Boy Scout Council at Saranac Lake, N.Y., and has for years supported individual troop units in the Washington, D.C., area.

The more than 100 guests for the ceremony and reception were mostly Mrs. May's personal friends.

The plaque, unveiled and presented by Dr. Delmer H. Wilson—director of the division of personnel of the Boy Scouts of America—read: "To Marjorie Merriweather Post May, in deep and everlasting appreciation. Scouting's golden anniversary year, the National Capital Area Council and the Boy Scouts of America, April 11, 1960." Expressing the hope that perhaps the tablet will go in "Friendship Walk" a corner of Hillwood's famous gardens, given to her by her friends, "Skipper" Wilson was assured that it would.

Said Marvin Braverman, chairman of the occasion, opening the ceremony:

"This is Marjorie May Day; as we all know one of the most outstanding and lovely women in Washington * * *"

Herbert May sat beside his wife during the presentation and was with her in the receiving line when the party opened. In accepting the honor Marjorie May said she had just been told that she was the first woman in the United States to be given a Scout pin. "I didn't believe it, but now I'm terribly proud."

The Philippine Ambassador and Mrs. Carlos Romulo, Justice, and Mrs. Tom Clark, Mrs. Augustus Riggs 4th who is Mrs. May's daughter; former Italian Ambassador and Mrs. Augusto Rosso and Engineer Commissioner, Brig. Gen. Alvin C. Welling, were in the gathering.

Also, there was Mrs. Thors, wife of the Icelandic Ambassador, who is in New York; Mrs. J. William Fulbright, Mrs. George A. Garrett, Gen. and Mrs. Wade Haislip, Lady Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel W. Bell, Mr. and Mrs. Garfield Kass, Mrs. Wiley Buchanan, Vice Adm. "Jerry" Land, and National Symphony conductor and Mrs. Howard Mitchell.

Mrs. May, who adores flowers, wore a toque of giant yellow and mauve pansies and was pinned with white orchids when she arrived.

Tabulation of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that a Congressman be properly informed on the views of the people he represents. In this connection, a public information questionnaire was sent to

the constitutents of the First Congressional District of Kansas. The following are the results. Approximately 90,000 questionnaires were distributed. They were mailed to every person with a telephone, to all post office boxes, and to all rural routes. In addition, questionnaires were sent to any individual who requested copies for distribution, all colleges and universities in the area, and all groups and clubs requesting copies for the membership.

A total of 7,976 questionnaires or about 9 percent were returned and over 50 percent included a special letter or additional comments.

Questionnaires originally mailed to district addresses were forwarded and returned from many areas outside of the State of Kansas, including such communities as Rochester, N.Y., Washington, D.C., and San Diego, Calif. Even servicemen serving overseas replied. The office is now receiving questionnaires at the rate of approximately one or two per day.

When analyzing the results, consideration was made for the fact that it is difficult to answer some of the questions with a simple "yes" or "no." The questionnaire method has limitations but generally speaking it does reflect the views of the persons in the First District.

If anyone desires extra copies of this tabulation, I will be happy to send such.

I am grateful for the fine response and I hope everyone will continue to write me on matters of interest.

With reference to question 4, asking if an increase of taxes is favored and if so, what taxes, the response by county was generally the same. The great majority suggested either excise taxes or postage rates on third- and fourth-class mail be increased if necessary to balance the budget. As a third alternative some suggested the income tax. In many cases it was suggested that instead of raising taxes a greater effort be made to cut down on needless Government spending in order to obtain additional revenue to balance the budget.

The tabulation follows:

Entire district tabulation

[Percent]

Question	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor a national fair trade law?	33	45	22
2. Do you favor extending the coverage of the minimum wage law of $1?	54	34	12
3. Under existing conditions at home and abroad, do you consider a balanced budget:			
Percent			
Unimportant 3			
Essential 45			
Desirable 39			
4. Would you favor increasing any taxes if necessary to balance the budget?	47	40	13
5. Do you favor curtailing our domestic programs, if necessary to balance the budget?	62	28	10
6. Do you favor cutting defense spending, if necessary, to balance the budget?	37	52	11
7. Do you favor Federal aid to education for:			
School construction?	41	53	6
Teachers' salaries?	27	59	14
Do you think such will result in Federal control of education?	49	38	13
8. Do you think the Agriculture Department should devote more effort in research for the development of industrial uses for farm commodities?	77	13	10
9. Do you favor medical care for social security beneficiaries—to be financed by increased social security taxes?	32	59	9
10. Should cooperatives be taxed the same as other businesses?	77	14	1
11. From the information available, are you satisfied with our missile and space efforts?	40	41	99
12. Do you favor:			
Elimination of all agriculture price supports?	44		
Sliding scale supports from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity?			
Fixed supports at 90 percent of parity or above?	20		13
Graduated parity based on production units from 95 percent down?	10		
13. Do you favor continuing our foreign aid program?	13		
Do you think the program is helpful in our efforts to promote peace?	50	33	17
14. Do you favor G1 educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	49	34	17
15. Do you think the Federal Government should spend more on soil conservation work?	35	58	7
16. Do you favor increasing the interest rate on Government loans to REA co-ops from 2 percent to the average rate the Government pays on its own bonds?	42	44	14
17. From the information available, do you believe this country's defense program is adequate?	75	13	12
18. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you:	57	25	18
1. National defense	5. Labor problems		10. Civil defense
2. Balanced budget	6. Farm problem		11. Federal aid to education
3. Inflation	7. Juvenile delinquency		12. Veterans' benefits
4. Reduction in Government spending	8. Foreign affairs		
	9. Social security		

ATCHISON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	38	22
Question 2	59	28	13
Question 3 [1]			
Question 4	53	35	12
Question 5	58	25	17
Question 6	38	54	8
Question 7	43	50	7
	30	56	14
	41	38	21
Question 8	75	18	7
Question 9	38	51	11
Question 10	84	11	5
Question 11	28	54	18
Question 12	41		
	17		15
	13		
	14		
Question 13	60	29	11
	54	28	18
Question 14	39	54	7
Question 15	33	58	9
Question 16	79	10	11
Question 17	56	25	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Social security.
5. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Juvenile delinquency.
8. Farm problem.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Federal aid to education.
11. Civil defense.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[1] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 49 percent; desirable, 51 percent.

CLAY COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	34	34	32
Question 2	37	39	24
Question 3 [2]			
Question 4	37	43	20
Question 5	67	18	15
Question 6	46	40	14
Question 7	30	63	7
	14	76	10
	52	26	22
	79	8	13
Question 8	16	65	19
Question 9	69	18	13
Question 10	43	31	26
Question 11	45		
Question 12	19		8
	14		
	14		
	48	35	17
Question 13	44	33	23
	21	62	17
Question 14	39	46	15
Question 15	73	20	7
Question 16	65	12	23
Question 17			
Question 18			

1. Balanced budget.
2. National defense.
3. Farm problem.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Inflation.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Labor problems.
8. Social security.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Veterans' benefits.
12. Federal aid to education.

[2] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 46 percent; desirable, 36 percent.

BROWN COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	41	31	28
Question 2	52	37	11
Question 3 [3]			
Question 4	52	43	5
Question 5	66	20	18
Question 6	45	46	4
Question 7	35	58	4
	21	65	19
	52	30	17
Question 8	82	10	8
Question 9	20	78	2
Question 10	69	23	8
Question 11	41	37	22
Question 12	36		
	25		10
	16		
	13		
Question 13	50	37	13
	47	35	18
Question 14	29	60	11
Question 15	36	56	8
Question 16	78	16	6
Question 17	60	19	21
Question 18			

1. Balanced budget.
2. National defense.
3. Inflation.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Farm problem.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Civil defense.
10. Social security.
11. Veterans' benefits.
12. Federal aid to education.

[3] Unimportant, 2 percent; essential, 52 percent; desirable, 45 percent.

DONIPHAN COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	34	30
Question 2	47	46	7
Question 3 [4]			
Question 4	44	32	23
Question 5	60	25	15
Question 6	37	46	17
Question 7	37	54	9
	28	54	18
	52	36	12
Question 8	82	7	11
Question 9	23	65	12
Question 10	73	16	11
Question 11	36	53	11
Question 12	29		
	25		9
	26		
	11		
Question 13	55	29	16
	53	25	22
Question 14	32	52	16
Question 15	51	38	11
Question 16	70	16	14
Question 17	58	25	17
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Farm problem.
3. Juvenile delinquency.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Inflation.
6. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Labor problems.
8. Foreign affairs.
8. Social security.
10. Civil defense.
10. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[4] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 54 percent; desirable, 15 percent.

LEAVENWORTH COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	39	42	19
Question 2	63	30	7
Question 3 [5]			
Question 4	53	45	2
Question 5	57	38	5
Question 6	39	59	2
Question 7	45	53	2
	32	59	9
	47	40	13
Question 8	73	21	6
uestion 9	41	55	4
Question 10	79	17	4
Question 11	41	42	17
Question 12	48		
	19		6
	11		
	16		
Question 13	54	38	8
	50	39	11
Question 14	36	60	4
Question 15	42	47	11
Question 16	76	14	10
Question 17	51	34	15
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Reduction in Government spending.
6. Farm problem.
7. Foreign affairs.
8. Juvenile delinquency.
9. Social security.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[5] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 50 percent; desirable, 40 percent.

MARSHALL COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	48	32	20
Question 2	45	43	12
Question 3 [6]			
Question 4	35	48	17
Question 5	64	27	9
Question 6	38	43	19
Question 7	33	64	3
	16	67	17
	55	26	19
Question 8	76	13	11
Question 9	27	66	7
Question 10	76	16	8
Question 11	48	31	21
Question 12	40		
	19		10
	20		
	11		
Question 13	42	41	17
	38	44	18
Question 14	32	61	7
Question 15	46	44	10
Question 16	65	21	14
Question 17	67	14	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Balanced budget.
3. Inflation.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Farm problem.
7. Social security.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Juvenile delinquency.
10. Veterans' benefits.
11. Civil defense.
12. Federal aid to education.

[6] Unimportant, 6 percent; essential, 56 percent; desirble, 35 percent.

JACKSON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	35	29
Question 2	45	26	29
Question 3 [3]			
Question 4	44	40	16
Question 5	67	26	7
Question 6	38	35	27
Question 7	24	60	16
	19	65	16
	58	27	15
Question 8	85	6	9
Question 9	28	68	4
Question 10	73	24	3
Question 11	48	29	23
Question 12	42		
	15		14
	15		
	14		
Question 13	47	43	10
	44	39	17
Question 14	37	60	3
Question 15	44	48	8
Question 16	76	11	13
Question 17	63	18	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Balanced budget.
3. Reduction in Government spending.
4. Farm problem.
5. Labor problem.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Inflation.
8. Social security.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[3] Unimportant, 2 percent; essential, 55 percent; desirable, 36 percent.

JEFFERSON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	41	36	23
Question 2	42	41	17
Question 3 [7]			
Question 4	50	43	7
Question 5	58	28	14
Question 6	38	51	11
Question 7	39	46	15
	22	58	20
	45	35	20
Question 8	81	11	8
Question 9	26	57	17
Question 10	72	16	12
Question 11	38	39	23
Question 12	38		
	18		17
	16		
	11		
Question 13	45	41	14
	43	38	19
Question 14	30	59	11
Question 15	42	43	15
Question 16	65	16	19
Question 17	59	18	23
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Social security.
6. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Farm problem.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Juvenile delinquency.
10. Federal aid to education.
11. Civil defense.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[7] Unimportant, 3 percent; essential, 42 percent; desirable, 55 percent.

NEMAHA COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	31	29
Question 2	41	45	14
Question 3 [8]			
Question 4	45	44	11
Question 5	66	21	13
Question 6	40	48	12
Question 7	37	56	7
	20	64	16
	52	31	17
Question 8	80	11	9
Question 9	17	76	7
Question 10	63	26	11
Question 11	39	35	26
Question 12	44		
	22		0
	15		
	19		
Question 13	49	35	16
	44	34	22
Question 14	33	56	11
Question 15	46	33	21
Question 16	72	18	10
Question 17	57	17	26
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Labor problems.
3. Reduction in Government spending.
4. Inflation.
5. Balanced budget.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Farm problem.
8. Social security.
9. Civil defense.
10. Foreign affairs.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[8] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 34 percent; desirable, 30 percent.

RILEY COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	30	49	21
Question 2	55	33	12
Question 3 [10]			
Question 4	54	35	11
Question 5	59	30	11
Question 6	40	53	7
Question 7	51	47	2
	34	59	7
	44	43	13
Question 8	79	14	7
Question 9	33	60	7
Question 10	79	14	7
Question 11	35	44	21
Question 12	48		
	23		6
	8		
	15		
Question 13	68	23	9
	62	25	13
Question 14	35	60	5
Question 15	46	43	11
Question 16	79	13	8
Question 17	53	30	17
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Reduction in Government spending.
4. Balanced budget.
4. Labor problems.
4. Foreign affairs.
7. Farm problem.
8. Social security.
9. Civil defense.
10. Juvenile delinquency.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[10] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 32 percent; desirable, 46 percent.

SHAWNEE COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	28	52	20
Question 2	58	31	11
Question 3 [12]			
Question 4	47	42	11
Question 5	63	30	7
Question 6	34	57	9
Question 7	40	53	7
	30	57	13
	50	42	8
Question 8	72	12	16
Question 9	35	54	11
Question 10	85	10	5
Question 11	41	43	16
Question 12	46		
	20		18
	6		
	10		
Question 13	52	35	13
	49	35	16
Question 14	39	54	7
Question 15	40	41	19
Question 16	76	10	14
Question 17	57	28	15
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation
3. Balanced budget.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Foreign affairs.
7. Juvenile delinquency.
8. Social security.
9. Farm problem.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[12] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 46 percent; desirable, 44 percent.

OUT OF DISTRICT

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	35	45	20
Question 2	40	30	30
Question 3 [14]			
Question 4	70	10	20
Question 5	50	25	25
Question 6	20	60	20
Question 7	60	30	10
	40	60	0
	15	60	25
Question 8	75	15	10
Question 9	35	45	20
Question 10	80	5	15
Question 11	40	30	30
Question 12	60		
	5		35
	0		
	0		
Question 13	60	25	15
	60	25	15
Question 14	30	45	25
Question 15	35	30	35
Question 16	65	15	20
Question 17	45	25	30
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Balanced budget.
4. Labor problems.
5. Foreign affairs.
6. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Farm problem.
8. Civil defense.
9. Juvenile delinquency.
10. Federal aid to education.
11. Social security.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[14] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 50 percent; desirable, 25 percent.

POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	43	21
Question 2	49	33	18
Question 3 [11]			
Question 4	33	43	24
Question 5	65	32	3
Question 6	30	51	19
Question 7	44	48	8
	23	58	19
	43	32	25
Question 8	72	12	16
Question 9	26	67	7
Question 10	74	14	12
Question 11	45	37	18
Question 12	41		
	20		9
	14		
	16		
Question 13	39	36	25
	39	35	26
Question 14	25	64	11
Question 15	37	49	14
Question 16	71	15	14
Question 17	57	22	21
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Balanced budget.
3. Juvenile delinquency.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Inflation.
6. Labor problems.
7. Social security.
8. Farm problem.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[11] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 48 percent; desirable, 39 percent.

WASHINGTON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	30	30
Question 2	40	45	15
Question 3 [13]			
Question 4	43	44	13
Question 5	68	18	14
Question 6	50	35	15
Question 7	33	56	11
	20	69	11
	54	29	17
Question 8	84	11	5
Question 9	24	67	9
Question 10	66	22	12
Question 11	42	34	24
Question 12	41		
	21		5
	19		
	14		
Question 13	40	42	18
	38	40	22
Question 14	31	59	10
Question 15	45	43	12
Question 16	64	28	8
Question 17	65	15	20
Question 18			

1. Inflation.
2. Balanced budget.
3. National defense.
4. Farm problem.
5. Reduction in Government spending.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Labor problems.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Social security.
10. Veterans' benefits.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Civil defense.

[13] Unimportant, 5 percent; essential, 44 percent; desirable, 46 percent.

Inter-American Cooperation Moves Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as we take up the Mutual Security Act of 1960 I am including under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, an excellent expression of inter-American cooperation as outlined in a speech given this morning by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State in the Pan American Union:

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION MOVES FORWARD

(Address by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, in observance of Pan American Day, before the Council of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1960)

I am grateful for this opportunity to meet here with the Council of the Organization of American States today as it gathers in celebration of Pan American Day in the 70th year since the founding of the inter-Ameri-

can system. Not only is this my first appearance before a protocolary session of the council, but it happens by circumstance to be almost the first anniversary of my appointment as Secretary of State. The year has indeed been a momentous one in the history of the organization, full of events of tremendous significance to the continued growth and development in the unique cooperative relationship which this organization represents.

Speaking personally, I value highly the good fortune that has made it possible for me to journey twice to Latin America, once last August to attend the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in Santiago and again in February when I accompanied the President on his trip to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. The pleasure and stimulation gained from this experience of travel could only have been increased had my good fortune been extended by visiting all 20 of your countries.

Two such trips only half a year apart bring me to the inescapable conclusion that Latin America, still emergent and even nascent in some aspects within its present high level of attainment, is an area of tremendous development potential. It has most of the natural resources and all of the human resources for a steady and predictable rise in prominence and importance among the world family of nations. The surge and pulse of this rise is a visible and tangible circumstance, to be seen and measured in the construction of new cities, the laying out of networks of roads, the building of schools, the spread of new industries. One can sense the trend of movement from rural areas and agriculture to urban living and industrial development, from limited suffrage to universal suffrage, from narrow exercise of authority to fully representative government. Here are many of the world's last great frontiers—the jungles of the Amazon Basin, the isolated mountain valleys of the Andes, the almost inaccessible mineral deposits, the extensive farmlands of high potential in almost every country—all awaiting the conquest of advancement through new methods of health and sanitation or the construction of new means of communication. Here, too, one can sense the race between a bursting population growth and the upsurge of economic development that must provide more and more products and develop more and more jobs for larger numbers of people.

It seems to me that such convictions as we in the United States had on this score were reinforced by the President's recent visit to Latin America and that a new sense of urgency was communicated to us with respect to such participation as the United States, within the framework of its worldwide commitments, can contribute.

Looking back across the intervening 70 years since the founding session of the "Commercial Bureau of the American Republics," conceived principally as a clearinghouse for the interchange of commercial information, who among our predecessors then in attendance could possibly have foreseen that the humble seed they planted was to grow into the all-encompassing structure that the Organization of American States is today? The soil that nurtures this rich growth is mutual cooperation.

Represented here today are 21 Republics; each sovereign and separate, each with its distinctive identity and national aspiration. For each the Charter of the OAS confirms sovereign equality regardless of size or power. Each uses its equal voice in determining issues by the exercise of its vote in the democratic process of decision by the majority. Yet with all the express individuality and distinct character of its respective members, with all the diverse interests and separate aims of the various countries, with all the divergencies between widely differing peoples, this international assembly works with remarkable harmony toward its objective—and that objective, simply stated, is to provide a steadily improving way of life for the 360 million people it represents.

These 360 million individual human beings, wherever they may be in whatever country, provide the measure by which their chosen representatives must guide their actions. The individual citizen is today the common denominator of all representative government and of all foreign policy wherever there is freedom of choice. The "common man" is the initial charge that sets in motion the dynamo of democracy that impels the forces of change toward a better way of life.

At the present stage in the evolution of international affairs within this hemisphere, attainment of the normal aspirations of the individual citizen may require drastic revisions in existing social, economic, and political institutions. These aspirations toward a general improvement in living conditions, toward the elimination as rapidly as possible of the consequences of poverty and ignorance, must be recognized by the OAS itself and by the individual countries that are represented here. They should be achieved in liberty, and with a dedication to international peace and harmonious cooperation as reflected in the guiding principles of the Organization of the American States, which are prime requisites to the accomplishment of its objectives.

Throughout the many years of its history, the genius of the inter-American system has been its capacity to reconcile principles and forces that have at times appeared to be in conflict. If sovereign states had refused to yield when purely national interests appeared to conflict with the general international interests of the whole assembly of nations, if each had chosen to adopt only principles that were in perfect accord with its individual goals, the Organization of American States could not have moved forward to the high level of attainment that it has reached today. Many of these conflicts have proven to be more apparent than real, especially in the light of shared benefits that have accrued to every nation through mutual international accord.

In similar respect, a partial success in improving the living standards of the individual citizen is not enough. The achievement of material progress, for example, falls short of the need unless it is accompanied by the equally important attainment of liberty based upon respect for human rights and representative democracy as described in the Declaration of Santiago agreed upon at the fifth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs last August. This statement declares that the "principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere" must include such essentials as the rule of law assured by separation of powers, free elections to choose governments, judicial procedures to protect individual freedom and human rights, freedom of information and expression, and effective control of the legality of governmental acts. It further points out that political proscription, perpetuation in power, and the exercise of power without a fixed term are manifestly contrary to democratic order in the Americas.

However lofty and hopeful might be the fundamental principles of an international organization, their application within the borders of the member nations is often not easy. All of us will do well to bear in mind that those who judge will also be judged. It seems to me that the organization as a whole must be willing to concede that each member may have its own special problems and its individual circumstances that may make progress appear very slow in the translation of broad principles into specific actions within each country. Yet it would be a matter of no small concern to the organization as a whole if its member nations agree to the broad principles but seek to travel only their separate paths in application. My view is that for member nations to maintain their own self-respect in the community of this hemisphere there needs to be a genuine endeavor to implement within their respective borders the fundamental principles to which their international representatives have signed agreement. We can all hope that recognition of this essential fact will bring with it the maturity and calm judgment required for the official conduct of governments in our present day relationships.

To reach the root of many problems facing our hemisphere requires a methodical study of the existing and potential resources to meet present and future needs. Many of these studies have been underway through the various entities of the Organization of the American States. The farsighted initiative of Operation Pan America, calling for detailed economic surveys of the countries of the Americas, is an important concept that will bear fruitful results within the near future in planning and organizing new projects on the basis of specific needs.

That the Organization of American States has been an instrument of accomplishment is manifest in many ways. Defense against aggression, from within or without the hemisphere, is now the concern of the whole American community rather than any single nation—and sums formerly spent for defense against neighbors can increasingly be safely devoted to economic development. The twin pillars of nonintervention and collective action are now firmly cemented into the foundations of our tested and proved system of inter-American security. Astonishing progress has been achieved toward the goal of eradicating malaria and other diseases from our hemisphere. A regional development bank has become a reality. A major breakthrough has been registered in the discovery of a highly nutritious food, called Incaparina, to combat the high mortality of young children. Important groundwork has been laid in establishing a common market and a free trade association. The benefits of agricultural research already are evident in many ways, such as the development of new cattle breeds more adaptable to Latin American conditions. Even the launching of promising young artists on careers of worldwide acclaim, plus a long list of other achievements in the general field of culture and education, are commendable efforts that likely could not happen except for the existence of some form of international organization.

In my view, the achievements and the work actually underway in the areas of cooperation are often less noticed than they should be—given the apparently irresistible attraction of controversy and conflict. Steady, constructive, carefully planned progress in any of the many fields of human interest and endeavor in which we cooperate, both in the OAS and between ourselves, may not be as dramatic as if it were actively punctuated with sweeping slogans—but in the long run it may actually move further. For example, the OAS has long recognized the need for extensive efforts in the field of housing. The many activities of the Inter-American Housing and Planning Center in Bogotá, Colombia, are demonstrating results in the development of new building materials and inexpensive construction methods that will be of enormous importance in the solution of one of the most fundamental problems of our people. I am well aware of the close cooperation between the center and certain of the projects in this significant field that have been aided by my Government. Among others, these include the low-cost housing project in Chile which President Eisenhower visited recently, and

which he and others of us who accompanied him found to be among the interesting points of the tour. These and similar endeavors are carried forward under the concept of self-help and mutual aid that might well be taken as key words in our international relationships.

If we support the premise that the dignity of the individual in a free society is strengthened when he acquires his own home, so must we also recognize the importance of land ownership to the man who works the land. While there is much arable land not in economic use—properties owned both publicly or privately that are difficult of access or not put to full use—small farmers by the hundreds of thousands must make their living from tiny plots that yearly become more depleted from too intensive development. Land distribution is a problem of the hemisphere, demanding the attention of all nations and the Organization of American States as a whole. The establishment of adequate credit facilities to assist small farmers in purchasing land, the establishment of adequate facilities to confer title to new owners, and the adoption of appropirate fiscal policies to promote more effective use and facilitate transfer of poorly utilized land are measures demanding urgent attention.

It will serve us well to remember that the mind of the individual citizen is the object of a great ideological conflict that divides our world. One side thrives on the ills of mankind—poverty, hunger, disease, ignorance, upheaval—while the other strives for man's natural desires, for individual freedom, human dignity, and personal well-being. Any international organization that hopes for and works for solid accomplishment will need to recognize that its framework must be solid and durable to withstand the constant probing of new and subtle forms of exploiting whatever forms of weakness may exist.

Under a system of free elections and representative government, the day will likely never dawn in this hemisphere when the majority voter of any country will freely choose his own complete subjugation to the state. It is contrary to all reasonable supposition to conceive that the voter of the Americas, in any considerable number, would ever willingly enslave himself to a monolithic economy, surrender his individual freedom, renounce whatever religion he may hold, or relegate himself to the status of landless servitor to a new class of bureaucratic aristocracy. Since the imposition of such a system through force, threat, or subversion would be a denial of basic principles for which the OAS stands and, therefore, could not be allowed to exist, and since its appeal to the voter is traditionally small in all areas of the world, the continued progress toward ever more valid democracy in each of our native lands is the real promise of life in our hemisphere.

If an ideology that is foreign to our hemisphere has little chance of taking root here, the state of harmony within the hemisphere will bear some attention. Each country should assume a certain responsibility toward the fundamental principles of the inter-American system. To quote from the Santiago declaration:

"Harmony among the American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and the exercise of representative democracy are a reality within each of them, since experience has demonstrated that the lack of respect for such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigrations that cause frequent and grave political tensions between the state that they leave and the states that receive them."

The truth in these statements is self-evident. After all most of the basic principles of the Organization of American States are as hallowed in time as that ancient day when separate civilizations first realized they had to try to exist in harmony together. In many ways the Declaration of Santiago is an echo of the words so wisely stated many years ago by that great freedom fighter, José Marti:

"America must encourage every means of bringing the American peoples closer to one another, and reject everything that keeps them apart. In this, as in all human problems, the future is of peace."

By the fact of the frozen wastelands that lie above and below and the great oceans that swirl on either side of our continents, we are all neighbors. Give us, each one of the 21 republics, each independent and yet interdependent, the maturity and foresight and thoughtfulness to be good neighbors. There is not one among our countries that cannot help the others, there is not one that cannot receive help from the others, there is not one that will not profit through the mutual well-being of all.

New York Times Overlooks Racial Turmoil in Its Own Back Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, on April 12 and 13 there appeared two articles in the New York Times, written by one Harrison Salisbury, which purported to give an accurate account of race conditions in Birmingham, my district. These articles were in fact gross distortions of the truth and I am convinced Mr. Salisbury went about his preparation of the articles without any intention of giving a true and correct picture of the situation in Birmingham.

On Friday, April 15, 1960, Mr. Gene Wortsman, Washington correspondent for the Birmingham Post-Herald, ran an article in the Post-Herald in which he pointed out the fact that while Mr. Salisbury came 950 miles to write his stories of alleged racial terror in Alabama, he could have written a much more accurate story of racial turmoil in New York City by going only three blocks. Mr. Wortsman's article follows:

NEW YORK TIMES OVERLOOKS RACIAL TURMOIL IN ITS OWN BACKYARD

(By Gene Wortsman)

WASHINGTON.—The New York Times, which sent a reporter 950 miles to write of racial terror in Alabama, could have written a story of racial turmoil in New York City by sending a reporter only three blocks.

Although this story was available to the Times on April 8, as far as can been learned here, the newspaper to date has devoted one paragraph to it.

The story was the State-by-State report of advisory committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

These committees described discriminatory conditions in their own States. Of 48 State committee reports, that of the New York committee was tied for second in length.

It required 16 pages.

Only Minnesota exceeded it with 22 pages, and only Oregon tied it.

The Civil Rights Commission summary was given to the President and to Congress.

The Times story began on page 1 of the April 9 edition. The headline and first five paragraphs discussed testimony before Congress by Commission members.

Paragraph 6 then told that the State-by-State findings had been issued. But only in paragraph 9 did the newspaper mention New York problems. It said:

"The New York report said there had been 'daily complaints from parents of Negro children guided to nonacademic careers, discouraged in their ambitions, scorned and stereotyped, categorized as difficult, of low cultural background and as coming from broken homes.'"

This report was issued by the Civil Rights Commission whose office is three blocks from the Washington bureau of the Times.

The following day, April 10, in its large 10-section Sunday edition, the Times still ignored the report. It ran six out-of-State stories involving racial matters. These stories came from Alabama, Texas, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Washington, D.C.

What did the New York Advisory Committee have to say of the city's and State's racial problems?

Here are examples:

"Since the May 17, 1954, school decision of the U.S. Supreme Court instead of the number of * * * segregated schools being diminished, there has been a growth and extension of such schools. In 1954 * * * there were 51 * * * segregated * * * schools in New York City. Today, there are 84 segregated schools.

"We observe the inequity of overcrowded, part-time education in Negro schools, side by side with hundreds of empty seats and enriched, full-time education in the predominantly white schools nearby.

"We observe the continuing evils of contrived and gerrymandered school zones and of patterns of containment all working to the end of the separation of the races.

"We note that the ability of these children to read and write is years behind that of children attending schools a mile or two away."

The report gave examples of Negro attempts to integrate schools, but of white refusal to comply.

In Public School 3 in Brooklyn, parents are petitioning to remove the principal for insulting behavior. He has said the neighborhood is evil and parents of the children are depraved, the report stated.

The report discusses housing, saying it remains a serious problem:

"Many individuals regardless of their personal qualifications, are denied the opportunity to acquire decent accommodations in buildings and neighborhoods of their choice. Segregated living areas are created and maintained * * * contributing to numerous * * * social evils. * * *

"Age combines with overcrowding to make dwellings in Negro areas largely unfit for human habitation.

"The high disease, death, and crime rates common to Negro areas represent the social costs we pay for requiring people to live in such surroundings."

A Constituent Writes: "I Am Afraid To Think of Old Age"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent and longtime friend that car-

ried a postscript which relates a matter that frankly appalls me.

The postscript concerns an elderly lady who had the misfortune to suffer a serious injury from a fall. The story of her mishap, the subsequent financial pressures and the attitude of the hospital, furnish another striking example of the need for this Congress to support a Federal hospitalization and health bill.

I urge my colleagues to read this true story of a lady 88 years young, whose experience prompts my friend and constituent to observe: "I think I will stay at Jack Benny's age of 39. I am afraid to think of old age."

The postscript to my constituent's letter follows:

DEAR JIM: Just one more P.S. I have the sweetest old lady tenant of 88 years of age in my front apartment. She fell last week and broke her hip, or rather fractured her hip.

It happened at midnight. We finally found a doctor to come to the house. He ordered an ambulance to the Culver City Hospital. I went with her and her companion to the hospital, as she has no relatives here.

Between the three of us, her lady companion, Margaret Masart, our good neighbor, and myself, we managed to get $120 together. Scraped the bottom of the barrel.

Twenty dollars for ambulance and $100 for downpayment at the hospital.

When we signed her in at the hospital, they asked for $250. I was furious. It was an emergency, and at midnight besides.

The doctor called in a bone specialist. A week in the hospital in an eight-bed ward at $22.50 a day plus. Then 6 months in private sanatorium at $250 a month.

She receives a small social security benefit, plus she has a small nest egg in bank. But how long will this last when the money is going at this rate?

Imagine, if she only had just her social security, like many of our senior citizens? It is frightening, to say the least.

President Eisenhower and his administration and the American Medical Association are against medical aid for our old people. This is just one example of the need for some kind of a decent bill in this field.

I read that the AMA said any old person can raise $500 for doctor bills without undue hardship. I have news for them.

I spoke my little piece at the hospital in regard to the $250. They accepted the $100, but her companion had to sign papers that she would go to the bank as soon as possible for the balance of the money.

I think I will stay at Jack Benny's age of 39. I am afraid to think of old age.

The Late Brigadier General Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a well-deserved eulogy to a man who served as our Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for years with honor and distinction, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, that appeared in the Stars and Stripes recently:

BRIGADIER GENERAL HINES

The news tells us of the death of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, U.S. Army, retired, who served for many years as head of the Veterans' Bureau and later as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when all veteran agencies were combined.

General Hines took over the administration of the old Veterans' Bureau when it was in a sad state with scandals of one kind or another threatening its existence.

He had already demonstrated his ability as an organizer when the Army placed him in charge of the port of embarkation in Hoboken, N.J., in World War I.

Once in charge of the veterans' agency he continued to show that he had not lost his touch and it was not long thereafter that the Veterans' Bureau and later the Veterans' Administration was working on a smooth basis.

We knew General Hines quite well and had occasion in the late twenties and early thirties to come in conflict with some of the groups set up to adjudicate veterans' claims.

At the time we were younger and perhaps a bit stubborn when we felt a veteran was not being given a fair shake. We are still stubborn when it comes to veterans' rights but perhaps a bit mellower.

Quite naturally in our enthusiasm and belief in the veterans' cause we laid the blame for most of the things we considered wrong at the door of the boss—General Hines.

However, as the years passed we were to change our opinion of the agency's head. Despite the multitude of affairs which crowded his desk and took up his time, we found him ever willing to listen to the veteran's side of the story, even to the extent of sitting in on discussions between us and the VA officials.

At such times he listened carefully, asked questions and, if he felt our cause was a good one would remand the case for further study and sometimes with the recommendation that the adverse decision be reversed.

This consideration by the head of the Veterans' Administration of an individual case has gone by the boards long since. It disappeared when General Bradley succeeded General Hines as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and has never been resumed.

Down through the years with the experience thus gained by personal contact with this very busy man we learned to respect him and cast aside all the early bitterness that once existed.

Getting to know him better we found him a patient man and a just one and we realized that if he said "No" he did so only after thorough study of the situation. As a consequence we can only say now that the Government has lost a fine and capable servant and the veterans and the organizations which represent them a kind friend.

To his widow and family we offer our sincere condolences and look only with regret at his passing. May his soul find the repose it so justly deserves in the life hereafter.

H.R. 11666

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11666) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the State Department appropriation would make it impossible for necessary public functions to be carried on by the Department during the next fiscal year. It is just as simple as that. The State Department must deal with representatives and citizens of other nations other than in purely formal negotiations, and a representation allowance is needed for this purpose. The money in this bill for representation allowance is now down to a rockbottom figure. I do not think we can properly reduce it. But before I talk about his amendment, I do want to take a few moments to say that I personally appreciate the studious, diligent, and patriotic effort that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] makes in this House day after day after day after day. I think he knows more about more bills than any one of the rest of us. He is one of the most valuable men in the Congress. I want the RECORD to show that I appreciate his efforts for a better America.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have recommended the sum of $835,000 for representation allowance. This is $40,000 less than the State Department felt it must have for this job. It is only $10,000 more than the Congress appropriated for the fiscal year 1960. In other words, we are recommending about 1 percent more than the amount of money that was appropriated last year for this purpose, despite the fact there has been an increase in all costs during that period, and despite the fact that 8 or 10 new American posts must be established with the funds that are available. We have 183 diplomatic posts spread around the whole world, and each of them must carry on certain diplomatic social activities which require expenditures from the representation allowance.

Actually, per diplomatic post, there will be less money for this year's requirements, even though the costs are higher than they were a year ago.

Now let us face it. This is not a whisky allowance. Of course some whisky is bought. It is served at most social functions, including those to which we Congressmen are invited in Washington. Certainly it is a part of diplomatic functions. So is food. So are flowers. So are service costs. In other words, this is just what it says, a representation allowance. Our representatives are entertained at social affairs by diplomats from other nations. We have to reciprocate. It is to our advantage to show the proper courtesies to the leading figures in the nations to which our representatives are accredited. People are human. They appreciate these things. What is more, they expect them. Everybody does it. There are national days to which all the diplomatic corps are invited, such as our own Fourth of July. When those things take place it is very important to show proper recognition of local customs and to maintain cordial

relations with the people in other embassies and in the other nations where we have our own representatives. Each of us on the floor recognizes the value of social gatherings. We attend them quite frequently. We participate in them. We do these things because we can see the advantage of maintaining contact with other people. Sometimes more can be accomplished or more learned at a social function than in any other way. The State Department does exactly the same thing with its representation allowance in order to further the interests of this Government. If we were not to follow this procedure we would be the only country, major or minor, that fails to do so. We would be looked upon with scorn by our neighbors in the world. Our representatives abroad have a big and important job to do and that job they must do for the good of this Nation, and for our world interests.

I trust the amendment will be rejected.

That Needs Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very frank, sincere, and truthful editorial that appeared in the National Tribune on Thursday, April 14, 1960, which should give all of us some food for thought on a very important subject matter of much interest to all of our veterans:

[From the National Tribune, Apr. 14, 1960]

THAT NEEDS CLAUSE

While the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. were gratified by the fact that at last the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs had agreed to recognize the organization and permit its representatives to offer its views to the committee, and while the chairman of the committee, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, was quite gracious in his reception of the men who represented this comparatively new group of veterans of the First World War, and while the thought was offered by Chairman TEAGUE that there might be some modification of the present pension law and the one which goes into effect on July 1 of this year, he did state that he still believed in the "needs" provision as far as pensions for veterans was concerned.

We have discussed this "needs clause" many times and at great length. We have shown how high ranking, retired officers of the armed services are permitted to quit their military jobs after a certain amount of service and go out into the civilian world and accept positions from private industry paying anything from $10,000 to $100,000 a year and still receive their retirement pay because of their military service.

We have even suggested that many of these retired officers have never fired a shot in anger against an enemy of the United States, yet, their length of service or their acquisition of some disability or other permits them to retire with pay and go on to secure lucrative employment in civil life.

We have also stated that we had no objection to this because we felt that many of these high ranking, retired officers had particular qualifications which they had acquired during their services with the Government, which entitled them to go out and earn anything that civilian employers thought they were worth.

We would not have brought this subject up at this time had we not read of a survey conducted in the Department of Agriculture which shows that the average total income for employees in that particular Department is $10,000 a year.

Now, these employees of the Department of Agriculture have been paying for civil service retirement during their years of employment and will be permitted to receive that retirement pay upon the completion of a certain number of years of service and nothing will prevent them from seeking private employment to augment their civil service retirement pay.

The same holds true of Members of the National Legislature who also pay into a retirement fund. The amount of retirement depends on their years of service and, if we may say so, it is not too little.

We do not begrudge them this retirement. They have paid for it and they have it coming to them. Yet, be they doctors or lawyers or skilled in any other profession or trade, there is nothing to prevent them from earning as much as the freight will allow in order to add to their retirement benefits.

We can go along with this in propriety because we feel that when a man or woman has paid for benefits to tide him or her over in their later years, he or she should receive this benefit and not be stopped from adding to it by their future endeavors.

Now, if all this is true from the standpoint of retired military men, retired Congressmen, or retired civil servants, why should it not be true for those who receive pension for service in time of war—men who saw actual combat or men who might be sent into combat at the behest of their Government?

The man who entered service in World War I, either willingly as a volunteer or under the Draft Act, had no choice as to the place where he was required to serve. It might have been Kelly Field in Texas where he sweated out the war or it might have been as a replacement—poorly trained—in some combat division on the Western Front. Once in the military service the individual had no choice. Some were lucky and some did not fare so well. The fact remains that they served their country when their country called them and we believe that this is a poor time in which to invoke a "needs clause" when it comes to paying them a pension in their older days.

Statistics provided by the General Accounting Office have shown that there are few veterans of World War I who are so affluent as not to need a little help thru their declining days. As a matter of fact, we also believe that the few veterans of the first World War who are really well off would not make application for a pension. Those veterans are proud men and they will not, as a whole, ask for something which their own ability had provided for.

This holding out for a needs clause sounds quite plausible and realistic but when it comes down to reality there are very few World War I veterans who are so well off that they cannot use the aid suggested in H.R. 9336, without restrictions to to income.

True, there will be a few chiselers for some people love money more than anything else, but we feel certain that many more needy veterans will profit by such a measure as H.R. 9336 than will take advantage of its provisions.

It must be remembered that just as the retired military men have earned their retirement by reason of length of service and just as Members of Congress have earned their retirement by reason of their contribution to a retirement fund, so, also, are veterans now at retirement age, who have paid into social security, entitled to receive that benefit without a restricting clause and still be entitled to a war pension.

We have learned that the highest social-security payment at this time is $119 a month. This amounts to $1,428 a year and thus, a single World War I veteran can be deprived of his War I pension, no matter how badly handicapped he may be, for the sum of $28. Certainly, there is no justice in such a provision of the pension law.

For this reason we ask, once again, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to reconsider his position and realize that while his objections to no restrictions on income in any pension law for veterans of World War I are sincere, admit it does not necessarily follow that they are sound.

Representative TEAGUE seems to be a kind man, a decent man, but we feel that he has been warped just a little bit by the attitude of younger veterans who, at this time, feel no need for Government aid and thus do not realize why others, less able than they are to cope with the present economic situation, could use the pension called for in H.R. 9336.

Interest Rates Then and Now—Truman versus Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, although the administration's drive to increase interest rates on long-term Government obligations seems to have collapsed, such an objective remains a threat so long as the Republican Party is in control of the executive branch of Government.

The interest cost, alone, to the taxpayers on our national debt has increased some $5 billion since 1953 and this amounts to approximately $125 per year for each American family. At the same time, the rate of our economic growth under President Truman has been cut in half since the present administration took office. This reduction in our economic growth is principally due to the high-interest-rate policy of the administration in power.

The housing industry of this country, Mr. Speaker, has reached a new low which can be attributed to the high cost of money, and unless and until a new administration, with a different economic philosophy, is placed in charge of our Government there is little hope that this great industry can reestablish itself on a firm financial footing and supply the thousands of needed homes for the American people.

In the Washington Post of this morning, Mr. Speaker, there appears an article by Seymour E. Harris, littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University, in which he criticizes the administration and points out just what has happened to our economy during the past 7 years because of the high interest rate.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1960]

HIGHER INTEREST RATES OR MORE GROWTH?

(By Seymour E. Harris)

This is a statement in support of those Congressmen who are not disposed to yield to the President's request for a removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government securities.

A removal of the ceiling on Government issues would be a signal to the Federal Reserve to raise rates further, and to starve the economy for money even more than in the past. The Federal Reserve needs no such encouragement. They see inflation everywhere, which they try to contain through restrictions on the supply of money and higher rates of interest.

How much damage can be done by the high rates of money, for which the President is now pleading, is suggested by the following: Growth rate from 1947 to 1952 was 4.6 percent; from 1952 to 1959, 2.3 percent. The dear monetary policy, that is high rates, probably more than anything else, explains the difference. By 1959, the cost of stunted growth since 1952, not in relation to the highest goals but in relation to the achievements under Truman from 1947 to 1952, was about $60–70 billion per year.

Why has the Treasury had so much trouble of late?

Obviously, the dear money policy largely induced by Washington is the main source of embarrassment.

Higher rates are partly the result of increased competition from other borrowers. The percentage rise of debt since 1952 has been 42 percent; 116 percent by State and local governments, 97 percent by individuals, 54 percent by corporations, and only 10 percent by the Treasury.

Many of these borrowers are prepared to pay much more than the Federal Government. These competitors to some extent are the Government's doing. In its determination to get everyone heavily in debt but itself, the Government paid in part in an unequal competition for funds.

Here are a few suggestions to improve the market for Treasury issues.

Why not issue securities payable in stable dollars to low-income groups? Why not auction securities? Why not exploit the 4–5 year market, of which the Treasury was largely unaware until it was pushed into it by the obtuseness of the Congress? Why not force the Federal Reserve to abandon a bills only policy, which means a conscious attempt to abandon the Government bond market, and besides means that the Federal Reserve disarms itself of a potent weapon?

Why not require the Federal Reserve to finance increased monetary needs through open market operations, which add to the revenue of the Treasury and should increase the market for Government securities by about $600 million a year?

Finally, and most important, why not require financial institutions to put a percentage (varying) of its assets into Government securities? In this manner the Government (the people) would be compensated to some extent for delegating its money-creating authority to the banks.

Surely, if the financial institutions in fact are required to purchase securities in wartimes, they should be required to do so as long as we are in great danger.

Dear money has yielded the largest gains to the least productive though useful members of society, the rentier class. Whereas all personal income rose by 36 percent from 1952 to 1959, interest income rose by 120 percent.

The President feared that the ceiling would force the Treasury to issue excessive amounts of short-term issues which the banks would have to purchase with newly created money.

Despite the forced issue of short-term securities recently, the holdings of Government securities by banks have tumbled—a decline of $8 billion in 1959 or from 30 to 25 percent of assets. Actually, a good part of the Treasury's embarrassment arose in 1959 from a net decline of banks' investments in Treasury issues of $7.8 billion even as Treasury debt rose by $7.9 billion.

In the writer's opinion, the Congress would err badly if it acceded to the President's request. The broad limits within which the Treasury is allowed to saddle the taxpayer with interest charges should remain in the domain of the people's representatives. In this connection, Senators DOUGLAS and ANDERSON have shown that the Treasury advisers on prices to be charged for lending to the Government are those who are to lend the money.

Congress, in return for any concessions, should demand important changes in monetary, debt and fiscal policies. Above all, Congress should not validate a rise of 1–2 percent since 1952 in long-term rates by raising ceilings correspondingly. To do this would be a validation of mistaken policies.

A good part of the improvement in the market rests with the administration. Relaxation of dear money policies and less dependence on monetary policies; more modern therapy for inflation; improved marketing procedures for Government securities; a directive to the Federal Reserve to abandon (1) the bills only policy and (2) expansion only by cutting reserve requirements. Then we shall have less recession, more growth, more public welfare, a more equitable relation between the Government and financial institutions, and a larger and more orderly market for Government securities.

Sergeant York Should Be Assisted by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, certainly one of America's greatest soldiers was and is Sgt. Alvin C. York, of the east Tennessee mountain country. Although not one of my constituents, yet he lives just across the Tennessee border from my own district and I have visited his place and talked with him on one or two occasions. It seems to me if any one man might deserve some special consideration by Congress, that one individual would be the humble but exalted Sergeant York of Tennessee. "The spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him" and then he decimated the enemy for our country in his hour of greatness and in our time of national peril.

Below is an editorial taken from the Los Angeles Examiner of March 29, 1960, and I think it deserves our profound consideration:

IKE, TRUMAN GET BREAK DENIED YORK

(By Vincent X. Flaherty)

Congress passed special laws which permitted Dwight D. Eisenhower, then a five-star general, and President Truman, to skirt the full blast of internal revenue and write their memoirs on a capital-gains basis.

Both of these distinguished Americans cashed in heavily on their book sales. They were able to do this because it was argued neither of these gentlemen was a professional writer, and each had only one story to sell.

Congress speedily passed the favoring laws. Nobody raised a voice against the legislation. Everybody seemed to approve except, probably, many professional bookwriters who are lucky, indeed, if they are able to write one big money-making book in their entire lifetimes.

If Eisenhower and Truman were allowed to hit the literary jackpot, then the same kind of legislation should be passed in favor of another distinguished American—Sgt. Alvin C. York, most famous foot soldier of World War I and winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

York, now 75 years old and invalided since 1954, had only one story to sell, too. He isn't a professional writer, either. He sold his story to the movies. Gary Cooper performed a masterful portrayal of York and won an Oscar. The picture was a smash hit.

Eisenhower's and Truman's books combined earned a million dollars. York was paid around $100,000. He is a simple man of the soil, unfamiliar with handling a large sum of money. After all these years he now owes Internal Revenue $85,442, almost as much money as he was paid for his story.

Confined to a wheelchair since suffering a stroke in 1954, York has been unable to take care of his little Tennessee farm. November 18, 1957, the Nashville Tennessean quoted the ailing York as saying "The Government is hounding me to death. They're trying to drive me to the poorhouse."

At the time the story was published, nine Government representatives had prepared a tax case against York and had gathered to give him a hearing. Most of them were sent all the way from Washington, D.C. Because of illness, York was unable to appear. The case is still dragging on.

Last week you probably read about York aplying for social security benefits. He now receives a $60 per month disability pension, plus $10 a month as a winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Otherwise, his farm nets him a meager income. I never knew, until I read the story, that Medal of Honor winners get $10 a month. What a tawdry sum to pay for America's loftiest honor.

By golly, I'd like to start a Sgt. Alvin C. York club and try and urge Congress to give the great old soldier the same break it gave Truman and Eisenhower.

International Center in Hawaii for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between the East and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to join my distinguished colleague, the Representative from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] in sponsoring a bill introduced April 19 to establish an international center in Hawaii for cultural and technical interchange between the East and the West.

The bill is the answer to one of the great needs of our time, and I would like to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and his colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG]; the distinguished majority leader, the Sen-

ator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and the distinguished majority whip, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their bipartisan efforts that have resulted in the emergence of this legislation.

Enactment of my bill H R. 11823 or one of the companion bills will be the forging of a mighty link in the chain that binds East and West in a bond of friendship, mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has at once, in this statement of his, interpreted the need and suggested the solution:

I propose to you that while governments discuss the meeting of a few at the summit, universities consider the massive interchange of mutual understanding on the grand plateau of youth. More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together.

The University of Hawaii, in a most favorable sociological climate of blended ethnic elements, and of which the East-West center is to be a part, already is geared to the role of international interchange and has long served in that capacity.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] has pointed out, Hawaii's statehood has brought the United States 3,000 miles closer to the people of Asia. The 50th State thus is ideal—from geographical as well as sociological and other points of view—as a location for the East-West center.

Let us lose no time in forging one of the greatest links in the immensely important chain of good will and good deeds that hold together the East and the West in peace and progress.

Address by Chairman Overton Brooks on Government and Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a major address delivered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who is chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member.

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS spoke at the University of California at Los Angeles on Wednesday, April 13, 1960, in the fourth of a series of 12 lectures on "Peacetime Uses of Space." Other speakers in the series include Lt. Gen. J. H. "Jimmy" Doolittle, Lloyd V. Berkner, Ralph J. Cordiner, Dr. Willard F. Libby, Vice Adm. John T. Hayward, and Dr. Edward Teller.

In this distinguished company, Congressman BROOKS delivered a sound and discerning address on "The Place of Government in the Utilization of Space." He pointed out that our space lag, in comparison with the U.S.S.R., resulted from our own past decisions and not from any inability to do things in outer space as well and as fast as the Russians. In fact, he said, we have apparently taken only about half as long as the Russians to develop IRBM's and ICBM's. Congressman BROOKS proposed a number of steps that would enable this country to make the best possible effort in outer space.

I particularly welcome the statements by Congressman BROOKS that new international accommodations will be necessary in the peaceful uses of outer space, and that the space age will increase the incentives and opportunities for nations to live together in peace and harmony.

The address follows:

THE PLACE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE UTILIZATION OF SPACE

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a great pleasure to take part in this exceptional series of lectures on the peacetime uses of space. The University of California has earned the gratitude of all Americans by providing a forum for a distinguished array of speakers to examine in detail the sweeping implications of space technology. Dr. Simon Ramo, who suggested the series, has expressed the hope that public understanding and responsiveness will be enlarged and heightened. All of us who have been honored with the opportunity of speaking here must share that hope and accept its challenge.

My topic is the place of Government in the utilization of space. In dealing with so broad a subject matter, it will be necessary to pick out certain aspects as most suitable to the purposes of the lecture series.

I will begin with the present circumstances of the national space program; the values we can expect it to achieve; its importance to our international position; proposed changes, and historical background.

Then I will take up some problems of space regulation and control. Space law is not only needed, but needed urgently, in view of the facts of space and the participation by other countries in space exploration and research. Later, it will also be necessary to regulate the activities of private enterprise in space. Up to now, all American space activities have been conducted by the National Government. For some time to come, the Government will continue to be the principal space entrepreneur. In a society dedicated to private enterprise, however, it seems inevitable that space will sooner or later be used for private purposes. Space law must anticipate this development.

Finally, I will list some steps that would enable this country to reap the benefits of space technology both sooner and more certainly. Time is short. The opportunities are vast.

II. NEED AND VALUE OF ASTRONAUTICS

The year 1960 began in Washington with a great debate over the national space program. I wish I could tell you that the outcome was a clear set of conclusions. Unhappily, the charges and rebuttals are still flying through the air like ballistic missiles. Many outsiders complain that they feel confused. Some insiders may secretly feel the same way, though they may never admit it. And no wonder. For example, at least four different sets of comparisons of American and Soviet missile strength have appeared in major newspapers of the Nation.

I am not going to try to clear up the missile gap or even the space lag. The roots of the disagreement go deeper. If you want to know about the prospects and problems of using outer space, including our chances of outstripping the U.S.S.R. in the long run, and what our Government can do to help, you need information of a more fundamental kind. Perhaps we should return to fundamentals, and start with the need and value of space flight. The debate in Washington has revealed a difference of opinion on this subject, even within the executive branch of the Government.

People have been dreaming about space travel for thousands of years. Now that we have the means to make the dream come true, however, many people begin to doubt the value of our space program. Is it merely political and psychological—that is, are we going into outer space just for reasons of national prestige and advantage in the cold war? Or is it military—to prevent outer space from being used against us, and to use it, if need be, against our enemies? I would answer that the value of our space program is both psychological and military, in the cold war and the hot war alike, and could be amply justified on either ground, in the perspective of 10 or 20 years. Or we can justify it on the ground that it leads mankind further along the roadway toward his destiny.

More directly, for most of us, the value of our space program is also scientific and economic. If you happen to be a teacher or a housewife, it may be hard to think of outer space as something that affects you. Yet it does just this; and sooner or later, a lot of our prosperity as well as our national security is going to be wrapped up in outer space.

For example, we can look forward to better and cheaper methods of radio communication, weather forecasting and navigation by means of satellites. Already new developments in treating diseases and in analyzing the human anatomy, which will have a direct effect upon human beings, are being developed in our space program. New space exploration may unlock the ancient secrets about the origin and use of the solar system and even of life itself.

Admittedly, such wonders lie in the future. Yet I expect to see some of them myself in the next 10 years or so.

At present, space exploration is first and foremost a new means of scientific research. Naturally, this aspect appeals to the scientific community, both at home and abroad. It is only the beginning.

III. MILITARY AND CIVILIAN USES OF SPACE

From what I have just said, you can see that the benefits we hope to gain in outer space are both military and civilian. We all welcome the fact that the value of space exploration is apparently much greater than just the military possibilities. At the same time, the relationship between the military and civilian space programs has raised problems from the very beginning. The first successful American satellite was launched with a military missile in the hands of military personnel. We thus began to acquire the ability to explore space, in the first place, through military efforts to develop missiles as weapons of war. The U.S.S.R. had the same experience.

All concerned, including our military leaders, agree that space exploration is not solely a military program. Neither can we deny that space has tremendous military significance. The problem, then, is either to separate military and civilian space functions, or to link them in some effective relationship.

As many of you know, this kind of problem is not confined to space alone. It is a perennial problem of government in dealing with new technology. For example, the Atomic Energy Commission was given the job of providing nuclear warheads for mili-

tary missiles. The armed services, however, remained responsible for the means of delivery and for developing and using the military weapon systems. In the field of atomic energy, then, civilian and military functions are not entirely separated. This arrangement has worked well.

The Space Act of 1958 created a new civilian space agency. The result is a system of cordinate civilian-military control, which was recommended by the President in his message to Congress of April 2, 1958. In its final form the act had the full approval and signature of the President.

The civilian space agency was given general authority to plan, direct and conduct aeronautical and space activities. At the same time, the act provided for full cooperation between the civilian agency and the defense establishment. Because civilian and military interests in space are often difficult to separate and unavoidably overlap, machinery was created both for coordination and for overall control. For this purpose the act established a National Aeronautics and Space Council, of which the President has been chairman, and a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee for the day-to-day coordination of civilian and military space activities.

As time has gone on, it has become apparent that neither the Space Council nor the Liaison Committee was used effectively. On the other hand, there is general agreement that the Space Act provides an adequate basic framework for national space activities.

In a recent message to Congress, President Eisenhower declared that—

"A single program embracing military as well as nonmilitary space activities * * * does not exist and is in fact unattainable."

There are certain questions that trouble me on this score: Are the military and civilian space programs really so separate and distinct? How should they be coordinated? How should the space effort be divided between military and civilian agencies? Is there a need for long-term planning, direction and coordination, encompassing both the military and the civilian space programs; and, if so, how should the need be met?

On all these questions there is a clear-cut difference of opinion. For example, in contrast to President Eisenhower's views, General Medaris told the Committee on Science and Astronautics:

"I believe strongly, and feel that it is wholly demonstrable, that the fields of ballistic missilery and space exploration and exploitation are in fact naturally indivisible elements of a single broad technology and that a continuance of divided efforts in this broad area cannot but result in delay, duplication, and waste of both money and manpower.

"From a purely technical viewpoint, there is so little difference between civilian and military space programs that there is no justification for their division and resulting duplication."

In dealing with the various proposals to proceed with space development, the U.S. Government must draw upon the thinking of its ablest leaders—in politics, science and economics. As time moves along and developments indicate shortcomings in the space program, changes in space legislation as well as in the organization of the executive branch may be necessary.

In order to make wise decisions, the Federal Government must determine what priorities should be assigned to the space program; and, as time goes on, this decision will have to be reviewed repeatedly.

President Eisenhower has indicated that in his mind this Government is not engaged in a space race with the U.S.S.R. For example, he was asked whether he felt any sense of urgency in catching up with Russia either in space exploration or in military missiles. He replied (according to the New York Times):

"I am always a little bit amazed at this business of catching up. What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate."

We may naturally ask: "Adequate for what?" Surely not adequate for catching up with Russia.

Again, when he was asked whether our national prestige was at stake in space exploration, he replied:

"Not particularly, no."

At that time he seemed to take issue with the overwhelming, if not unanimous, opinion of vigorous leaders who have come by the hundreds before the committees of Congress declaring that our national prestige was, in fact, in great jeopardy. Every witness who has stated his views on the subject to the Committee on Science and Astronautics has agreed that our status in space development is a major factor in the cold war, and tends to be taken abroad as an indication of our civilian and military prowess.

President Eisenhower also said in his state of the Union message:

"Our effort in space exploration * * * is often mistakenly supposed to be an integral part of defense research and development."

This fits in well with the other statements I have quoted. The view that we are not, or need not be, in a space race with the U.S.S.R. in my opinion, ignores both the effect of space achievements on other nations and the military potential of space technology—which I believe cannot be denied.

And, of course, space developments do have a vital military potential. It is difficult to conceive of any major development in space that may not in time fulfill vital military needs.

Like the automobile and the truck, space vehicles must in time fulfill military needs. All means of communication and conveyance have military potentialities, and having these potentialities, are subject to military use. Nuclear energy in time may be diverted entirely to meet civilian energy requirements, but will continue to have important military applications. Space developments, too, may be devoted to peacetime pursuits and requirements, but they will still have vital military applications which we should not attempt to deny.

Under these circumstances, what is most needed in space research? Surely, basic research is fundamental to the needs of the military as well as to peacetime necessities. It is fundamental, not only in the field of space but also in other types of research and development. For example, the knowledge that we gain from the man-in-space program will apply to the medical treatment of man-on-earth.

All these considerations affect the question whether the space program should be divided among different departments of the Government or should be placed entirely in the NASA. Of course, no one would deny to the military the development of weapons in their field applications.

I know that there are, in this country, people to whom competition is still the "space of life," and who urge that it will make for better progress if basic research is divided among different Government agencies. They argue, naturally, that the need of economy in these new developments will be met by efficiency and reducing unnecessary effort. Of course, no system can avoid some degree of duplication. But competition in pure science is costly in both time and money.

It would be better to have competition among individual scientists, and complete cooperation among the various agencies of Government in our space program. America has neglected basic science. Only in recent years have our leaders given thought to better, more aggressive and more efficient programs for building up our treasures of basic research. In our official program of pure (as contrasted with applied) space science, NASA can be expected to put forth its full effort with a minmum of overlapping and duplication (and without the bickering and back-biting which in the past have muddied our major space efforts).

IV. STATUS AND PROSPECTS OF THE NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

At present, the space program is drifting with the winds of expediency. While continuing to deny that our space program involves national prestige, competes with the Soviet program or requires any particular urgency, the present administration is nevertheless devoting more money to the development of this program. Federal funding of the space program must of necessity increase year by year. The demands of NASA will increase, and the space development of the armed services will not diminish for many years.

Only three Polaris submarines were included in the current budget. Without prior warning, Admiral Burke state on February 8 that the Navy will ask for funds to build six more.

The administration had directed a drastic cut in funds requested by the Atomic Energy Commission to develop a nuclear-powered space rocket (Project Rover). As a result, the project was expected to be delayed by a year or more. There are those who say that the delay was not justified on technical grounds. On March 8, 1960, the AEC transferred funds within its own budget to add $11 million to Project Rover.

Naturally, I am pleased that these vital programs will be getting more support. It does seem to me, though, that they should have had adequate support at an earlier date in accordance with an overall plan. Must we proceed by fits and starts—one step forward and two steps back? Surely it is costly and dangerous to play our national space policy by ear.

Suppose we take a longer look ahead. What are the long-term plans for our space program?

On January 28, 1960, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration gave the Committee on Science and Astronautics an estimate of its budget needs for the next 10 years. The total was less than $15 billion, or an average annual rate of some $1.5 billion. Recall that the agency received more than $500 million for this year—its first full year of operation—and is requesting $915 million for fiscal year 1961.

Yet the agency presented its 10-year budget forecast as sufficient to wrest space leadership from the U.S.S.R.

Although it seems to lack sufficient urgency, the 10-year program is technically well thought out. It calls for the flight of a Mercury astronaut (not in orbit) in 1960; an unmanned "hard" landing on the Moon in 1961; planetary probes of Mars or Venus in 1962; and an unmanned "soft" landing on the Moon in 1963.

By the standard of meeting our competition, however, it seems too low, overoptimistic, and unrealistic.

For example, the only big space boosters included in the 10-year program are those already under research and development: the Saturn and the Nova. As you know, our space lag is mainly in boosters. The Saturn is expected to become available by 1965. Four F-1 engines (six in some versions), each producing 1½ million pounds of thrust, will be clustered to make the Nova. The first flight test of the F-1 engine is not scheduled till 1968. No date has been set for completion of the Nova. If the U.S.S.R. develops even bigger boosters in the meantime—before 1970—ours space budget will need to be raised very sharply, or we will fail to reach the goal of catching up. Dr. Wernher

von Braun told my committee: "I consider it quite likely the Russians have a larger rocket than any they have flown so far."

To give another example, manned flight to the moon is not scheduled in the 10-year program until after 1970. Dr. von Braun also told my committee that he "would not be surprised if Russia makes a soft landing on the moon this year."

Can we catch up with the Soviet Union? I believe we can, and I have yet to meet any American who thinks otherwise. Even Khrushchev seems to agree. At the U.S. Fair in Moscow last summer, Khrushchev talked with Dr. John Turkevich, a Princeton professor who speaks fluent Russian. Dr. Turkevich later reported that he said to Khrushchev:

"We will catch up to you and beat you in satellite weight before you surpass us in wheat production" (an astute remark in more ways than one).

Khrushchev replied seriously: "America is a strong and powerful country. If it sets its mind to do something, it will succeed."

V. THE SPACE LAG

Ever since the first Russian satellite was launched in 1957, we have heard loud cries that we were lagging behind the Russians in space. This charge is not to be lightly brushed aside. Qualified witnesses have agreed that the mainstage rocket, or booster, used in Soviet space missions produces from six to eight hundred thousand pounds of thrust. In this country, the largest rocket booster is still the 300,000-pound-thrust Atlas. We are trying to bridge the gap by developing high-energy upper stages as well as bigger boosters. Within a few years, we may have perfected the giant Saturn rocket. In the meantime, however, the U.S.S.R. is not likely to stand still.

According to testimony given to my committee, the Soviet space lead is based primarily on this 2-to-1 superiority in rocket thrust. Greater thrust permits the U.S.S.R. to carry out space missions that would otherwise be impossible. It also shortens leadtime, and increases reliability.

As you all know, the result has been a string of firsts and other exhibitions of Soviet prowess in rocketry. These are not hollow triumphs; they reflect an ability to put men and instruments into orbit, or into deep space, for a variety of purposes. They have also convinced many people around the world of Soviet leadership not only in rocketry but in broad areas of science and technology. While it is clearly a delusion to take rocketry alone as a proof of general scientific progress, the fact that many people do so has affected the world position of the United States.

The impact of Soviet space feats on world opinion has now been recognized by many high officials of the present administration—including Dr. George Kistiakowsky, the President's scientific adviser, who recently said that we "cannot ignore the very real political implications of various spectacular accomplishments in outer space that have come to have symbolic meaning to the world at large."

A month or so earlier, Dr. Kistiakowsky observed that this country is engaged in "a scientific and technological contest with the Soviet Union, which today involves our national prestige, and tomorrow, perhaps, our very survival."

Now, I am not recommending national self-flagellation, though I think a little self-criticism is good for the soul and good for the country. On the contrary, I believe that Soviet superiority in rocket thrust, while undeniably an important index of space capabilities, should be kept in proper perspective.

Whether in space research or military astronautics, the best results are not always obtained with the biggest boosters. Nor can progress in space research be measured by the chronology of spectacular feats. There are too many partial measures which cannot simply be added up—for instance, the variety and types of missiles and space vehicles, the number of successful launchings, instrumentation, reliability, tracking and control devices.

Dr. Homer Newell of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration recently completed a study of American and Soviet space research programs. He concluded that the U.S.S.R. leads us in high-altitude measurements, biological experiments, payload package ejection, deep-space probes, and vehicle technology. On the other hand, he said, the two countries appear to be nearly equal in upper air research and in satellite studies of the earth's environment; and the United States has taken the lead in solar radiation experiments and in studies of the atmosphere up to an altitude of about 200 miles.

The detailed comparisons made by Dr. Newell may be cause for concern but hardly for despair. In fact, he might well have included a list of the very creditable American "firsts" in outer space—for example, putting the first satellite into a polar orbit; putting the first satellite into a (near) circular orbit; the first ejection of capsules from satellites; and the first use of a satellite for communications relay. It is widely believed, furthermore, that we have more than held our own in guidance, miniaturization, and data recovery. There is even some feeling, though it is hard to verify, that we have acquired more useful scientific data.

I particularly wish to point out that our space lag, in comparison with the U.S.S.R., is the result of conscious choices.

It is not the result of inability to do things in outer space as well and as fast as the Russians. In fact, the Russians have developed more powerful rockets than ours because they began their development 5 or 6 years earlier.

We did not give high priority to ballistic missiles until 1954, when we first knew that we could make light, small nuclear warheads. Government witnesses told my committee that we made a choice at that time between lighter warheads and more powerful rockets. We chose the lighter warheads. Why could we not pursue both courses, and make both the lighter warheads and the more powerful rockets? If we had done so, according to expert testimony, we might not now be trailing the Russians in outer space.

Is it possible that the space and missile programs have been tailored to fit budgetary preconceptions?

In August of 1955, Dr. von Braun told a high-level meeting that he had the hardware to put the world's first satellite into orbit. He was not allowed to proceed.

In 1956, General Medaris received an order from Washington, instructing him not to let the Jupiter C go into orbit. At that time, General Medaris and his scientific colleagues were about to test-fire the Jupiter C. They believed it could be put into orbit at will.

Remember, the first Russian satellite was not launched until October 1957.

Yet, as you know, our Thor and Jupiter IRBM's are now available in quantity, and our Atlas ICBM's became operational at about the same time as their Russian counterparts. Considering the dates when we began our programs, it appears that we developed IRBM's and ICBM's in about half as much time as the Russians.

This is an accomplishment in which we can all take pride. But it was made necessary by our own earlier decisions not to develop large rocket boosters and not to engage in a satellite program. The same decisions have hampered our efforts in outer space up to this very day.

VI. SPACE LAW AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

So far, I have been talking about our own national space program, what it means to us, and how it seems to be progressing. Now I should like to turn for a moment to the less evident but no less vital problems of space regulation and control.

There is a need now to begin work on the establishment of general space law. Man's ability to explore and use outer space is developing rapidly. Not only the United States and the U.S.S.R. but many other nations will soon be in the game. Any delay in creating applicable rules of international law may make our later efforts more difficult.

The need for space law is more than a mere matter of traffic control, important though that may be. Perhaps it would help to give a few examples.

A pressing problem of space law concerns responsibility for the effects caused by the return of spacecraft to earth. In addition to the need for international agreements dealing with liability for the resulting injury or damage, it may well be necessary to change domestic law. At present, it is by no means certain that an American citizen harmed by an American space vehicle could recover damages in an action against the Government.

Another problem is the allocation of radio frequencies for space use. Frequencies have been used in violation of treaty provisions, and transmissions have continued, interfering with normal communications, long after their purpose had been served. Looking to the future, we can see a coming "war" of the radio frequency spectrum. In effect, the spectrum is a scarce natural resource, already overloaded, which will be required to carry more and more traffic. The growing overload will come not only from military but from scientific and commercial use. Rapid communications will be needed among an increasing number of points for production, transportation, and other economic activities. In outer space, unless agreement is reached on frequency allocations, the information acquired by difficult and costly experiments may well be lost.

To give another example, scientists are beseeching their governments to help in keeping space clean. At the first international meeting on space science, held at Nice in January of this year, great concern was expressed over the dangers of contaminating other planets with living organisms from the earth and of contaminating the earth if space vehicles return from other planets. In H. G. Wells' novel, "War of the Worlds," man himself could not overcome the invaders from Mars, but man's diseases did. The dangers of interplanetary contamination are far-reaching and not at all fanciful. They are certainly a proper subject for space law.

It is apparent that new international accommodations will be necessary in the peaceful uses of outer space. Without trying to make a complete list, we can see now that conflicts may arise, unless an understanding is reached, in a number of fields including the extension of national sovereignty into outer space, interference among space systems and rivalry on the moon and the planets.

There is a more positive side to the novel forms of international cooperation which are likely if not certain to develop as a result. It is true that the use of outer space may create new international problems and tensions. We should not forget, however, that it also increases the incentives and opportunities for nations to live together in peace and harmony.

I will not trespass any further on the domain of the space lawyers except to repeat that their work and its practical applications are of great concern to us all. In order to benefit from the full fruits of space exploration, I believe, we must proceed at once to develop the principles of space law, and try to reach early agreement on the scientific and commercial uses of space.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

To me, the most hopeful omen of our future space progress is the growth of public understanding and support. Two years ago, there were many doubters. Today, most informed people in this country seem convinced of the necessity for going ahead in space at urgent speed.

Let me suggest some definite steps that would enable us to make the best possible effort. My suggestions will not be startling. In fact, I believe that each of these steps is self-evident and that most of you will find yourselves in agreement that each should be taken.

First, recognize that we are engaged in a long-run space race with the U.S.S.R., and make up our minds to compete.

I am speaking, of course, about the scientific and peaceful investigation of outer space. In the field of military missiles, however, there are two matters that deserve special mention: defense against the ICBM and the Polaris program.

An adequate means of defense against ICBM's has not yet been developed. We should not rest until it has been perfected.

Polaris is not just another missile system. It is a different kind of weapon—an almost invulnerable means of inevitable retaliation, if it can be made ready in time. The Minuteman, with mobility made possible by trucks and rail transportation, has a finite ability to land nuclear warheads at the end of an 8,000-mile range, doubtless within a mile of its target, as the Russians claim for themselves.

To close the missile gap by matching the U.S.S.R. missile for missile would be costly, protracted, and perhaps unprofitable at this time; to leap it with Polaris and Minuteman could transform our whole strategic situation. To develop Nike-Zeus as a sure, effective means of stopping nuclear warheads launched from 8,000 miles away would give us in America the possibility of returning to a posture of composure which is badly needed.

Second, emphasize large rocket boosters and high-energy upper stages, including the possibilities of nuclear and ion propulsion.

Third, improve the management of our military and civilian space programs. I will not try to predict what precise form of organization will finally emerge. There is a crying need, however, for comprehensive long-range planning, clear lines of authority, vigorous leadership, and continuity of effort.

Finally, further emphasize basic and supporting research and scientific training—the indispensable reservoir on which all our future progress must depend.

VIII. EPILOGUE

In conclusion, I want to say that we are now crossing the threshold into a new and expanding era of human development—the space age. It is perhaps the most interesting and exciting age through which mankind has ever passed. It is an age filled with tremendous developments, discoveries, and changes, the character of which we cannot at this hour even predict.

At the inception of this entirely new era, the Government must take the leadership in space. As time moves on and the age of space takes form and becomes more sharply focused, activity will tend to move from complete Federal control and direction into the hands of private commerce and enterprise. As it grows, space will become a human activity, felt in the channels of commerce, industry, and even in the normal and routine activities of everyday home life. We today are laying the basis for life in this new age.

Upward Spiral in Cost of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my policy to inform the people of the unneeded rising prices of natural gas companies, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the following letters which I have just received:

McMANUS & McMANUS,
Keokuk, Iowa, April 18, 1960.

Hon. LEONARD G. WOLF,
U.S. Representative from Iowa,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEN: Because of the great public concern in Iowa arising from the continual upward spiral in cost of natural gas charged by pipeline companies, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed comments of Keokuk Gas Service Co. relative thereto. If you have any comments or suggestions, Mr. W. W. Mullikin, manager of Keokuk Gas Service Co., 428 Main Street, Keokuk, Iowa, would deeply appreciate them.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

NICK McMANUS.
By E. J. McMANUS.

KEOKUK GAS SERVICE CO.,
Keokuk, Iowa, April 18, 1960.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

(Attention: Mr. G. H. Gutridge, Secretary.)

DEAR SIRS: In reply to your communication of April 8 regarding the above matter, we submit for your consideration the following comments expressing our position in regard to the proposed change in rates for the sale of natural gas by Michigan Wisconsin.

The undersigned during the months of May, June and July, 1959, appeared as an intervenor during the Power Commission's hearings in docket No. G-17512. Involved in those hearings was the question of changing the form of the rate to be charged distribution customers of Michigan, Wisconsin from a flat rate to a two-part demand and commodity rate. This intervenor strenuously objected to the proposed change in rate form. Essentially we resisted the change in rate form because it alone would cause such an increase in cost of gas as to reduce our company's net income before taxes by 5 percent. However, the Presiding Examiner in Docket No. G-17512 in his decision, which was subsequently affirmed by the commission, permitted Michigan Wisconsin to change the form of its rate.

Now, pursuant to the commission's order in Docket Nos. G-18313 et al, Michigan Wisconsin has submitted its proposed change in the level of its rates from $2.62 demand and 24 cents commodity, which is presently being collected under bond pending the Commission's approval, to $3.50 demand and 26 cents commodity. We strenuously object to this proposed increase in rate level because, if permitted, it will further reduce the net revenues before taxes of our company by at least an additional 10 percent. Thus by the two steps of changing the form and level of its rates Michigan Wisconsin will reduce our company's net income by at least 15 percent. If we are to continue in the business of distributing gas to our 3,700 customers in and about Keokuk and parts of Lee County, Iowa, this increase must be passed on to them.

We are in a peculiar position in the State of Iowa in that our State has no public utility commission empowered to fix rates. Each city council in the upwards of 900 cities and towns in our State are the ratemaking bodies. They are naturally antagonistic toward any increase in the retail cost of natural gas to the citizens under their jurisdiction and we are in complete agreement with them on this subject. We are of the opinion that, if the proposed increase is allowed, our competitive position with respect to other fuels will be jeopardized to such an extent that our natural gas customers will be forced to turn to our competitors and thus eliminate our chance of economic survival. Natural gas will be priced out of our fuel market.

In the event the Commission sees fit to permit Michigan-Wisconsin to raise its rate level as proposed, we submit that an equitable system of rate zones be established. This would permit those distribution customers of Michigan-Wisconsin as well as the public which they serve to reap a small measure of economic benefit from their geographic location with respect to the source of Michigan-Wisconsin's gas supply. It seems unfair to us and contrary to the public interest that our customers should be paying the cost of transmitting gas to existing customers as well as prospective customers under Michigan-Wisconsin's expansion program who are not located in as favorable a geographic position with respect to the source of supply.

In conclusion we submit that the proposed change in the level of Michigan-Wisconsin's rates is not only economically unfair to us, but it's patently contrary to the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Respectfully submitted.

W. W. MUCEIBIN,
Manager.

Congress Should Enact an Educational-Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following timely editorial which appeared in the April 14, 1960, issue of the New York Times:

EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS

After acting on the voting-rights bill, it is important that the House turn its attention to another kind of civil rights measure. This is what might well be called an educational rights bill, one that would recognize the Federal Government's inescapable responsibility in the present crisis in American schools.

Early in February the Senate passed a bill providing $1.8 billion on a matching basis over a 2-year period for teachers' salaries or school construction or both. One of the great advantages of this measure is that it gives the individual States a choice in spending the money; one of its great disadvantages is that in the light of the administration's narrow view of school needs the President would be almost sure to veto it. To avoid such a fate, the House Education and Labor Committee last month reported a bill providing

half the amount of the Senate proposal, stretching it out over a 3-year period, and limiting it to matching grants for school construction only, with an administration-approved bond-retirement plan thrown in for good measure.

The administration, backed by the usual conservatice-Republican, southern-Democratic coalition, has shown so little grasp of the magnitude and the urgency of the school problem in the United States that even if Congress grants any aid at all, it is likely to be inadequate. Yet it is difficult to believe that this issue can once again be shoved aside, as it has been for nearly a decade. It ranks in importance with civil rights and national defense—in fact it is part of national defense.

"The public schools in the United States * * * are ill-staffed, ill-equipped and ill-housed to provide the kind of excellence in education which the era demands * * *," said the Public Education Association of this city in a recent statement. The nationwide shortage of public school teachers is 135,000 (average annual salary $5,160); the nationwide shortage of classrooms is about 130,000; within the decade, school enrollments will increase by 25 percent, and expenditures "sufficient merely to maintain existing standards" will jump even more sharply. It is no longer simply to improve the quality of education that Federal support is vital; it is necessary to prevent a decline—and it is necessary now.

Patriots Live To Slay Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an excellent article written by Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, which appeared in the April 16, 1960 edition of the Pilot, of Boston, Mass.:

PATRIOTS LIVE TO SLAY TYRANNY

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing)

On April 19, 1960, we commemorate the 185th anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. On this day of April in 1775 the siege of Boston began; the American Revolution began; freedom as we so gratefully know it in America began.

Familiar and noble names shine out of the stirring story of the overwhelmingly unequal struggle into which the brave leaders of the colony of Massachusetts plunged when they saw their inheritance of freedom threatened, their human rights in peril. Names which sound like a litany as they fall upon our ears: John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Dr. Joseph Warren, Paul Revere, William Dawes. There are other names with equal claim upon our perpetual gratitude, names less well remembered but of equal distinction wherever the tocsin of liberty rings: names such as that of Benjamin Austin, a man long in public life and honored with responsible offices; Nathaniel Barber, no officeholder but notably an influential citizen; David Jeffries, town treasurer of Boston and earnest propagandist of ideas which later gave life to our Declaration of Independence; Henry Hill, a man of wealth, greatly beloved for his generosity and his rectitude; William Molyneaux, a successful merchant and protagonist in the drama upon whose prelude the 19th day of April raised the curtain.

Farmers left their cattle and their lands and crowded down the roads and lanes of this quiet countryside—embattled farmers, nameless on the pages of the ordinary history book, each carrying his simple weapon and wearing his signs of embattlement as never more proudly have been worn the insignia of high degree.

Mechanics were there, too—Gibbons Sharpe, whose name we know, and many whose names have been forgotten but whose measureless services in the furtherance of liberty are indelible on the scrolls of time. The mechanics were no newcomers on the scene; they had been watching the Tories and the British troops for months, comparing notes and sharing information when their clubs held their meetings or whenever they came together at the Green Dragon Tavern. It is to such vigilance as theirs that Lord Percy, second in command to General Gates, paid grudging tribute when on the afternoon of April 18 he reported to his general that the Americans already knew that the British troops were to move that night and to strike at Concord.

AIM TO PRESERVE

All these men of 1775 were sincere, devoted, and ready for the sacrifice of life, if need be. Their devotion and sincerity were replete with activity and before they should lay down their lives they meant to fill them with every sort of peacetime maneuver which might accomplish their purpose short of war. There was no room in their thinking for anarchy nor for any of the points of view to which the revolutionists of our century have given expression. These patriots did not aim to overturn but to preserve. To them, as Richard Frothingham wrote in his "Siege of Boston" freedom did not appear as the instigator of license but as the protector of social order and the guardian genius of commercial enterprise and moral progress.

There are writers who toss off the engagement at Lexington and Concord as a skirmish. That is as it appears to be when the number of men involved and the maneuvering of the opposing forces are compared with the great and decisive battles of history. Of the Americans, only 49 were killed, 39 wounded, and 5 missing; of the British, 73 were killed, 174 wounded, and 26 missing. These are insignificant figures placed alongside the casualties of modern warfare. But there was nothing of insignificance in the action itself. Even from the military angle, this so-called skirmish made a contribution, for it confirmed at the start that the Indian style of fighting—firing from behind trees and stone walls—was far superior for the locale and the era than was fighting in closed ranks as the European system of the age decreed, and this valuable military lesson was illustrated time and again up to the very surrender at Yorktown.

There was, however, much more than military victory gained in Lexington and Concord. There was a moral victory from which derived the supreme courage which union in a great cause engenders. There was the respect for this courage which the British recognized, to which any adversary perforce pays tribute. There was, one may well say, the birth of our Nation, for along the road from Concord to Cambridge, as the British soldiers scampered in pell-mell flight, if not in actual rout, was born the United States of America, for which we are, one and all, ready to die in order that its freedom may be preserved.

No nation in all time has been born out of so little self-seeking by the individual, out of greater devotion to the common good. Those informal troops embarked that April night on a war so long, so filled with difficulties as to have chilled all but those in whose veins flowed the warm blood of a holy purpose.

OPEN DOOR

Success attended their efforts and the Nation which in 1783 rewarded their sufferings, their sacrifices and the unquenchable fire of their dreams was a new and glorious kind of Nation. Geographically it was a small Nation but the nobility of its purpose and promise inflamed the pioneer to take his little bundle of household goods, his wife and his children and make his way over harsh and dangerous country to open up frontiers and eventually to spread our civilization to the edge of the Pacific and beyond.

As soon as it became apparent that our resources afforded enough and more than enough for all, our Nation opened up its doors and called to the oppressed of other lands to come and share our blessings, to invest their labor and their love in an ever growing America. Within the very lifetime of those who fought at Concord and Lexington the political institutions which should insure justice and guard the natural rights of man were firmly planted, functioning and flourishing. The Revolution had succeeded in the new world and had received the blessing of the mother countries beyond the sea.

In the years since our revolution we have fought other wars—wars which the generation involved believed to be necessary for the preservation of our heritage. In our own century we have fought two frightful wars, both of them waged with a high degree of unselfish devotion. In 1917 the boys went out—tens of thousands of them to their death—to make the world safe for democracy, and those who came back were, poor fellows, a disillusioned generation. In 1941 fathers saw sons shouldering rifles and shipping off to unknown lands to fight again in a war to abolish tyranny and to preserve what we now call the freedoms of the Western World. Theirs was a new kind of war, different in environments, different in sort of battle, and at the end, different in the mode of peace. But these differences were not of their own making, and in their hearts and minds was the same devotion to freedom that had been so herocially exemplified in 1775 and in all the wars between.

BATTLE FOR MINDS

What about us—we who must fight the battle of the present—call it, as you will, the cold war or world war III. Our war is more intensely total war than ever World War II. It is being waged, seemingly not for territory but for trade and, much more devastatingly, for the conquest of the mind. In satellite states freedom has long since been lost as the Communist conspiracy has closed in, terrified men's souls, weaken their wills, and set up a minority dictatorship that holds in bondage entire nations, nations scarcely less devoted to freedom than were our own men of 1775.

Many of these nations are Christian nations. In their faith in the one true God and their desire to follow Christ in thought and act they find the meaning of their lives. They cannot without courting the concentration camp stand up in fervent affirmation of their faith. They cannot proclaim their belief in God or declare, as the delegates from our Massachusetts counties of Essex and Worcester and Middlesex declared in Faneuil Hall, the 25th of August 1774, that they stand for "life, liberty, and the means of sustenance by the Grace of Heaven." But they know, no less than our delegates of 1774 knew, that those who fight tyranny are fighting God's own battle against the powers of evil and that the obligation they have of enlisting in the war is twofold: as patriotic citizens of their various enslaved nations and as devoted children of God.

The foe hides behind no subterfuge: he boldly proclaims that he is anti-God and that the purposes of all his tyranny, the final goal of Soviet communism is the ob-

ligation of the idea of God from the hearts and minds of men, to be accomplished by whatever degrees of force and persecution each case may call for.

It is the atheistic nihilism of communism and its adherence to the interpretation of human society in accordance with the tenets of dialetical materialism which make it impossible for a nation like ours whose motto proclaims our trust in God to have any confidence in dealing with Soviet Russia, for we know that to its rulers the vocabulary we use—such as freedom, liberty, the rights of man—can have no like significance, no concurrent meaning with our own. The very source of Russia's being impels it to use fair means or foul to create a regime on earth in which totalitarianism will crush beneath its turgid mass all the noble concepts which we hold dear, all the great hope of mankind for which the men whose heroism we celebrate today fought and gave up their lives, if needed.

NO COMMON GROUND

In the unshakeable resolution of the leaders of Communism to hold fast to their atheism and dialectical materialism many of our thinkers of today find their reason to despair of any achievement at the coming summit meetings. They see no common ground. They believe that Russia looks forward to this meeting nothing more than another opportunity to advance toward a Red Germany and a further Sovietized world.

What happens when Russia takes over a country? It crushes the heart of the people, it forces them to abandon the principles which the nation has held dear and to eradicate the institutions through which they expressed their faith in God. We have seen it again and again. We saw it in the martyrdom of Bishop Francis Xavier Ford. We saw it in the persecution of the Catholic Bishop of Shanghai, the noble Ignatius Kung Pin-mei, who was sentenced to life imprisonment because he refused to break his ties with the Holy See. In Yugoslavia Bishop Franjo Cekeda is under arrest on the same sort of framed charges as were brought against Cardinal Stepinac, of blessed memory, and in Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty, the beloved of his people is at present safe only through the good offices of the American Government.

I am sure that those of you acquainted with the story of your churches and synagogues in these Red-dominated countries can match this list of leaders gone to their death or languishing in prison, and that all of us, Protestant, Jew and Catholic can unfurl long lists of white-robed martyrs whose names do not reach the columns of our press but which, nevertheless, shine as brightly for those of us for whom they carried the torch.

RED CHINA

How far are we, the great majority of American citizens, responsible for Russia's grave crimes by our failure to make our voices heard and our position clear in one major matter after another on the international scene? What are we doing now in this matter of recognition of Red China and its admission into the United Nations? We cannot be complacent about it and we cannot plead ignorance. In its 17th annual convention, held in December 1959 in New York, the Communist Party of the United States adopted the following resolution: to advance the cause of peace and progress, by ending the cold war, by furthering the policy of peaceful coexistence with peaceful relations, by establishing the recognition of normal relations with People's China. Such news as was given to the press pointed to a new deluge of demands for the recognition of Red China and the seating of the Peiping regime in the United Nations—all this despite the foul crimes committed by that regime against religion, against God.

The day that Red China is seated in the United Nations will mark another milestone in the weakening of the machinery for world peace. The United Nations is already beset with difficulties due to the Soviet use of the veto, and will certainly be well on its way to the status of a Communist preserve, if Red China—whose leaders are dedicated to the worldwide triumph of Marxist Leninism—is seated on the Security Council.

I am not a pessimist. I do not despair of the intelligence, the perseverance, the love of liberty or the patriotism of the American people. I do not believe that the American of 1960 means to fail the men who died at Lexington, nor the generations whose devotion and service have built this country from a seaboard colony to a great nation. I do not believe that America of today will betray the armies which even in our day have died that freemen may not be denied their freedom. We possess among us the moral and intellectual force which inspired Adams and the rest. One thing alone we seem to have lost: their singlemindedness in the face of danger, their wholehearted concentration on the commonweal.

If we as a people were fully alerted, every citizen with sufficient schooling to understand the trend of events would be aware of all that has transpired in Germany since the close of World War II. He would know that Chancelor Adenauer is strong in his purpose to accomplish. He would have noted in the press the Communist-directed effort to discredit him as a neo-Nazi. He would watch with close attention the reception of the delegation of the National Maritime Union now en route to Moscow.

He would rejoice in the two great American labor parties who have rejected trade union exchanges with the slave labor system of Soviet Russia. All these things he would ponder, as Sam Adams pondered the future possibilities of a republic composed of states united under a wise and noble constitution. He would not be at the mercy of radio or TV commentators, of chance opinions however vehemently expressed. His mind would be informed, his opinion served by constant and careful reading, by thought and discussion, by a resolution that as a citizen he would help preserve the America he loved, with a vigilance unsurpassed even by those who fashioned it nearly 200 years ago.

INFLUENCING YOUTH

The plans of the Communist Party are plain for all to read, at least those plans whose publicity they hope will advance their cause. We know that the party in the United States adopted in their last convention the resolution to launch a 2-month ideological campaign from March 1 to this coming May Day on the affairs of youth, to stir young men up against compulsory ROTC, and against loyalty oaths for Federal scholarships. We are forewarned of the infiltration of youth organizations, of this frank approach to subversion of our Government, subversion at least in spirit.

What are our opinions on loyalty oaths? How many young people do we listen to that we may discover the source of their ideas? Are we for or against ideas on purely emotional grounds or do we care enough to endeavor to reach a well considered stand, and then to act upon it in the many ways at our command as members of American society?

We have watched Soviet Russia ruin the beautiful culture that was once Europe, cleave it apart, shatter it, intimidate it, enslave it. Only a little remains in comparative freedom, and within the territories of that little the Communist Parties are hacking away in the hope that soon the supergovernment of Moscow will envelop all. Here in the United States the party is struggling to recover its lost prestige. Again it is working in university circles, in youth organizations of many sorts, in discussion clubs on and off campuses. A new society called "Advance," secret in membership, has as its objective—so it is said—to smuggle their members into larger organizations and to spread their ideas everywhere. New impetus is being given to the areas of mass work—to labor, to the Negro, to the young intellectuals.

There are few, if any, Americans—if we except those tarred with the Communist brush—who would not lay down their lives for our country. We may lack the vigilance and the earnestness of the men of 1775, but we do not lack their patriotism nor are we surpassed by them in love of country or in appreciation of our political blessings.

As we honor those men we recall the comment of Lord Percy made on April 20, 1775, "these rebels are determined to go through with the business of winning freedom." Let us of 1960 be no less eager to go through with the business of preserving the freedom they won, no less ready to fight for it with every fiber of our being.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Strategy for the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the April 1960 issue of the Foreign Affairs magazine contains a thoughtful article by Mr. Richard Gardner on the American balance of payments problem, entitled "Strategy for the Dollar." As I pointed out in a recent speech on the floor of the Senate, "the present trade gap is as dangerous to the health of our national economy as the ICBM gap is to the defense of our national security." Mr. Gardner presents a series of practical steps that could be taken to close this gap in a manner that both meets American domestic economic policy needs and also provides for a healthier international economic trade pattern. While I do not agree with several of the suggestions made for ending the present drain of American dollars, I do believe that this article makes a valuable contribution to current economic thinking on this problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am advised by the Government printer that the insertion will run beyond the two pages permitted, and will make approximately 3¼ pages, at a cost of $263.25. I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding the additional cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGY FOR THE DOLLAR

(By Richard N. Gardner)

The most important new influence on American policy to emerge during the past year came from the most unexpected quarter. For more than a decade we had been worrying about the dollar shortage—the supposedly persistent tendency of the United States to run a surplus in its balance of payments. But sometime last summer we woke up to the startling fact that the United States was running a large payments deficit.

During the years 1958 and 1959 the excess of our foreign payments over receipts totaled some $7 billion. This deficit was financed by a $4 billion increase in foreign holdings of dollars and a $3 billion reduction in the U.S. stock of gold. As these lines are written, we continue to run a deficit, though at a somewhat reduced rate, and later this year foreign holdings of dollars will surpass our holdings of gold for the first time in American history.

There is no question about the ability of the United States to close the deficit in its balance of payments. We could strike a balance by drastically curtailing foreign military spending and economic aid, restricting our imports and our private foreign investment, or painfully deflating our domestic economy. But these measures would solve our balance of payments problem at the cost of our security and prosperity and that of the entire free world.

The real question is not whether we can reduce our deficit but how much we ought to reduce it and how we can make this reduction without sacrificing policies which are vital for the achievement of our national aims.

In the first excited reaction to the turnabout in our payments position we seemed in some danger of upsetting vital foreign policy programs. The administration started to tie our foreign aid spending to purchases in the United States. It was reported to be contemplating a drastic reduction in our military establishment abroad and deep cuts in aid to less developed countries. It was under heavy pressure to modify its moderately liberal trade policy. Except for the decision to put a "Buy American" label on Development Loan Fund spending, however, we weathered the first winter of concern with the payments deficit without overturning any important elements in our present foreign policy.

The threat to existing policies will recur, of course, if we fail to reduce the deficit below the high level of 1958–59. But this is not the only danger. Preoccupation with our payments deficit may smother new and creative policies now struggling to be born. To promote our national objectives in the decade of the 1960's we shall need bold programs to reduce our import restrictions and increase our aid to less developed countries. Such programs are unlikely to be adopted if we continue to run large payments deficits.

II

Much of the discussion about our payments deficit has assumed that our national interest would be served by eliminating it as soon as possible. Unfortunately, the problem is not so simple. The payments question has to be looked at not solely from the U.S. viewpoint but from the viewpoint of the free world as a whole.

In order to have an expanding free-world economy, monetary reserves must grow at about the same rate as international trade. In the 1950's, the free world's gold supply grew only one-third as rapidly as free-world trade. The rest of the reserve needs of the free world outside the United States were met from the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. During the decade as a whole we fed $14 billion in reserves to the rest of the world, $4 billion in the form of gold, $10 billion in the form of increased foreign holdings of dollars. The dollar thus became the world's principal reserve currency. Without this supplement to liquidity the substantial economic achievements of the 1950's would never have taken place.

It would be unwise for the United States to seek to solve the liquidity problem all alone during the next decade by running deficits of the present size. Such large and recurring deficits could eventually destroy foreign confidence in the dollar and trigger a massive conversion of dollars into gold. This would force us to trim our foreign payments drastically through restrictive measures destructive of free-world security and growth. Yet if we eliminate our deficit entirely, or convert it into a surplus, we leave the free world short of reserves it desperately needs. The answer to this dilemma will not be found in the International Monetary Fund in its present form, since the national quotas are not large enough to cover future liquidity requirements and are not regarded by member countries, in any event, as reserves. In the years ahead, therefore, we shall have to find some new multilateral solution to the liquidity problem. Whether the answer lies in converting the Fund into a world central bank as proposed by Dr. Robert Triffin, or in some other institutional innovation, is beyond the scope of this article.

It may take several years to find a generally acceptable multilateral solution to the free world's liquidity problem. What do we do in the meantime? Probably the best compromise is for the United States to aim at very moderate deficits in the years ahead, deficits on the average of about $1 to $1.5 billion a year. This would feed the free world's reserves much less rapidly than we have done during the last 2 years, but about as rapidly as we did during the 1950's as a whole.

Annual average deficits of $1 to $1.5 billion would not impose an intolerable strain on the United States. Various measures are suggested later which could minimize the risks involved and insure that the deficits were financed mainly through the accumulation of foreign dollar holdings rather than withdrawals of gold. Although it may not serve the interests of private holders to accumulate dollar balances at interest rates low enough to support our domestic economic expansion, the foreign governments and central banks which are the only holders in a position to demand gold and start a run on the dollar must act on larger economic and political considerations. They have every reason to agree to small annual increases in their dollar balances, especially since there is no immediately available alternative for increasing free world reserves. They would go a long way to avoid weakening the very currency in which they hold a substantial portion of their reserves. Moreover, the United States, as the biggest importer and the biggest supplier of funds for free world growth and defense, has unequalled sanctions at its disposal to induce the cooperation of the principal foreign dollar holders. These countries are not likely to take any action which would embarrass or weaken the very country on which they most depend for their prosperity and defense.

III

Just how strong is the tendency toward imbalance in U.S. payments? Will a reduction in our deficit take place as a result of natural economic forces or will a balance be increasingly difficult to achieve?

To begin with, the events of the postwar years should warn us against jumping to the conclusion that an imbalance in world payments is permanent. Only a few years ago a considerable body of expert opinion accepted as inevitable a tendency for the United States to run persistent surpluses in its accounts with the rest of the world. As late as 1957 Sir Geoffrey Crowther, former editor of the Economist, proudly reminded a Harvard audience that for 20 years he had preached the doctrine of "a permanent and organic shortage of dollars; the more time passes the more convinced do I become that I am right. It is difficult to believe that there can ever have been another case of a

country where the demand of the rest of the world for its products was so urgent and its demand for the products of the rest of the world so indifferent." [1]

Where the experts talked of dollar shortage a few years ago they now debate the dollar glut. What has happened in the interim? To begin with, our definition of the problem has changed. We used to measure the imblance in world payments in terms of our commercial surplus minus foreign investment, on the grounds that our oversea military spending was temporary and foreign aid was a balancing item to finance the surplus. Today we no longer exclude foreign aid and military spending in measuring the imbalance in world payments. Some time during the last few years we came to regard these as relatively permanent items necessary to finance the growth and defense of the free world. With this recognition the problem changed from how the rest of the world could finance our troublesome commercial surplus to how the United States could generate a sufficient commercial surplus to finance payments for free-world growth and defense. Accordingly we now measure imbalance in world trade by our payments deficit—the extent to which we lose gold and foreigners accumulate dollar balances.

This, of course, is only part of the story. The size of the U.S. deficit has increased. It was some $2 billion larger in the period 1958–59 than 1953–56. The increase in the deficit resulted almost entirely from a decline in the surplus of our merchandise exports over merchandise imports. This was due, in part, to some temporary adverse factors—lagging business recovery abroad compared to recovery here; special circumstances hampering key exports like cotton and civilian aircraft; and the steel strike. The elimination of these temporary factors is expected to result in a substantial increase in our merchandise surplus in 1960 and a reduction in our payments deficit this year to less than $3 billion.

The drop in our commercial surplus durin 1958–59 led some people to conclude that the United States has lost its ability to compete—that "we have priced ourselves out of world markets." Plausible as it seems on the surface, this theory is supported by very little evidence. Wage rates, wholesale prices, and consumer prices in the United States have all increased rather less in recent years than in Britain and France and at about the same rate as in Germany, Italy, and Japan. To be sure, our prices have risen more rapidly than prices elsewhere on certain commodities (some steel products, automobiles, and farm products under price supports). But there is no evidence of a substantial increase of our average export prices relative to the average export prices of our principal competitors.

We are facing keener competition in world markets than a few years ago, but price changes are not primarily responsible. Thanks in large part to the Marshall plan and our other postwar aid programs, Europe and Japan have markedly increased their capacity to produce and deliver goods at existing prices—goods of high quality and new kinds of goods in anticipation of changing consumer demands. We have also promoted competition for our exports through the establishment by American companies of branches and subsidiaries overseas.

Yet despite this encouragement of foreign competition by foreign aid and investment, our ability to compete in world markets remains fundamentally unimpaired. Recent studies by the U.S. Department of Commerce confirm that the recent drop in U.S. exports reflected difficulties—some temporary—in three or four big items and not a loss of markets all along the line.[2] Our share in world exports remained virtually unchanged between 1950 and 1958. Moreover, as of today, we have a larger share in world exports of manufacturers than we had before the Second World War.

Accompanying the drop in merhcandise exports has been a substantial rise in merchandise imports. As in the case of exports, this increase can probably be explained less by price changes than by the growing capacity of our industrial competitors to deliver the goods. Probably there has also been some shift in American consumer demand in favor of imports as a result of higher income levels, greater sophistication in taste, and increased tourism and business travel. Yet even in 1959 imports barely exceeded 3 percent of our gross national product—the share they have held with remarkable consistency over the last 30 years except during the war and immediate postwar period.

Even if we leave aside the temporary circumstances which made our payments balance particularly adverse in 1958 and 1959, our present payments for world growth and defense still overbalance our commerial surplus by around $3 billion a year. Our problem is to bring this deficit down to the $1 to $1.5 billion target outlined earlier by increasing our commercial surplus or reducing our foreign payments and doing so without impairing policies necessary for the growth and security of the United States and the entire free world.

IV

Sound domestic politics are first of all the ultimate foundation on which our new dollar diplomacy will stand or fall. If we are to finance the foreign economic and military expenditures necessary for free world growth and freedom, we must increase the size of our commercial surplus. To do this we must check the creeping inflation of our costs and prices, or insure at least that we inflate somewhat less rapidly than our main industrial competitors. Labor will have to show greater restraint in limiting demands for wage increases to increases in productivity. Moreover, our balance of payments should not be subjected to the strain of another nationwide steel strike. This underlines the need to find better ways of settling industrial disputes in basic industries.

In the domestic field we particularly need a concert of government policies to assure a faster rate of economic growth. Unless we achieve greater average annual increases in our production we shall experience growing difficulty in providing ourselves with higher levels of consumption and basic services while at the same time financing our defense and foreign policy and paying our way in world trade. We should place much greater emphasis on investment in research and technology. Faster productivity advances will help develop large new export markets for the United States even with moderate increases in money wages.

Sounder domestic policies should be supplemented, secondly, by a national export drive. Our exporters developed some bad habits during the sellers' market that prevailed during and after the war. We can no longer afford to take for granted foreign customers for American goods or regard foreign markets as a minor extension of the market at home. To meet stiffer foreign competition we have to develop new and better products adapted to changing foreign demands. We must sell them more aggressively, service them better, and supply them on easier credit terms.

Although the primary responsibility for staging an export comeback rests with the business community, the Government can provide some help. It should support exporters with medium-term credit facilities at least as favorable as those provided by our main competitors. It should do a better job of informing American businessmen of possibilities for foreign sales by strengthening economic and consular staffs abroad and improving advisory services at home.

The third element in our dollar diplomacy must be action to speed the removal of foreign restrictions against American goods. During the postwar years our exports have been suppressed by an elaborate network of exchange controls and import quotas, some of them expressly discriminating against the United States. Others, though nondiscriminatory, severely restricted our foreign trade. The main industrial countries of Europe and Japan which have benefited from the recent redistribution in world reserves can now dispense with all or nearly all of these controls.

Some progress has been made in this direction. Britain, France, and other countries have recently announced significant liberalizations of import restrictions which will help to increase our exports in the years ahead. But much more remains to be done. We should take every opportunity in international and bilateral negotiations to press for the removal, by countries with adequate reserves, of their restrictions on American exports. In appropriate cases these countries must remove controls not merely on their imports of our goods but on their imports of services—e.g. tourism in the United States. Furthermore, we must go beyond the removal of direct controls and do some hard bargaining for the reduction of some of the high tariffs which confront us on many important export items. This is another strong reason for strengthening the President's presently inadequate tariff-reducing powers. Although further reciprocal tariff reduction will increase American imports as well as exports, the freeing of trade all around will enhance the efficacy of the adjustments we make to cope with stiffer international competition.

The liberalization of other countries' restrictions on imports from the United States should be accompanied, in the fourth place, by the easing of restraints on capital outflow. Even those of our industrial allies which have made progress in import liberalization have done comparatively little in this direction. With the continued improvement of their reserve position they could give greater freedom to their citizens to invest abroad. With the easing of restrictions on capital outflow a substantial amount of European long-term capital would come to the United States during the years ahead through the purchase of American securities and the establishment of productive enterprises.

Fifth, we should stop our encouragement of American investment in other than underdeveloped countries. In view of our payments deficit, indiscriminate incentives to foreign investment are a luxury we can no longer afford. We should enact the Boggs bill providing deferral of U.S. income tax on the income earned abroad by a new class of American foreign business corporations, but only after amending the bill so that deferral is available only on income which is reinvested in underdeveloped countries. Moreover, we should enact a Boggs bill in reverse to take away the deferral privilege now available to foreign corporations in advanced countries which are owned or controlled by Americans. This would help to slow the surge of our investment in Canada and Western Europe and stimulate the backflow of profits now being accumulated in these countries.

Sixth, a greater share in aid to underdeveloped countries should be assumed by

[1] "Balance and Imbalance of Payments," pp. 34, 48.

[2] "Foreign Commerce Weekly," Dec. 21, 1959, pp. 16–18, 21.

Western Europe and Japan. The increased aid efforts of our industrial allies should be channeled through new multilateral institutions such as the proposed International Development Association, now awaiting congressional approval. The proposal of Under Secretary Douglas Dillon to expand the OEEC into an aid-coordinating institution is a further step in the right direction.

We should remember, however, that the present level of Western aid for less developed countries is still far below the level necessary to assure a rate of growth compatible with American and free-world interests. In view of this fact, a larger aid effort by Western Europe and Japan must not mean a smaller effort by the United States. On the contrary, the United States should probably aim at a $1 to $2 billion annual increase in its economic development efforts during the next decade.

An increase in economic aid efforts by foreign countries, therefore, will provide no direct saving for our balance of payments. But it may help us indirectly. If the trend toward united lending by our industrial allies is allowed to continue, a considerable portion of their aid may be spent on American exports. It is unfortunate that we should have set our allies a bad example in this respect by tying the disbursements of the Development Loan Fund. Given liberal trade policies here and abroad, the United States can expect to be a major beneficiary of the expansion of foreign markets that will result from a faster pace of development in the less developed countries.

The seventh element in our dollar diplomacy should consist of new efforts to reduce foreign military spending. We cannot place the security of the free world at the mercy of our balance of payments. If certain military expenditures abroad are necessary to assure the survival of freedom in this world, we will have to find the means to finance them. At the same time, our payments problem does justify additional measures to prune unnecessary military expenditure.

We are currently spending some $3 billion annually on troops and bases overseas. By reducing some PX privileges and requiring some fraction of military pay to be banked in the United States we would serve the double purpose of reducing conspicuous consumption abroad by our troops and their dependents (a major cause of anti-American feeling) and cutting somewhat this $3 billion drain.

A large part of the $3 billion in our foreign military spending goes for the operation and maintenance of American bases in Europe. The benefits of these bases are enjoyed by our allies as well as ourselves; the costs should be shared in accordance with capacity to pay. The same observation applies to the several hundred million dollars worth of military hardware we have been shipping free of charge each year to our NATO allies. Payment for some of these supplies would mean a welcome increase in our export earnings. We shall have to move cautiously in this area to avoid political difficulties. But the difficulties involved should not deter us from beginning a collective reexamination of outdated formulas for sharing the burden of common defense.

V

The seven policies outlined above should be enough to reduce the deficit to our target level of $1 to $1.5 billion a year. But they may take some time to work. Moreover, we may have to run larger deficits in some years to push ourselves out of future recessions and cope with other unforeseen economic, political and military contingencies. Quite apart from these problems, we must be prepared to sustain the continuing small average deficits until such time as the free world's liquidity problem is solved by a major institutional innovation. For all these reasons, we should consider resorting to four transitional measures which, while making no fundamental contribution to balancing our payments, will buy time and give us greater freedom to maneuver. Although our reserve position is strong already, there is no reason for taking chances. We do not want to live the next few years under the lengthening shadow of a dollar crisis.

First, we should explore the possibilities for the accelerated repayment by the European countries of loans that they have received from the United States. Still outstanding are several billion dollars in Marshall plan loans and special postwar credits such as our 1946 loan to Britain. Acceleration of loan repayment by mutual agreement would mean interest savings for the foreign governments and substantial reductions in our payments deficit. Some prepayment has already taken place on an ad hoc basis. Now we might reach agreements with particular countries for further prepayment in the event that they accumulate a substantial additional amount of reserves at the expense of the United States.

Second, we could guarantee the gold value of the dollar balances held by foreign governments. This would encourage the four or five countries principally concerned to settle their surpluses with us by accumulating interest-bearing dollar claims rather than running down our gold supply. Although gold clauses in private contracts are no longer enforceable in American courts, an internationally binding gold guarantee could be given by the U.S. Government. Since devaluation of the dollar is in any case an inappropriate remedy for our balance of payments difficulties, we would only be committing ourselves to avoid doing what we do not wish to do anyway.

Third, we could eliminate, or at least reduce, our gold reserve requirement. Under present law, the Federal Reserve banks must hold gold certificates equal to 25 percent of their note and deposit liabilities. This has no effect on our monetary policy. But it ties up $12 billion of our gold stock, leaving only $7 billion free for use in foreign trade. Modification of the requirement would have no adverse domestic effects and would provide massive additional support for the dollar's international position.

Fourth, we could make use of the International Monetary Fund. With all the talk of dollar weakness in the last 2 years we have continued to be a net creditor in the Fund to the tune of $2 billion with additional unused drawing rights of $4 billion. This situation is absurd. It underlines the Fund's practical shortcomings as a provider of international liquidity. But we do not have to stand idly by awaiting modifications in the Fund agreement. We are entitled to liquidate our present creditor position in the Fund and get a standby credit entitling us to exercise part of our other drawing rights at will. To avoid possible adverse psychological reactions we should take these actions at a time like the present when our payments position is improving.

VI

The dollar diplomacy outlined above may be described as the liberal-collective—as contrasted with the restrictive-unilateral—solution to our payments problem. The policies are liberal in the sense that all of them, in greater or lesser degree, mean more economic freedom and a better allocation of resources at home and abroad. They are collective in the sense that most of them rely for their success on harmonious cooperation with other countries. Many of the policies require self-discipline and sacrifice. But all of them are worth undertaking for their own sake, quite apart from our payments problem.

Are we willing—and able—to employ this dollar diplomacy? The answer is still uncertain. We have yet to adopt most of the elements of the liberal-collective solution outlined above. At the same time we have embraced one element of the unilateral-restrictive solution—"tied-lending." Last October the administration announced that henceforth Development Loan Fund credits to underdeveloped countries must normally be spent in the United States. Later it confirmed the "Buy American" trend in U.S. foreign aid by declaring that specific capital projects of the kind presently administered by the International Cooperation Administration would be transferred as quickly as possible to Development Loan Fund—and thus be governed by the new policy.

The tied-lending policy has been justified as an important means of reducing the payments deficit. This argument will not withstand analysis. About two-thirds of the foreign aid to which the policy applies is already spent on our exports or on the exports of less developed countries heavily dependent on American aid. This portion represents no net drain on our balance of payments. About one-third of aid dollars are spent by the recipients on imports from our industrial competitors. These dollars are lost to the United States only to the extent that our allies hoard them and refuse to respend them on American goods. Now that our allies have built up their reserves and have begun to dismantle their import controls, somewhat less hoarding may be expected to take place. Even on the most favorable of estimates, the tied-lending requirement can increase our foreign receipts by only 10 to 20 percent of the foreign spending to which it applies.

In 1960 tied lending will make practically no difference in our balance of payments, because it does not apply to the $800 million of Development Loan Fund loans already committed but not disbursed. In 1961, spending by the Development Loan Fund might reach $600 million. In that event some $60 to $120 million might be saved by the tied-lending policy—about 2 to 4 percent of our present deficit.

Two more plausible arguments are frequently made in defense of tied lending. The first is that it helps to pacify the powerful forces who would want to apply much worse medicine to deal with our payments problem—quotas, tariffs, cuts in foreign aid and military spending. This argument overlooks the fact that concessions of this sort to opponents of liberal trade and aid policies rarely succeed in their objective, but rather encourage demands for additional concessions. The appetite for unilateral-restrictive measures in foreign economic policy tends to grow by what it feeds on.

The second argument advanced in defense of tied lending is that it was needed to force our industrial allies to finance their own export surpluses, i.e., give more aid to underdeveloped countries. But there is no reason to believe we could not achieve the same result by persuasion in the various international forums available to us. In view of the whole tendency of our postwar foreign economic policy, we are obliged to exhaust the possibilities of the carrot before resorting to the stick.

Since "tied lending" has applied only to the smaller portion of our foreign aid, its ill effects so far have been mainly symbolic. But it has quite practical disadvantages as well, which would be felt increasingly if the policy were extended to other parts of our foreign aid program. Being trade-diverting rather than trade-creating, the policy wastes world resources in the same way as quotas, subsidies, and high tariffs. By forcing the less developed countries to purchase in the United States even when foreign products are cheaper or better suited to their needs, it reduces the value of our foreign aid. By subsidizing U.S. exports regardless of price and quality it encourages the very slackness

which has reduced our competitiveness in world markets. By encouraging our allies to tie their loans it could deprive our balance of payments of the benefits of their growing foreign aid efforts.

"Tied lending" is not merely a retreat from liberalism in foreign trade; it is a retreat from the principle of collective action. We have expended huge amounts of energy, time, and money over the last 20 years to build agencies of free world economic and political cooperation—the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and many others.

These institutions could help us solve our payments problem, if we use them with vigor and imagination. When defenders of "tied lending" argue that it is necessary to "force our allies into financing their export surpluses" they forget we are part of a free world alliance. As suggested earlier, our intimate connection with our allies through bilateral and multilateral financial, trade, and military arrangements gives us plenty of possibilities for adjustment. Only when we have exhausted these possibilities, which we have not even begun to do, are we justified in substituting unilateral sanctions for collective negotiation.

The tendency toward large deficits in our balance of payments may plague us for years or may disappear as suddenly as it has come. It will probably take some time to find out. Meanwhile we can solve our problems by the new dollar diplomacy described above—a diplomacy which is not really new at all except in the application of familiar principles in new and more difficult circumstances.

Why I Am Proud To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an essay written by Dana Jean Carter, 102 North Kensington Place, Springfield, Ohio, a high school junior, on the subject of "Why I Am Proud To Be an American." This essay was a winner in the statewide American Legion essay contest in Ohio; and, as a result, Miss Carter was 1 of 12 such essay contest winners honored by the Ohio delegation in the Congress at a luncheon held here in Washington on April 19. I am sure the House of Representatives will join with me in congratulating this student on her excellent essay, which is as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Dana Jean Carter)

There are many reasons for my having pride in being an American. When a person attempts to analyze the reasons for which he is proud of being an American, he is faced with such an overwhelming number of them that his problem becomes the selection of the most fundamental. To me, the letters of the word American, serve as a source for finding these reasons.

The first letter is "A." Here we find the words allegiance, alliance, and armistice. Americans have a strong sense of allegiance which has been displayed many times throughout our history. Armistice is a word known to all Americans. How many times our military leaders signed an armistice in order that we might live in peace and prosperity. Alliances with other nations have proven to be very beneficial. These alliances were made so that our country along with those of our allies might benefit and grow stronger.

In "M" we find the words machinery, materialism, and music. Every day we are finding new machines to turn out more goods more efficiently. Materialism is evident through our possessions, property, and wealth. American music is an art in which many of us take pride. For through music, we have come into closer contact with people all over the world.

"E" might stand for education and equality. America excels in the field of education making it possible for everyone. Equality is a characteristic which we are proud of. In America everyone has equal opportunities.

"R" is the beginning for the words race, religion, and resources. In America, one's race is not important; rather it is his ability that counts. Our country was founded partly because of its religious freedom which has remained one of the most cherished rights of the American people. Our country is abundant with natural resources which are mainly responsible for the growth of our great industries.

"I" stands for independence, individuality, and integrity. The greatest fight for beliefs ever made by the Americans, was that battle for their independence. In America the individual may strive to great heights or he may be complacent. Whatever the outcome, it was the individual who was able to make the choice. This integrity of an American is displayed daily by his conduct and dealings with his fellow Americans.

"C" might stand for the words "church" and "creed." America is abundant with beautiful churches where anyone and everyone may worship according to his beliefs. Our creed is our beliefs which may always be expressed freely and without fear.

Again we have the letter "A" perhaps containing the words "athletics" and "arts and sciences." We take pride in our athletes and athletic events. What would America be without her football games and the ever-popular hot dogs? We have also made great advances in the fields of art and science. Our art has a newness to it and our scientists never stop their research in medicine, diseases, and now, space.

The last letter is "N" which is the first letter of "nationalism" and "never." The strongest feeling of the American people is the devotion to their country and its welfare. "Never" is a word which shows the number of times that America has surrendered to an enemy, or in recent history, the times that its shores have been invaded.

The people of America are like no other race in the world. They are people who love their country enough that they are willing to make the greatest sacrifice of all, their lives, if necessary. Would anyone need a better reason than that to be proud of being a part of such a nation?

New York State Vacation Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Department of Commerce recently published a new illustrated pamphlet entitled "New York State Vacation Lands." The editors of the Herald Tribune in a recent editorial commented enthusiastically on the material contained in this publication and, more importantly, on the many significant and diverse assets that make New York State a wonderful and exciting setting for a summer vacation.

I could not agree more fully. Being a New Yorker by birth and, in a sense, by trade—I admit to being a biased observer. But I could not let this fine editorial go without comment. I cannot resist this opportunity to talk about the great State of New York. I am extremely proud of our rolling farmland, impressive mountain resort areas, countless historic landmarks, wonderful and comfortable climate, ocean beaches, rustic and scenic landscapes, Broadway theaters, many natural wonders, and, of course—the majesty of New York City—gateway to America, trade center of the world.

I certainly hope that my colleagues in the Senate will today make a mental note to visit New York this summer. Along with the many Americans who will vacation in New York this summer, I know that they will be impressed and pleased.

I extend this invitation particularly to Members of this body, to spend their vacations in the State of New York, notwithstanding the wonderful attractions of the State represented by the distinguished present occupant of the Chair [Mr. BARTLETT]. I am sure that if he were not operating under the injunction of silence as the Presiding Officer, he would say that Alaska should share equally with New York the distinction of being a prime vacation land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to from the New York Herald Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I urge all who read it to take advantage of the opportunity here discussed to obtain a copy of "New York State Vacationlands" from the State Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD READING FOR THE SUMMER

We don't customarily review books on this page, but we're willing to make an exception for "New York State Vacationlands," an illustrated paperback which, by no coincidence, is published by New York State.

To get the literary criticism out of the way quickly, the writing in this book is clear, the pictures colorful, the index comprehensive, and the facts undeniable. But it's the subject matter that is really unbeatable. For this book is about New York State as a place to spend as varied, enjoyable, and interesting a summer vacation as any to be found within a like-size area in the United States. Natural beauties, man-made attractions, historical sites—New York State has them all. It also has—though modesty prevents us from more than mentioning it in passing—New York City, which gets 25 pages all to itself.

All in all, we'd call this good springtime reading and the sort of literature which, when properly acted upon, can make for a better summer, too. One additional bit of

information: the book is free and may be obtained by dropping a line to the New York State Department of Commerce, room 324, Post Office Box 1350, Albany 1, N.Y.

Richard Bales, Conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, April 19, the Washington Civil War Round Table awarded its gold medal to Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra. This coveted award in the past has gone only to great historians of the Civil War. Mr. Bales has provided an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of the War Between the States with his recreation of the music of the period, now contained in his albums, The Confederacy and The Union.

The award to Mr. Bales was made by Col. R. S. Henry with the assistance of Miss Mary W. Lee, granddaughter of Robert E. Lee, and Mrs. David W. Griffiths, granddaughter of U. S. Grant.

Under unanimous consent I include a copy of Mr. Bales' reply:

Miss Lee, Mrs. Griffiths, Colonel Henry, Mr. President, you have placed about my neck the emblem of one of this country's great honors, and I should like to be able to call up those words which could express both immediate thanks and the sum of my feelings.

I do, indeed, assure you of a grateful appreciation for the Gold Medal of the District of Columbia Civil War Round Table. Tonight will always stand as a high point in the life of this musician who is both your 1960 recipient and, at the same time, ever your enthusiastic fellow member of some seasonal standing, exploring with you during most of the year the always thrilling story of the American Civil War.

To review the former recipients of the medal is to recite a list of distinguished gentlemen and scholars known largely for their printed words; may I, therefore, thank you for placing another art within the scope of this award? For now you have added the art of music, the deepest, most subtle of them all, and one which played a most influential role in the War for the Union.

That music, the popular music of a century ago, had been in the process of development since the days of the American Revolution. It was not folk music, for that is the music of legend, nor the absolute classic music of the imagination. It was the composed work of many men and women who wrote directly of the daily lives of the American people and their young country. Those gifted artists achieved an immense variety of expression both topical and emotional. These tunesmiths had a continuing, strong and healthy patriotism which they translated into their music. Such musicians took the pulse of America, and, through their songs, dances, and marches we can relive in part the history of our country, and, in particular, the Great War Between the States.

Composers, singers, bandsmen, and instrumentalists chose their sides as did the rest of the country. Their compositions, through some inner mystery of music (not yet understood) either went directly to inactive library shelves or played lively and sometimes lasting roles in the struggle. Several songs, composed in the years immediately preceding, marched straight into the conflict and served through the war with distinction. "Lorena," "The Yellow Rose of Texas," "Dixie," "John Brown's Body," many of Stephen Foster's, and others donned Blue or Gray, and fought with their wry and broad humor, heartsleeve sentiment, light-foot rhythms, and bloodwarming tunes.

A number of Yankee songs became captured Confederate materiel, and vice versa. "Dixie" a northern song, has never been successfully wrested back from the South, and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" owes its melody to a pious writer of hymns in Charleston, S.C. Yet both sides played, sang, danced, loved, and died to each others' music—with but a few exceptions. When bands serenaded across the lines, an exchange of partisan tunes was inevitable.

Filers of copyrights had a field day beyond measure. South stanch northern tunes as "The Battle Cry of Freedom" and "The Vacant Chair," also, were resolutely published in the South, and sold for the same 50 cents, if not the identical four bits, backed by U.S. gold. Thousands of Yankees marched to "Dixie," and the Confederates' second favorite was "The Bonnie Blue Flag" with Mississippi words and a Philadelphia tune.

When we listen to the grand old music now, let us not forget that many of those who wrote it, and most of those who played it, gazed often on the faces of those leaders whose names I need not recite again now, saw the endless columns of dusty marching men, watched them fight, suffer, and die, and often carried them from the field or took them water there. Bandsmen on occasion stayed up all night on watch, while weary soldiers slept to fight again on the morrow. Sometimes musicians were told to lay down their instruments and pick up rifles.

We can never forget the Confederates' playing "Dixie's Land" all day in Montgomery at Jefferson Davis' inaugural and on the sidelines at Gettysburg, nor the Union bands with their legions of throbbing side drums stirring Walt Whitman to his rhythmic poetry, cheering up Lincoln and his family on the White House lawn, and the chivalry of those musicians in blue at Appomattox Courthouse, when, 95 years ago this month, they greeted their conquered Confederates, not with "The Union Forever," but "Should Old Acquaintance Be Forgot." "The last war between gentlemen" was reflected in its music to the end.

From the leaders to the ranks, from the richest civilian to the man too poor to buy his way out, the music of 1861–65 served virtually every emotional need. American music has never been the same since.

Thus you have honored the artists of those older days, also, my own colleagues: those singers and players of the present to whom I owe so much of the success of "The Confederacy" and "The Union," some of whom are here tonight. Thanks as well for my wife and daughter who managed to live through the endless hours when these compositions were being hammered out on the piano at home, day and night.

I wish that my mother, now 87, who taught me to love music and my country, could be present, but she will read this in her room and I might add, without glasses.

I know that there must be a most comfortable part of Heaven reserved for soldiers of the Civil War—indeed, they probably need an eternity to swap enough experiences for their hearts' content. But this evening, two of them I know want to turn their faces in your direction.

My grandfathers: Henry Bales in his Indiana blue, and Richard Horner in his Virginia gray, both cavalry officers, now rising in their stirrups, smiling, and, with hats off, are adding their thanks to mine.

Creaks and Groans in the Machinery of National Security Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release from the office of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Government Operations Committee.

In the release, the junior Senator from Washington, whose work as chairman of the subcommittee has been outstanding, announces new public hearings in the subcommittee's nonpartisan attack on "creaks and groans in the machinery of national security planning."

The release indicates that seven men of science will appear before the subcommittee next week. They are referred to collectively by the distinguished Senator from Washington as "seven scientific wisemen."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, today announced new public hearings in the subcommittee's nonpartisan attack on "creaks and groans in the machinery of national security planning." The hearings, starting Monday, April 25, will focus on gearing science and technology into foreign and defense policymaking.

"Science and technology," JACKSON said, "exercise a new and decisive influence on national power, prestige, and policy. The statesman, the soldier, and the scientist must work together as never before. The question is: What is the right way to organize our Government to get the right scientific and technical programs at the right time?"

The hearings will feature testimony from witnesses JACKSON characterized as "seven scientific wisemen."

The schedule of the hearings is as follows:

Monday, April 25: Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corp. and member of the Gaither committee appointed by President Eisenhower in 1957 to survey national security problems.

Tuesday, April 26: Dr. James B. Fisk, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and vice chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee; Dr. William H. Pickering, director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology; and Dr. Ruben F. Mettler, executive vice president of Space Technology Laboratories.

Wednesday, April 27: Dr. Herbert York, director of Defense Research and Engineer-

ing, and formerly director of the Livermore Scientific Laboratory, University of California; and Dr. Edward M. Purcell, professor of physics at Harvard University, Nobel Prize winner, and member of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Thursday, April 28: Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, and recipient of the Enrico Fermi and atoms for peace awards.

All hearings will start at 10:00 a.m., in the Government Operations Committee hearing room (3302 New Senate Office Building).

The Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery was established last year for the purpose of making the first full review of the national security process since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. Further hearings will be scheduled throughout the session.

Serving with JACKSON on the subcommittee are Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota; EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine; KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota; and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York.

Why I Am Proud To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an essay written by John Dechant, Franklin-Tremont Road, Franklin, Ohio, a high school freshman, on the subject of "Why I Am Proud To Be an American." This essay was a winner in the statewide American Legion essay contest in Ohio; and, as a result, Mr. Dechant was 1 of 12 such essay contest winners honored by the Ohio delegation in the Congress at a luncheon held here in Washington on April 19. I am sure the House of Representatives will join with me in congratulating this student on his excellent essay, which is as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By John Dechant)

The men of America have always been happy and willing to fight and perhaps to risk their lives to keep America free; this is just one of the reasons that I am proud to be an American. These men have fought to keep such rights as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom of choice.

All of these freedoms have been important in the first 14 years of my life, and I know my inherited freedoms will mean more and more to me as I have more and more experiences with life. But, thus far the freedoms that have affected my life and that have made me glad, as well as proud to be an American, are freedom from want and freedom of choice.

I have never had to want for a good home. My parents can provide a home of the type they please, not the type some government official tells them they should provide. I have always been supplied with the proper food and have not had to beg for food in the streets as some children have to do in some foreign countries. There has always been a bed waiting at home for me, and I haven't had to worry whether the Government was going to send me off to some factory where I would stay and work. I am proud that I have never wanted love, because I have always had it from my parents. I have never worried about clothes because my parents think it is their obligation to see I have the proper clothing.

Not only have I been provided with the proper clothing, but in America, because of our high standard of living, I have never wanted for some of the luxuries, such as a new white sweater for my football letter, a new sport coat to wear the day I joined the church, and a new necktie the night of our prom. Because my parents have been free to work and earn money, I have never wanted for any of these things. I am proud that not only I, but all people in the United States, have this right.

By comparison, a Russian doesn't have the right of choosing anything unless it is approved by the government. Here, in the United States we are free to choose the kind of life we wish to lead. The success or failure of my life may depend on the choices that I make.

Last year I had the choice whether or not I wanted to join the church. This is one example of freedom of choice. In our school I had the choice of what subjects I wanted to take to further my education. After the age of 16, I have the choice of finishing high school or going to work. After I graduate, I can choose whether I want to go to college and for what profession I want to prepare. In Russia they don't have this right. They are ordered to go to work or go to school, and they are told what to study.

I can pick up any magazine and read an article for or against the United States ways, and no one would say anything to me. In some countries I would not be able to find a magazine that discussed the government.

Later in life I will have the right to choose what job I want to hold to make a living for my family; also, I will be free to choose the friends with whom my children and I want to associate.

Only in America could I have these privileges, and I am proud of them. If these rights were threatened, I, too, like my forefathers, would be proud to fight to keep these rights. Yes, I am proud to be an American.

Postal Pay Increase—The Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in line with the current consideration in the House of Representatives of proposed legislation providing for a postal pay increase, I have read with great interest statements in favor of the increase prepared by Andrew T. Walker, president of branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, and by Moe Biller, president of Postal Union of Manhattan and Bronx Clerks. The statements of these two representatives of those engaged in a vital public service deserves the careful attention of the Senate.

The postal workers have a special call on our sense of justice. In questions of pay, job and retirement security, and competitiveness with jobs in the private sector, the postal workers depend on us and we cannot fail them.

I ask unanimous consent that the two statements may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSTAL PAY RAISE IS IN ORDER—"MOONLIGHTING" COMMON AMONG POSTAL EMPLOYEES

(By Andrew T. Walker)

(A presentation before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearing on Federal and postal employees salary increase.)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew T. Walker, president of branch one of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, the oldest active postal employee union in America. I am nearing the 80-year mark, having completed 50 years of service in the Post Office Department, and continued on as president by a change in the association constitution for the past 10 years.

I am indeed grateful to have this opportunity of presenting this statement to you for the record in behalf of such a vastly important subject as is being considered before this group.

There were at least 40 varied industries granting its employees wage increases in 1959. Leading the group is the airlines and coal mining sections with 15-percent increases. Others include steel, trucking, utilities, wholesale and retail trade, cement, food and beverages, printing and publishing, textile, clerical units in manufacturing industries, combined services, electrical, stone, clay and glass, shipping, furniture, and others.

Postal employees cannot strike in an effort to secure an equitable salary increase from their employer, the U.S. Government. Without a doubt the tightfisted fiscal approach of the administration toward its 2½ million employees' appeal for a pay hike is endangering the related functions of the Nation's civil agencies by sharply reducing the employees' morale and spirit to do more than a required day's work. That once proud feeling of belonging to the governmental family of workers, particularly in the postal service, is quickly fading away; that feeling of dignity and importance associated with Federal employment has been replaced with an attitude that Congress and the executive branch of Government does not care nor concern itself with him other than that he is a statistic on an employment chart.

Nearly half of our postal workers are "moonlighters" (second job holders) and perhaps the figure is quite higher here in the East, particularly in New York City, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and other adjacent cities.

Turnover of young, desirable employees from low-salaried civil service jobs is alarming. Particularly in the light when many municipal and State governments grant their employees some sort of relief in salary or reduced pension contributions, in either case permitting more take-home pay. False economy that denies a living wage is forcing experienced employees out of the postal service and from other Federal agencies as well, to be replaced by new men who must be trained at the expense of the Government.

POSTAL MEN AND WOMEN ARE TRAINED

It is true to say that in but few trades is it more difficult to gain perfection for advancement than in postal work. The clerk must qualify on two or three and sometimes four of the several aspects of mail distribution. These operations include schemes of separation necessitating months of study at home and then qualifying by examinations. The postal schemes involve separations of mail to all cities served by certain railroads and all other railroads connected through transfer points; separation of mail for an entire city to respective delivery stations;

separation of mail for all carrier routes out of a given carrier station and other distribution patterns. A clerk's knowledge must also include, depending on his assignment, mail classification, rates of postage, amounts of fees, serving the public with courtesy and patience; assuming financial responsibility for sums of money and registered mail. I am also mindful of the letter carrier who is also doing an excellent and outstanding job. In addition to knowing his route throughly, must start his day at an early hour and in any kind of good or miserable weather and represents to the public the good-will ambassador of the postal service. The mail handler, the custodial employee all the way down the line is doing a faithful job.

Civil service examinations are constantly being held throughout the Nation and in most instances on a continual filing basis—no closing date. This points up sharply the lack of applicants. A few years ago, Mr. James P. Googe, the regional director of the second civil service region admitted that: "Postmasters frequently report increased difference in securing enough eligibles to fill subclerk and subcarrier vacancies. In some area big wage scales and fringe benefits offered by private industry make it almost impossible to fill positions in the local post offices." I do believe that that situation is true today. Some improvement in fringe benefits has taken place in Federal employment I will admit but such improvement does not put meat and potatoes before the employee's wife and children.

PUBLIC SERVICE

The salary crisis in the postal service must be faced and solved with equivocation, gentlemen, and the simple facts are that the postal workers have earned the pay raise. True, it costs the taxpayers and incidentally that includes the 2½ million Federal employees as well, money to operate the postal service but we should be mindful that it also represents an outlay of expenditures by the Congress for the operations of the White House, the judiciary system, the Commerce Department; the Army and the Navy and other agencies. Also that very little direct revenue comes into the Treasury coffers from the functions of many of the other agencies. It is a basic understanding that the costs and operation of these public services are taken for granted. Yet, with the income of about $2½ billion a year from the Post Office Department there is still current talk of this so-called postal deficit. It is obvious that such revenue as is produced by the postal service is not duplicated by any other agency.

POSTAL RATES

The issue of increased postage rates is not related with the pressing problem of postal wages—no more than the operational costs of running the Department of the Interior or the Navy Yard with the salaries of its employees. Yet, it is an important subject and one to be deliberated upon by the committee at a later date, as I understand will happen. The citizenry of our Republic have always looked upon the postal service as a function created by our Constitution and for the people. Whether or not it pays for itself in terminology of time, cost and production is a matter for the Congress.

MECHANIZATION

We do not in the least have any objection against modernizing the mail and the allocation of funds for such equipment if it makes for improved service and provides for ample mail provisions but we do not subscribe to any counting system which will place a daily hardship upon the individual mail distributor. Electronic research must go forward in keeping with the times to prepare the way for the avalanche of mail tomorrow. It is said that within the next score of years the annual volume of mail is expected to double the 66 billion pieces of mail calculated for the fiscal year ending this June 30. The massive mechanization is on the road and the Department is expected to keep it rolling. It began 11 years ago with the cost of $49 million in 1949 This year the research spending is expected to total $11.5 million. An idea of how advanced this modern postal program is and will be is a statement by Mr. Rollin Barnard, Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities; he said "In Project Gateway almost all the equipment to go into Gateway has got to be invented." Gateway is a plan to build at Oakland, Calif., the most modern postal facility possible.

MAIL FIRMS GLAD TO HAVE POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR SECOND JOB

Many of the mail-order firms, and mail rooms of large concerns in the East particularly in the metropolitan area of New York have come to appreciate the mail distribution abilities of our postal clerks. Here is a ready made corps of men and women trained by the post office on city and State mail schemes available at hourly rates anywhere from a dollar an hour upward. The firm not alone knows a good bargain when it sees one but is getting an experienced and honest employee at half his worth, and at hours in the evening as well. In some of these firms thousands of contest letters are handled which contain money. Sometimes mailings of valuable certificates are handled by these part-time postal employees and the firms do not worry because they know the postal employee is trustworthy. I hope in time that dual job work by postal employees will be eliminated. It is as you know, gentlemen, occasioned by the aftermath of a substandard wage in Government employment. Records will show that bank and loan companies show an all record high in loans to postal and Federal employees, also records will further show that bail and loan companies show an all record high in loans to postal and Federal employees, also records will further show that many employees have borrowed on their insurance policies. Federal and State credit unions in various postal employee unions have taxed themselves in extending loans. I can cite my own Federal Credit Union in branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen. Up to today we have borrowed out in loans every single dollar and there is a waiting list. It is a healthy sign for the credit union not to have any idle cash but a sad commentary indeed that our postal employees have to borrow so heavily.

I do not believe it relevant here to speak of the billions for foreign relief but it sometimes rings an unfair note when we think of our loyal governmental family getting inadequate salaries and have to exist below the American standard of living, while billions of dolars are sent overseas.

FRIENDS IN CONGRESS

The postal worker has I believe a tremendous range of friendship in the Congress for the reason that he is and always has been one of the loyal and hardworking of all public servants. Also that when he appeals to Congress he is reasonable in his requests for equitable treatment. We stand today, united within all postal and Federal groups asking you, the members of this committee, to meet reasonableness with reasonableness. Our request to you to support the deserving Morrison pay bill is in keeping with the times. I thank you.

STATEMENT OF MOE BILLER, PRESIDENT OF POSTAL UNION OF MANHATTAN-BRONX CLERKS ON H.R. 10445 AND RELATED BILLS BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Officers and members of the postal union of Manhattan-Bronx clerks representing 10,000 postal clerks in the New York, N.Y., post office wish to express appreciation to this committee for holding public hearings on pending salary legislation. We also wish to thank the many Congressmen who are presently sponsoring about 60 salary increase bills before this committee.

At this time we wish to support and urge the approval by this committee of H.R. 10445 introduced by Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH of Minnesota. This bill provides for a salary schedule for clerks in level 4 of $5,500 to $6,100 per year. The top step would be reached in four annual automatic increases. About 99 percent of the clerks in the Post Office are in level 4. The bill also provides for four longevity grades at $200 each after completion of 5, 10, 15, and 20 years in the top automatic pay grades. In addition it would grant time and one-half for substitute employees who work more than 8 hours a day. This would also correct a number of the inequities of Public Law 68.

We believe that the salary increases which are embodied in H.R. 10445 are reasonable and justified, and above all absolutely necessary in order to keep postal employees out of debt and permit them to enjoy a decent standard of living.

Postal salaries have over a period of years steadily fallen behind those in private industry. The average postal clerk with a wife and two dependent children takes home less than $75 per week. A top grade postal clerk with 25 or more years of service in the same family position as described above takes home only $83.10 per week. It is utterly impossible to adequately support a family in America in 1960 on this wage.

The Heller committee for research in social economics for the University of California has found that a family consisting of husband, wife, and two children, in order to live decently, requires an annual budget of $6,668.28 for homeowners and $6,271.10 for apartment renters. The budget represented by the latter figure allows for a rental of $780 a year or $65 a month. It is impossible in the city of New York to obtain a decent 4- or 4½-room apartment for less than $100 per month today. It must also be stated that the budget figures presented by the Heller committee do not permit for luxury items, but include only those items that go to make up a commonly accepted American way of life.

Firemen and policemen, to our knowledge, have never been paid very high wages, yet in the city of New York the salary level of firemen and policemen today ranges from $4,000 to $6,181 a year. The top salary grade is reached after 3 years of service. It is interesting to note that in 1949 the pay of a postal clerk in step 7 was $1.815 per hour, compared with firemen and policemen in New York City who were earning $1.737 per hour. In 1952 the hourly pay of firemen and policemen were still behind that of postal clerks. Postal clerks earned $2.015 per hour, while firemen and policemen earned $2.001 per hour. As of today, the firemen and policemen earn 28 cents per hour more than a clerk with 25 or more years of service and more than 43 cents more than a clerk in step 7 with 8 years of service. Firemen and policemen in the city of New York today earn $2.776 per hour and have announced that they are compelled to seek increases ranging from $6,100 to $7,500 per year in order to keep up with rising living costs. In this connection, the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on date of March 22, 1960, featured a report by Leon H. Keyserling, noted economist, who called the pay of New York City police "shocking." He stated that the pay of New York City police was so far behind the rising cost of living that it would take 15 years of the increase to make up the loss. If this is true of the salaries of New York City policemen, how much more true is it of the pay of postal clerks in the New York, N.Y., post office?

He recommended a $1,000-a-year pay increase for police beginners and further raises as they advance in grade.

A laborer, the least skilled and lowest paid employee in the building trades earns $2.63 per hour compared with a clerk in step 7 who earns $2.34 per hour and a clerk with 25 or more years of service who earns $2.49 per hour.

Sanitation men, in the city of New York are presently dissatisfied with their salaries Yet within 3 years' time they earn $5,350 per year, a rate of pay which under present wage scales a postal clerk cannot hope to achieve in a lifetime. These figures clearly show how far behind postal clerks have fallen through the years. The postal clerk is a highly skilled individual, who takes regular scheme examinations on which he must achieve a 97-percent correct rating. It frequently takes a clerk 2 years to complete his scheme requirements for the first time. It usually takes a few years longer for the clerk to become a competent distributor on a particular scheme. In addition, clerks perform window duties and a multitude of other required assignments.

This group of skilled employees finds themselves in such a predicament today that more than 75 percent are working second jobs in order to make ends meet. In many cases wives are working to supplement the family income. This certainly is not conducive to a good family life to which every American is entitled.

The Manhattan-Bronx Postal Clerks Federal Credit Union has loaned $1,200,000 to our members in the past year. In addition the average loan has increased from $300 last year to $420 this year, an increase of 40 percent per average loan.

It is easy to understand why the morale of postal employees today is at an all-time low. Because of these low wages it is difficult for the postal service to attract qualified new employees and to retain them. Thousands of employees enter and leave the New York post office each year. The post office department in New York has had to give examinations for the position of substitute clerk virtually on a continuing basis. The New York post office presently employs 500 career part-time substitute clerks. This new category, which is based on eligibles who refused full-time clerical positions, highlights the seriousness of the problem.

Reports indicate that this abnormally high rate of turnover in the postal service is not peculiar to New York alone.

In his state of the Union message in January of this year, the President of the United States declared "1960 promises to be the most prosperous year in our history." A postal employee is at present clearly not sharing in this prosperity; in fact, he seems to be becoming steadily more impoverished. In fact, it seems to be clear that if the postal employee does not receive a decent pay raise in this session of Congress, his standard of living will lag even further behind than it is today.

Postal employees do not have the right to strike nor do they have any contract negotiations. If the postal employee is not granted relief immediately, he will continue to suffer until at least well into 1961. The postal clerk has a right to earn a decent living wage and raise his family in keeping with American prosperity of 1960.

Enactment of H.R. 10445 by Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH will give postal employees an adequate wage and, therefore, an opportunity to rear their families in a decent manner.

We urge the committee to report favorably the provisions in H.R. 10445. Without such an increase postal employees just cannot earn enough to support their families. These employees should not be forced to meet inflated costs with deflated incomes. We appeal to the Congress of the United States for postal salaries sufficient to give employees the essentials of life which our American standard assures. We also believe that those who are responsible in making the laws have a moral responsibility to treat postal employees fairly and justly.

We wish to thank you for the opportunity to present this statement for the RECORD.

People Meet Problem of Health Care on a Voluntary Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two clippings from Michigan newspapers as a matter of interest showing how people are trying to meet the problem of health care on a voluntary basis which is certainly commendable:

MAP HEALTH CREDIT PLAN—MICHIGAN MEN FORM NEW GROUP

BATTLE CREEK.—Formation of the American Health Credit Plan, Inc., to provide credit card service for health expenses was announced here Wednesday by President W. Earle Robinson.

Under the service a credit card system will provide for all health needs with a time repayment plan for bills. Robinson said the plan was intended to supplement health insurance programs. He said the need for such a service was created because of problems of exclusions under major health insurance plans and by the difficulties encountered by the aged in obtaining health insurance. The high cost involved in processing a small claim was also said to be a factor.

Other officers are: Vice president, David D. Robinson of Muskegon Heights, and treasurer, Jack Rice of Belding.

"EARN AND SERVE" COURSES OPEN NEW ERA FOR OLDER WOMEN WHO WANT TO HELP

Older women will have an opportunity to supplement their income and play a useful role in caring for the aged through an "earn and serve" program.

Purposes of the project, sponsored by the board of education's vocational education department, the Co-ordinating Council for the Aging and the local office of Michigan employment security commission, are to provide employment for older women and to furnish trained companions and homemakers for the elderly infirm and disabled persons who can live in their own homes.

Application for enrollment in the training course are being taken by the vocational education department.

The first class is limited to 16 women and the deadline for enrollment is April 19, with classes scheduled to begin May 2.

Interested women may phone the board of education for application blanks.

To be known as the "home aide program," this service was first proposed by the Co-ordinating Council for the Aging in response to requests by older women for employment and as the result of pleas for trained companions and homemakers by elderly persons or their relatives.

Joining with the council in formulating the details of the program have been the Kent County Medical Society's geriatrics committee, the Red Cross, MESC, Family Service Association, city-county health department, county department of social welfare, United Community Services, Community Health Service and the Practical Nurse School.

The training course will include 42 hours of instruction, running Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for 2 weeks with a concluding session on the third Monday. By special permission from the American Red Cross, the Red Cross home nursing course will be included in the training given home aides.

Miss Eleanor Morrison, home service director of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., will conduct the nutrition, food preparation, and homemaking portion of the training.

Handling emergencies will be covered by the police and fire departments. Medical society representatives will instruct classes in handling elderly persons, and the family service staff will train the home aides in techniques of managing personal problems. Diversional therapy techniques will be given by a group of occupational therapists.

Upon completion of the course the vocational education department will present home aide certificates to the graduates. Red Cross home nursing certificates will also be given.

Actual job placements will be made by MESC, whose staff will do the screening of applicants for the training course.

After a study of needs and job requirements, the home aide study committee has recommended an hourly rate of $1 to $1.25 plus transportation. For weekly rate the committee recommended a range of $30 to $40.

The welfare department has agreed to consider supplementation of social security or old age assistance grants of elderly persons to permit employment of home aides, when this is necessary.

The local home aide program will be studied by the Michigan legislative advisory committee on problems of the aging and several other Michigan communities who have similar problems for providing home care for elderly persons, the council reported.

Senator Wiley Urges the Clarification of State-Federal Jurisdiction on Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several months ago I urged congressional action to help safeguard the privacy of American citizens from unwarranted wiretapping and eavesdropping. The sanctity of the American home and the right of Americans for privacy at home, in business, and elsewhere, should be securely safeguarded. Over the years, however, a growing utilization of electronic devices for wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping, by both individuals and Government agencies, has seriously endangered this traditional right.

Under present Federal law, the divulging and publication of information obtained from the interception of wire and radio communications is made a crime. Often, however, this law is disregarded, or there is often too little effort to enforce it. Despite the Federal prohibition

of such evidence in the Federal courts, some States—contrary to the Federal statutes—specifically authorize wiretapping and admit it as evidence in the courts. Clearly, this evidences a real need for clarifying the lines of jurisdiction, as well as policy, in this field.

We recognize, of course, that the use of such practices by responsible law-enforcement agencies, such as the FBI and the intelligence branches of the armed services, may be necessary in the detection of crime, espionage, and sabotage. Also, there are certain crimes that cannot be detected and proven without wiretapping. In cases of serious crimes, society must be given adequate tools to protect itself. In such cases, however, it is important that we discern clearly between the criminal who abuses the practice and the law-enforcement officer who is charged with crime prevention.

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York, commenting on the question of State-Federal jurisdiction on wiretapping, concluded that:

A Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for a violation of its criminal laws.

All this creates a curious situation. It is widely recognized that the use of wiretapping information violates an act of Congress, the Federal Communications Act, and evidence obtained by wiretapping is, therefore, not admissible in the Federal courts.

Yet, at the same time, the Federal courts, recognizing wiretapping as a violation of U.S. statutes, are reluctant to intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State, even in cases involving unauthorized wiretapping.

The present provisions of the Federal wiretapping law were enacted in 1934. The act of 1934 never envisaged the new electronic devices. The act of 1934 never envisaged the conditions the police and the courts are faced with today in the field of wiretapping.

The Congress, I believe, has a duty to clarify the lines of jurisdiction related to wiretapping. Last year, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee held hearings on wiretapping. However, I believe that this study should be concluded and legislation be enacted to clarify: First, the legality or illegality of wiretapping practices; second, conditions under which wiretapping may be undertaken; and third, the State and Federal lines of jurdiction in this field.

A major purpose of this clarification, I believe, would be to effectively protect the rights of individual citizens without unduly interfering with effective law-enforcement practices.

I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, April 19, 1960, and entitled, "Confusion Compounded."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFUSION COMPOUNDED

The U.S. Court of Appeals in New York has come up with a tentative answer to one phase of a tangled question: Whether a Federal court should enjoin State officials from divulging evidence obtained by wiretapping—a Federal crime—in a State criminal prosecution. It concluded that "a Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for violation of its criminal laws." At the same time it indicated no doubt that the use of wiretap information violates an act of Congress—the Federal Communications Act.

This confusion stems basically from the vagueness of the language in the Federal Communications Act and the reluctance of Congress, despite the widespread use of wiretapping, to do anything to clarify the law. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that evidence obtained by wiretapping is inadmissible in any Federal court. But the State of New York has a statute which authorizes wiretapping under certain circumstances—if approved by a State supreme court justice—and permits the introduction in State courts of evidence obtained by wiretapping. Thus the State law places justices in the position of seeming to flout Federal law.

Considerable hullabaloo has emanated from district attorneys in New York State to the effect that Congress ought to amend the Federal Communications Act in order to permit State wiretapping. That would go far beyond the intent of the Keating bill, which would attempt to cut down on the abuses of wiretapping by authorizing it upon specific Federal court warrant for a narrow range of Federal crimes. It would be more becoming to the district attorneys if they would seek to have New York law brought more in consonance with Federal law.

Perhaps the U.S. Supreme Court will review this difficult case. If it does, it will have to weigh against its long tolerance of diversity of standards regarding the admissibility of evidence in State courts a concern for the respect due an act of Congress. The situation cries for legislative as well as judicial illumination focused specifically upon the point whether "no" means what it appears to mean or is to be construed as meaning "maybe."

Tribute to William G. Simon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the splendid and well-deserved tribute paid to Mr. William G. Simon, formerly in charge of the Newark, N.J., office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County, N.J. The association's resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas William G. Simon, special agent formerly in charge of the Newark, N.J. office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation while so connected, did, most diligently and with outstanding effect and result, cooperate in the educational and training programs of the various associations of police officials, including county associations of chiefs of police, and particularly the program of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, by aiding in the establishment of, and teaching in, schools for instruction to police throughout the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County, N.J. recognizes that the untiring efforts of William G. Simon, his knowledge, enthusiasm and rare spirit, and through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation did most materially contribute to the unqualified success of the aforementioned courses of instruction, merit our deep appreciation and particular and significant mention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That William G. Simon, in recognition of the above mentioned special and particular qualities, and for the services he has rendered to law enforcement, be earnestly commended by the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County, N.J. assembled at their regular monthly meeting on March 24, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. William P. Rogers; to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover; to William Webb Burke, special agent in charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Newark, N.J.; and to William G. Simon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Senators Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.; Peter W. Rodino, Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey; Hugh J. Addonizio, Representative of the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey; and George M. Wallhauser, Representative of the 12th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey; and in addition, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey and Hon. David D. Furman, attorney general of the State of New Jersey.

FRED HESS, *President.*
HENRY LIEBERKNECHT,
Recording Secretary.

German Reunification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. Walter Becher, Secretary General of the Bavarian Landtag, has called my attention to some very excellent remarks which were made on January 11, 1960, by the German Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, on the subject of German reunification. These remarks, which were made at the Overseas Club in Hamburg, express some very basic principles regarding reunification efforts which I feel merit the attention of the Congress and the people of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BULLETIN No. 16

On January 11, 1960, the German Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. von Brentano, held the following lecture on the international political situation, at the Overseas Club in Hamburg:

THE FREE WORLD IN DANGER

Only a fool would nowadays deny that the free world is in danger. A German is hardly

likely to think of denying this fact, since we are reminded of it day in and day out, indeed almost hourly, by the fate of the 17 million people who live in the Soviet zone of Germany, and by the fate of the city of Berlin, which, by reason of the note of November 27, 1958, has been the subject of our discussions for the past year. We realized from the outset that one small country on its own is not in a position to oppose this threat from the East, this aggressive and revolutionary policy, and that only a joint effort can ward off this pressure. The NATO came into existence as a reaction to this development, as a reaction to the events which happened in Korea and in Prague. The Federal Republic of Germany joined this alliance system because we realized and still realize today that peace can only be preserved and freedom safeguarded by the joint efforts of all the nations.

"We frequently hear the comment: These accursed blocs; to ease the tension, one must get out of the blocs. But I should like to stress that anyone who today compares the two blocs, the Atlantic Community and the Warsaw Bloc, is comparing two incommensurable magnitudes. To mention the two of them in one and the same breath, is an indication of political schizophrenia. For the activity of the one bloc consists, above all, in an attempt to organize the defense of freedom. Nobody, not even a public prosecutor, could accuse the Atlantic Community of ever having engaged in aggressive activity anywhere, whilst in the other part of the world the activity that began in 1945 has been continued, has led to a levelling down of the States of the East Bloc and was expressed in the events of June 17 in Berlin and of the Hungarian tragedy. We should all of us prefer not to have to talk about these things and not to be obliged to band together in blocs, but to have more time and money for tasks other than armament. But be that as it may, we cannot replace grim reality by wishful thinking.

"We must make a clear decision in this respect. If we advocate a legal order and a freedom-loving democracy, we must draw the logical conclusions. In that case it is our duty to protect and preserve this order and this democracy. And if we know that we are unable to do so alone and that others are in the same danger, then it is our duty to join forces with them for our own sake and for the sake of the others.

"The partition of Germany is not the reason for the international political tension. What is in evidence in the partition of Germany is the expression and the result of the international political tension. Actually, the question at issue in the conflict with the Soviet Union, as far as a reunification is concerned, can be expressed in far simpler terms; namely, the right of self-determination of the German people; that is to say, it is a question of restoring to 17 million people their right to live in freedom. By using the word 'reunification' we have perhaps created the erroneous impression in the world that the German people have been severed as a result of their own decision or as a result of false political decisions. Actually, however, these 17 million people have not severed themselves from us, but they are denied a right which one is prepared to concede to every country in Africa—a right which is discussed with great fervor in the plenary and special sessions of the United Nations, the right of free self-determination. And this is precisely what we demand for the German people—no more and no less.

"'NEW INITIATIVES?'

"I am aware that people frequently say to us: 'But you know that the Soviet Union rejects this idea; we must therefore choose another course, make new proposals and develop new initiatives.' Let me tell you candidly that I am not prepared to take part in any initiative which does not make it perfectly plain that the process of the reunification of Germany can, and, indeed, must be effected only by the free decision of the entire German people. I do not wish to polemize, but I should like to say that I was consternated at the fact that our opposition submitted a proposal with regard to Germany which threatened to neglect this question. I am speaking frankly when I say that this proposal would, in fact, inevitably lead us, against the wish of its originators, to a course which we must under no circumstances take. In my opinion it is simply unthinkable to begin this reunification process by setting up executive committees with equal representation and even giving these committees legislative power. Surely everybody who knows the conditions that really prevail, must realize that in this way we are doubly falsifying the first principle of every democratic order—I repeat, doubly falsifying, for we are giving the representation of 52 million people the same influence as the representation of 17 million people. And what is more—we are weighing the votes given by the 52 million people living in freedom like the votes of the 17 million who are living in enslavement. We are putting the representatives of the 52 million people living in a democracy on a par with the functionary class in the Soviet zone.

"Does anyone really believe that a free order can be achieved in this way? Can it be that people still fail to realize what is happening in the Soviet zone? Surely we Germans should realize this, for we know what a totalitarian system is like. Does anyone believe that one could discuss the question of a common legal order in Germany with Mrs. Hilde Benjamin? Does anyone believe that laws could be passed in such an all-German parliamentary council? I do not even wish to raise the question as to whether it is at all conceivable that such a process could provide for plebiscites. We know what plebiscites are like under such systems; the only thing one has to take care to avoid, is a result of 101 percent.

"I oppose these proposals. I do not deny that a large number of proposals have been made as the result of obvious impatience and anxiety for the people concerned. But this disquietude and this impatience must not tempt us to resort to a course for which we cannot answer. To those who submitted the above-mentioned proposal I should like to quote the words of a man who once played an important part in Germany as the president of this party, Mr. Schumacher: 'The system of Pankow is the complete de-Germanization and complete Sovietization of politics. The alleged German initiative from the East for unity is a component part of the international Russian foreign policy. It is our duty to warn the unsuspecting and the well-meaning among our people against every form of community, however friendly the terms may be under which it is offered.'

"FALSE COMPROMISES

"And this in my opinion is precisely the point to be considered. I should, above all, like to utter a warning regarding false compromises. I am well aware that compromises are part and, indeed, a sound part of political life. There are a number of questions in which a compromise is the ideal solution. But we must not forget that there are certain spheres which defy all compromise. When it is a question of fundamental principles, there can be no compromise. I repeat—there is no such thing as a synthesis of right and wrong. There is no such thing as a synthesis of freedom and enslavement. Those who affirm that one could perhaps consider certain modifications, are already overstepping the borderline. I personally am not prepared to take this step with them, for the decisions to be made, which I mentioned earlier on, are irreparable and final.

"True, it is the duty of all of us and we, all of us, feel bound to examine the question again and again: Is there a real starting point somewhere to enable us to get out of this dismal situation which is depressing us and the whole world, too? To get away from the menace that hovers over us—the menace that perhaps a new crisis will break out, that perhaps a new disaster will descend upon mankind—a disaster the extent of which we cannot visualize, as a result of the development of the modern science of armament. We should not take things easy. A few days ago, I read a formulation which so impressed me that I should like to quote it here. A clever man said in an article:'Our instinct of self-preservation is not powerful enough to make us think in an orderly way. We are laboring under the delusion of being able to blunt the teeth of a system, which seeks to destroy us, by tacit toleration and small courtesies.' And this is precisely what I am afraid of. I am afraid that we might not only endanger peace, but also lose freedom by a false policy.

"NO PEACE AT THE COST OF FREEDOM

"We must not purchase peace at the cost of freedom. There is no worse form of absence of peace than absence of freedom. And this is what everyone should bear in mind who thinks that concessions are possible and that one could perhaps go a step further and sacrifice a part of freedom. I can well believe that some persons may say: 'Yes, but what does the Federal Government intend to do; what did Mr. Von Brentano actually say; what about imagination?' Your President opened this meeting in a humorous way by referring to a fairytale in the adventures of Sinbad the Sailor, and he then pointed out that fairytales are, unfortunately, not part of foreign policy, but that in this case we are confronted by grim reality. And this gives me an opportunity to reply to this remark.

"I think quite a number of us could vie with our critics as far as imagination is concerned. But I am not prepared to apply this rivalry in the sphere of international politics. We once had some politicians for foreign affairs in the German Reich who possessed considerable imagination. And it is not so long ago. But all our imagination was not sufficient to enable us to imagine what consequences the activity of the said politicians would have for the German people. And for this reason, I think, to be quite candid, that we are all better advised—and this is not a personal question but concerns the task and the problem which I have mentioned—if we have men in the sphere of foreign political affairs who do not allow their imagination free flight, but see things as they really are, even though the discernment which we may gain in this respect may sometimes sadden us."

American Samoa Asks for Organic Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 60 years after the raising of the American flag over American Samoa by Capt. Benjamin F. Tilley, U.S. Navy, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton

will raise the territorial flag over American Samoa and officiate at the adoption of a territorial constitution which has been promulgated by a constitutional committee over the past 5 years. I commend the citizenry of American Samoa for this forward step and feel certain that they will rise to the new responsibilities they are assuming.

Within a few years, I am confident American Samoa will be ready for the next step in self-government—organic legislation. Our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs plans to begin studies on organic legislation in the near future, with the thought in mind to utilize the framework established in the new constitution as the basis for the legislation. Our actions will be in keeping with House Concurrent Resolution 27, adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa, on November 12 and 16, 1959, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this concurrent resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ENACT ORGANIC LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING A CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR OUR COUNTRY

Whereas our people expressed a keen desire for organic legislation in a petition signed by all our leaders, the matais of Tutuila and Manu'a, at a general assembly held in 1945 at Gagamoe, a historical meeting place of our people; and

Whereas a committee consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, recommended to the President of the United States in 1947 the enactment of organic legislation for our territory as a step toward the fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States under article 73 of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas in 1949 the Department of the Interior, with the strong support of the President of the United States, recommended immediate enactment of organic legislation for our country in order to extend to us U.S. citizenship, a bill of rights, local legislative powers, an independent judiciary, and representation by a Resident Commissioner in the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas we firmly believe that the enactment of organic legislation for American Samoa is the most effective and satisfactory way to discharge the responsibility of the United States under the United Nations Charter and to maintain fully its traditional role as the champion among nations of dependent people, of representative government, of justice under law, and of fundamental rights and human freedoms for everyone everywhere; and

Whereas with respect to organic legislation, it is the policy of the Department of the Interior to support such legislation when our people desire it and are ready for it, and our people, through their duly elected representatives, are asking for such legislation, believing firmly that our people are ready to begin their God-given right to make their own local laws; and

Whereas the enactment of organic legislation for our country will not only furnish our people the fruits of democracy but will also serve notice to all nations in the Pacific Ocean area that the right of self-determination and freedom from oppression are granted by the Constitution of the United States by acts as well as by words: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to enact H.R. 4500, introduced in the House of Representatives of the 81st Congress of the United States of America, as the same will be amended by the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa and approved by a convention of the people of American Samoa called for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of American Samoa.

Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the New York Times on Monday, April 11, 1960, published a letter to the editor from Philip Lepper, president of the New York Letter Carriers Branch 36, on the matter of letter carriers' salaries. The postal workers have a special call on our sense of justice, and we must not fail them. They depend on us for fairplay on questions of pay, job and retirement security, and competitiveness with jobs in private enterprise.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER CARRIERS' SALARIES

GOVERNMENT SAID TO BE OBLIGATED TO GRANT INCREASES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Letter carriers and Federal employees voluntarily forgo labor's right to strike. Therefore, the Government is more than morally obligated to recognize the need to overcome the inadequate salaries of these workers.

The salary of a letter carrier ranges from $4,035 at the entrance rate to $5,175 after 25 years. It is interesting to note that the independent Heller committee recently arrived at the following figures: For normal living with reasonable security, a wage earner who owns his own home must be paid $6,638 annually; if he rents a home (at $65 a month) he requires a yearly wage of $6,271. I suggest that the areas where a workingman and his family can rent a decent apartment for $65 a month are either scarce or nonexistent. This budget also suggests expenditures for education which seem parsimonious.

It is further interesting to consider that by Federal Housing Administration standards not a single letter carrier in the United States is making a postal salary that would qualify him to buy a home under their regulations. As a result, a program designed to put homeownership within the financial reach of workers with modest income is meaningless for letter carriers. Even by FHA standards our income is not modest; it is immoderately low.

LAG IN MANPOWER INCREASE

Productivity is another aspect which should be considered. Spokesmen for the Post Office Department during hearings on fiscal 1961 appropriations stated that in the last 6 fiscal years volume increased 20.2 percent. Manpower increase has been only 7.6 percent and, excluding the 24-percent increase in city delivery service due to expanding areas, the increase in manpower was only 2.2 percent—in other words, 20.2 percent against 2.2 percent.

The wages that workers in industry receive are a reflection of the overall need for such wages. They are a reflection of the skyrocketing inflation which has left the letter carrier far behind in his economic struggle for equality. Historically, the Nation's mailmen have been engaged in a continued, and sometimes frantic, effort to catch up with the economic parade. We have been the perennial victims of inflation and certainly not the causes.

Our Government invests billions of dollars in foreign economic assistance, in agricultural programs, urban renewals, and various other projects. While I have no intention of taking issue with the wisdom or unwisdom of the multitudinous programs which are financed with the taxpayers' money, I do insist that if we, as a nation, can afford all these things, then we certainly can afford to pay a living wage to the devoted men who carry the Nation's mail.

PHILIP LEPPER,
President, New York Letter Carriers Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers.
NEW YORK, April 4, 1960.

Address on the Occasion of the 193d Birthday of President Andrew Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the address delivered on March 15, 1960, at Jackson State Park, Lancaster, S.C., by my good friend, D. Glenn Yarborough, prominent Lancaster attorney, on the occasion of the 193d birthday of President Andrew Jackson.

President Jackson was born in Lancaster County, S.C., a part of the district I now have the honor of representing in the Congress.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is good that we gather here today to commemorate the birth of the man who made sacred the soil on which we stand. One hundred and ninety-three years ago, here was born of an Irish immigrant, only 2 years after he came to this country to seek freedom, Andrew Jackson. Shortly before Andrew Jackson's birth, the father died, leaving a widow with three sons to face an unfriendly wilderness.

Let us pause just a moment to contrast the periods—there were no social security benefits for the widow and small fatherless children, nor was there any welfare department to furnish them the barest necessities of life. Andrew Jackson had as his inheritance only the innate fortitude that a saintly mother and a courageous father could give to him.

When he was just a boy the terrible onslaughts of the American Revolution burst around him; at this tender age he was far more cognizant of the history unfolding before his eyes than would a child born of more normal circumstances; filled with his ancestors hate of the British he was eager to join in the affray, and he did so at the Battle of Hanging Rock when he was only 13 years of age; he saw both of his brothers die for the cause of the Revolution, and saw his mother laid in her grave for grief over the death of her sons.

Upon the cessation of hostilities, this illiterate boy, faced the grim world, and faced the future, with no family, no relatives and no financial means. Through a succession of events he was licensed to practice law in the State of North Carolina when less than 21 years of age, but the tractless West called him to Tennessee where began the events of his life, which events were to shape the destinies of a nation.

Truly can it be said that the era in which Andrew Jackson lived were the critical moments in the life of the fledgling United States; the scars of the Revolution were never quite healed during his lifetime; our Nation was comprised of a loosely united federation of States, united in name only; States rights were jealously guarded, and as Jackson was himself to exclaim later "Show me an express clause in the Constitution authorizing Congress to take the business of State legislatures out of their hands." Today, we like Jackson, espouse the cause of States rights, but it is hardly appropriate to extoll the virtues of those rights while we are willing to mortgage such rights for a mess of political porridge from the Federal "slop-bucket." Prior to this era, the destinies of this Nation were guided by the so-called landed aristocracy, even though the fight for independence was carried on largely by those of humble birth such as Andrew Jackson. Our Nation had been born of the struggles and dreams of peoples from all parts of the world who saw this wilderness as a haven of liberty, and now those dreams of those outcast people were beginning to assess themselves, and a champion was found in Andrew Jackson, a fearless soldier and lawyer, who truly believed in the innate immortality of man. He introduced into American history a new concept, the concept that true aristocracy lies in the human brain and heart rather than in ancestral family trees.

It would have been easy for this man, born into adversity and poverty, struck by the sword of a British officer and held in British prisons for months to have become embittered against humanity; yet this man dedicated his life that those who would come after under similar circumstances would not have to so endure such hardships.

It is of course true that certain events in the life of Jackson strike discords even today; it is also true that he was ruthless and it seems that he felt that the ends justified the means, and it is also true that his concepts during the Presidency did not coincide with the expressed interests of his native State of South Carolina, but yet we find ourselves today espousing his cause—Jackson almost used military force to enforce the tariff laws in South Carolina and today we seek such laws to protect our industries.

Jackson succeeded a long line of Presidents born into the landed aristocracy—Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Adams. He was defeated for the Presidency in 1824, at a time when apparently he did not really desire the office, but was elected in 1828 and reelected in 1832, in both of which elections he did not receive the vote of South Carolina.

The exploits of Jackson in the Indian wars, in the forceful taking of Florida from the Spaniards, and in the War of 1812 are legion, but these military exploits only indicate the restless ambition of the man to make a place in the sun for himself and for his Nation.

At the turning point of history of this Nation, as in the course of events of the history of every great nation, Andrew Jackson stood at the helm, as though called by providence. As we stand here today and dream of those days and those events, and as we look out across the horizon where in that day extended trackless wilderness, and today see endless highways, railroads, and industries, and as we see harnessed the Catawba River in which this boy fished, we are constrained to say to ourselves that there are no more frontiers, that there are no more opportunities for greatness. We today are living in an age when it is held by all political parties that the aim of the American people is to live in peace, harmony, and security, with little or no effort to secure our own individual destinies. We too often sink into a lethargy and say to ourselves, "We mortals are but like leaves cast about in the winds of fate." To so think and to so live is a sacrilege to the man whom we honor today and a disgrace to all the Jacksons in American history, the named and the unnamed. There is a greatness in every citizen if he will use the talents with which he is endowed. This country is proud of the men in its history who have changed and molded its destinies, yet the true heroes of this Nation are those who are willing to accept the responsibilities of good citizens without rewards, and without eulogies other than the self-satisfaction that comes with a job well done.

I have no fear for the destruction of this Nation nor of our way of life by conquest from without, but this Nation can of a certainty rot from within if our people lose their pride and faith in themselves, their families and rather than provide for their own future, look to the Federal Government for sustenance.

The value of history lies in our ability to apply the lessons learned to life today and to the securing of the future. The life of Jackson should well serve as a guidepost to those of us who today think the horizon has passed, and should serve as an inspiration to create new horizons, to rededicate ourselves to the premise on which this Nation was founded and for which Jackson and all other Jacksons fought, that of the inate dignity of man.

Resolution for a U.S. Postage Stamp Portraying "The Nucleus of Craftsmanship—Apprenticeship"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an age in which technological and scientific revolutions draw the world spotlight, there is, I think, too often an inclination to overlook the "motivating force" underlying progress—that is, the talent, ingenuity, brainpower of our people.

We recognize of course that technology, today, is a major vehicle upon which we, as a people, may establish a better, brighter future. As our age becomes more complex, however, the Nation, and the world, will require ever-larger armies of highly skilled workers—at all levels—to run the machines of progress.

As we attempt to train the vast core of workers, artisans, craftsmen, and others needed to undergird advancement in these fast-advancing times, there is a real concern—and rightly so—about the need for adequate apprenticeship programs.

Today, I was pleased to receive from Marvin E. Brickson, president of the Madison Federation of Labor AFL–CIO of Madison, Wis., a resolution proposing the printing of a special U.S. postage stamp.

As we know, the postage stamps of a nation present a panorama of its progress, depicting in miniature its famous men and women, the great events of its history, its organizations, its industries, its natural wonders.

As proposed in the resolution, a stamp emphasizing "the nucleus of craftsmanship—apprenticeship" would recognize the significance of apprenticeship to our ultimate productive power.

Reflecting the concern of the Madison federation on the need for adequate training programs to provide us with the highly-skilled manpower for the future, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution accompanied by a brief statement, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—TO PRINT A U.S. POSTAGE STAMP, "THE NUCLEUS OF CRAFTSMANSHIP—APPRENTICESHIP," RECOGNIZING THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF BONA FIDE APPRENTICESHIP AND BRINGING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC THE VALUE OF THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

Whereas millions of our fellow workers, throughout the years, have given of their time and effort in the promotion of this philosophy, for the purpose of training competent craftsmen for the industrial welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the future status of skilled manpower in the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon apprentice training; and

Whereas there is a need to acquaint the American public with the gigantic strides, activities, and efforts in establishing the philosophy of bona fide apprenticeship, and the efforts that are being taken by labor and management to provide the public with the highest possible grade of products and services in conformity with approved practices of safety and skilled craftsmanship; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Madison Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, to pay tribute to these fellow workers, apprentices, and to labor and management representatives who have voluntarily contributed their time and effort to this very necessary industrial activity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Madison Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, go on record as approving, and to petition Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield to have printed, a U.S. postage stamp using a facsimile of the imprint on this resolution and the attached analogy; also to request our congressional delegation to so petition the Postmaster General.

A copy of this resolution as passed to be sent to: Maud Wright, secretary, Boise Central Trades and Labor Council, AFL–CIO, 613 Idaho Street, Labor Temple, Boise, Idaho.

THE NUCLEUS OF CRAFTSMANSHIP

APPRENTICESHIP

Apprenticeship might well be called the nucleus of craftsmanship. Just as the sun is the nucleus of our solar system, holding in place the planets and their satellites by virtue of its enormous gravity pull, so is our economic system held in balance by the qualified craftsmen who staff the machines and build the artifacts of our civilization.

The sun nurtures and sustains all life as we know it—plantlife that men and animals depend upon for life grow from this sunlight and warmth. Similarly, apprenticeship could appropriately be termed the sustaining force of our economic life, supplying as it does, qualified craftsmen who have learned their skills through apprenticeship. Through the vitalizing influence of apprenticeship the apprentice grows in efficiency, and with the skills of his trade firmly established and thoroughly mastered, matures into a craftsman, becoming an integral part of the vital lifelines of our production system.

Truly, as the sun is the nucleus of our solar system, apprenticeship is the nucleus of our craftsmanship.

The Problem of Health Insurance for Our Retired Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, no problem is of more vital concern at the moment to our citizens than the problem of providing medical care for our retired citizens. Because of our keen interest in this problem, and in the various pieces of legislation which have been introduced to deal with it, I am bringing to the attention of Members of the House some thoughtful editorials that have appeared recently in newspapers in my district which reflect, I believe, the concern which most of my constitutents feel on this important issue.

There follow an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of April 6, one from the same newspaper on April 7, an editorial from the Schenectady Union Star of April 14, and another from the same newspaper on April 19, 1960. I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, Apr. 6, 1960]

NO PLACE FOR POLITICS

According to Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Eisenhower administration will soon present a medical insurance program for the needy aged for congressional approval.

But Democrats claim the administration will wait until Congress is ready to adjourn before submitting the plan. This, they maintain, is so the Republicans can blame the Democrats in the coming campaign for failing to set up such a program.

Whatever is done to help elderly citizens meet medical costs should be done on a nonpartisan basis. The issue is far too important to millions of Americans to become involved in politics.

The fact is that within 5 years there will be between 6 and 7 million Americans over 65 with no insurance to meet medical bills. Nine million will have some insurance, while 2 million will be eligible for welfare.

The record proves that people over 65 have two to three times as much chronic illness as the rest of the population and they stay in hospitals twice as long on an average. They spend 90 percent more on health than younger people.

The problem is how they can best be aided, and it is a problem deserving the attention of the best minds in out of Government. Certainly, there is no excuse for either party playing politics with the misfortune of others.

[From the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, Apr. 7, 1960]

HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUE

Although the House Ways and Means Committee rejected the Forand bill for Federal medical insurance for those over 65, this is not the last that will be heard on this subject. It is bound to be an issue in the coming presidential campaign.

While the Forand bill, which would have provided "free" health insurance to all pension eligibles and charged the cost against the working population in the form of a payroll tax, has been criticized as too extreme, the fact remains that millions of retired persons need medical care and cannot afford it. That puts it squarely up to the critics to say what they would do about what is admittedly a serious and growing problem.

New York State has legislated a partial answer to the medical care problem. A measure passed at the recently concluded session gives everyone covered by a group health policy the right, upon retirement, to convert it to an individual policy at "fair and equitable rates." While this is helpful, it is not going to solve the cost problem, yet it is about as far as any State can go. Broader action will have to come on a national level.

That the need for such action exists cannot be doubted, and neither can it be doubted that the problem must be met, not evaded. Developing a sound alternative to the Forand bill would be a very good place for Vice President NIXON or any other presidential hopeful to begin taking up the challenge.

[From the Schenectady Union Star, Apr. 14, 1960]

BEYOND THEIR CONTROL

In a blast against the scramble by Republicans and Democrats to hammer out some kind of health insurance program in an election year, the New York Herald Tribune remarks: "The crass assumption that millions of Americans, dignified by the title of senior citizens, can be bought by the offer of a free trip to a nursing home is as cruel and insulting as any political maneuver could be." Sounds like an echo of the Republican "line" in 1936, with social security the target. That year GOP nominee Alf Landon got 8 electoral college votes and Franklin D. Roosevelt 523—the highest of his four elections.

Many seniors will resent being accused of "selling" their votes for something that is supposed to help them cope with inflation, which the Government, not they, brought about. For example, the purchasing power—medical or otherwise—of Government bonds they bought some years ago for just such contingencies.

[From the Schenectady Union Star, Apr. 19, 1960]

FEDERAL MEDICAL AID OLD STUFF FOR MILLIONS

As discussion of extraordinary sickness aid for "seniors" goes on, much is said about the danger of getting the Federal Government into medicine. It long has been there with both feet.

For example, such service is available to about 22 million veterans who have served at least 90 days in the armed services during war. It is available for about 2.5 million members in the armed services currently, and to some extent for their families. Partial benefits accrue to retired armed service personnel. Under social security the Federal Government matches States in funds for care of needy persons, including sickness. Indians and certain Eskimos in Alaska, as wards of the Federal Government, are entitled to free hospitalization and medical service. Members of Congress and Cabinet officials may enter Bethesda Naval Medical Center or Walter Reed Medical Center in Washington, and get every kind of service except special nurses for $22 a day. President Eisenhower—or any other President—has to pay only $1.20 daily for meals to have full service at either of those centers. And Mrs. Eisenhower, as a dependent of the Commander in Chief, is eligible for medical service under the armed services program.

So Uncle Sam is doing quite a bit for his nieces and nephews in the way of full or partial free medicine. We doubt Cabinet members or Members of Congress come under the needy classification. However, a number of Senators and Representatives unquestionably fall into the oldster grouping.

U.S. Foreign Policy Reaps Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the upcoming summit conference, scheduled for May 16, offers one more opportunity for nations of the world—with conflicting interests—to find peaceful ways to settle their disagreements.

At a conference this morning, my colleagues and I on the Foreign Relations Committee were privileged to discuss the outlook with Secretary Herter.

In accordance with past policy, the United States continues to stand firm on West Berlin and West Germany, and adheres strictly to a nonappeasement policy. However, we are ready to negotiate on issues in which it appears that the Communists are willing to act in good faith if such agreements can be safeguarded or self-enforced.

Unfortunately, in a presidential election year, politically motivated efforts are too often made by opposition candidates to downgrade the U.S. prestige in the eyes of the world—casting unwarranted reflections on our policies and program.

In the face of such tactics, which almost seem like an attempt to "sell out" the prestige of the United States for whatever political advantage it may, or may not, bring the candidate—I always welcome positive analysis of just what we are accomplishing policywise in international affairs. Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an informative article entitled, "U.S. Foreign Policy Reaps Gains" by Joseph G. Harrison. Reflecting upon specific ways in which we are making a contribution to peace, stability, and progress, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REAPS GAINS

(By Joseph G. Harrison)

The foreign policy of the United States, according to a great deal of available evidence, has entered the crucial decade of the sixties in a considerably stronger position than many of its critics would have thought possible a year or so ago.

Indeed, an impartial observer might well argue that America's position in the world, despite certain obvious weaknesses and failures, contradicts those who claim that this position has continued to deteriorate.

It can, in fact, be maintained that the very opposite of what these critics expected has happened, and that for several years American foreign policy has been increasingly successful along most lines and at most points.

This does not mean that many grave problems do not lie ahead. The unresolved crisis over Berlin, Washington's presently unhappy relationship with Cuba and Panama, the continuing threat to Formosa on the part of Communist China, these and certain other unsettled questions indicate how difficult remains the road ahead.

Yet a broad survey of world conditions, as they affect the United States and are affected by it, indicates that in many areas of the globe Washington's policies have both strengthened this country's international relationships and improved the picture held of this country.

TRACED TO 1958

Some students trace the beginning of this improvement, surprisingly enough, to the summer of 1958, when, in the face of civil strife in Lebanon, an extremely tense situation in Jordan, and the overthrow of the pro-Western Iraqi Government, Washington sent a powerful contingent of U.S. Marines into Lebanon. This helped end the strife, and allowed an opportunity for peaceful compromise between the warring factions.

But, equally important, the Marines were, to the happy surprise of nationalist elements in the Middle East, quietly withdrawn after a few months. Important segments of Asian-African opinion, which had earlier condemned the dispatch of the Marines, even though the Lebanese Government had requested it, were gratified at the speed with which this withdrawal was made.

This and other wise steps taken since eventually resulted in a lessening of Arab hostility toward the United States, despite the fact that Moslem resentment over America's role in the establishment of the State of Israel continues, and will continue for the foreseeable future, to raise many problems for Washington.

At present American relations with the Arab-speaking nations of the Middle East and north Africa seem, on the whole, to be moving toward a steadily better relationship. This is particularly true of Washington's relations with the United Arab Republic, the most influential of the Middle Eastern nations.

SYRIAN AID RESUMED

Within the past few months, the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic accepted American aid for the first time since the end of World War II. Similarly, American aid to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic is rising steadily and negotiations regarding such aid are being held in an increasingly friendly atmosphere. At the same time, the United Arab Republic has quietly but effectively begun withdrawing a considerable number of students which it had earlier sent to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and rerouting them to American and British universities.

It is undeniable that the relationship between the United States and the revolutionary regime of Premier Karim Kassem in Iraq is far from satisfactory, with the United States being frequently lumped with other leading Western Powers as "imperialist." However, the United States has moved in such a way as to attract a minimum of unfavorable attention in Iraq, with the result that Baghdad has been finding fewer reasons for attacking this country. One proof of this is seen in the fact that Iraq has made no serious attempt to link the United States with the series of upheavals which last year kept that country in confusion and which resulted in a succession of sensational treason trials.

In fact, the Iraqi-American situation has improved so greatly of late that the Iraqi Government recently asked the United States Embassy to help it fill 230 teaching posts at Baghdad University so that it might avoid hiring further Soviet personnel.

In general, it is not easy to see how the United States could within the present context of political realities appreciably improve its present foreign policy in regard to the Middle East. Washington has already demonstrated a heightened awareness of Arab sensibilities. It apparently seeks to do as little as possible to rub these sensibilities the wrong way, and it is endeavoring through a number of reportedly effective means to convince the Arabs that the United States not only has no designs against their independence but is sincerely interested in the preservation of peace and the advancement of well-being in the area. This is an effective beginning, given the bitter relationship which began with the partition of Palestine in 1947.

NORTH AFRICANS PLACATED

In still another Arabic-speaking area the United States has also managed to steer with considerable skill through excessively difficult diplomatic waters. This area is North Africa, where interest and emotion are largely focused on the effort of the Moslem underground in Algeria to win local self-determination.

Through the personal visit of President Eisenhower to the heads of state in both Morocco and Tunisia, through American willingness to negotiate over U.S. Air Force bases in the former, and through the offer of economic aid without strings, Washington has succeeded to a considerable extent in creating a not unfavorable image of the United States in those two countries.

Similarly, its shrewd voting during crucial tests in the United Nations on the Algerian issue, while not wholly satisfying either the French or their Moslem opponents, has enabled Washington to avoid offending either side too deeply.

But it is in south and southeast Asia that one of the most noticeable improvements in American foreign relations has taken place. While communism has been having its difficulties, due largely to Chinese Communist aggression along its Himalayan frontier and its actions in Tibet, the United States has, through a number of careful steps, managed to reduce Asian belief that the United States, if not exactly imperialistic itself, nonetheless was a fellow traveler of European imperialism. Through generous economic aid, but above all by the restraint which it has shown at a number of critical junctures during the past year and a half to 2 years, America has been able to remodel to a considerable extent the image of this country held by many influential Burmese, Ceylonese, Indians, Indonesians, and other Asians.

EISENHOWER GAINS NOTED

It goes without saying that the triumphal tour through this area taken late last fall by President Eisenhower only served to confirm and forward what was already a noticeable trend toward warmer relations with America on the part of the majority of non-Communist countries of south, southeast, and east Asia. Indeed, this tour seems to have had a favorable effect even in those Asian countries not included therein.

One has only to think back to the tense situation which existed 2 years ago between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the Sumatran revolt, to recognize how great the improvement has been in this important corner of southeast Asia. At that time the United States was being openly accused of aiding the rebellion.

But by patient insistence upon its innocence, by carefully refraining from actions which might lend further color to these accusations, by the extension of postrevolt aid, and above all by the skillful and friendly diplomacy exercised by American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, Washington has converted its relationship with Djakarta into one of friendship and a considerable degree of mutual trust.

An equally welcome improvement has been effected in American relations with Burma. Some 8 months ago, Burma began reaccepting American aid, which it had terminated in 1953 on the grounds that it had military implications. This renewal of close American-Burman relations is the result of patient effort on Washington's part plus the generally better picture which the United States has cut in southeast Asia during the past several years.

LATIN AMERICA IMPROVED

Taken as a whole the U.S. relations with Latin America also seem to be in a period of upswing. The Eisenhower visit during late February, American restraint over Cuba, the courage shown by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON during his South American swing, the promise of greater economic aid, the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank—each of these has helped repair Latin-American complaints of neglect on Washington's part and improve the average Latin-American's image of the United States.

On the other hand, it is obvious that in certain areas of Latin America, the United States faces difficult days. No statesman would dare forecast the direction in which American-Cuban relations may move. Similarly, Washington's relations with Panama give every evidence of being headed toward some sort of crisis over the latter's demand for greater rights in the Canal Zone.

These will obviously both test Washington's diplomatic skill and have a bearing upon the continued improvement in this country's relationship to the rest of Latin America. But if Washington's course so far is any yardstick, the United States is prepared to handle these situations in such a way as not to jeopardize its new gains with Cuba's and Panama's sister Republics.

Although some doubts have been expressed as to its diplomatic wisdom, Washington's move in sending a protest to the Union of South Africa deploring the loss of life in racial riots there is seen as part of America's new vigor in foreign affairs. Whatever else its effect may be, the move is almost certain to enhance American prestige among the new nonwhite nations now coming forth in Africa.

ATMOSPHERE BETTERED

Of all of the changes for the better wrought during the past several years, however, the most noticeable, in many ways, is that affecting American-Soviet relations. It is true that this is not an easy situation to evaluate, as it is susceptible to change overnight, should the Kremlin so wish. It is also true that the continuing crisis over Berlin remains a dark and somber cloud upon the horizon.

Yet it is undeniable that the present atmosphere of conversation is an improvement over the situation which previously prevailed. In like manner, the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev cannot be dismissed as merely worthless window dressing. The continued edging toward some kind of agreement on the control of atomic tests and armaments is a helpful and hopeful sign, even if it would be dangerous naivete to pin too great hopes thereon at the present time.

While this somewhat easier situation between the United States and the Soviet Union is undoubtedly traceable in large part to Moscow's belief that it best serves Soviet purposes at the moment, it should not be overlooked that the greater flexibility in world affairs which Washington has shown during the past 18 months or so has contributed substantially to this improvement.

At present criticism of the White House and State Department emphasizes the three following points which pertain, in part at least, to foreign policy. One is that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership. A second is that foreign aid is not what it should be. The third is that America's defense position has deteriorated in comparison with that of the Soviet Union during the past few years.

The charge that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership is an interesting one from several points of view. It is undeniable that today, 15 years after the end of World War II, Washington does not have the commanding voice in world affairs which it had, say, 5 or 10 years ago.

There are those who ask, however, whether this decline (1) was not inevitable and (2) was not actually desirable. They point out, in fact, that the entire purpose of American foreign policy during the past decade and a half has been directed toward enabling other countries to stand upon their own feet, make their own decisions, and thereby lessen, rather than increase, their dependency upon the United States.

From this point of view, may not the decline in American leadership actually represent a victory for American foreign policy? It is obvious that this line of argument cannot be carried to the point of advocating the abrogation of all American leadership. Nor does it mean that America can afford to stop thinking in global terms. This would be as dangerous as it would be foolish. But one cannot dismiss out of hand the argument that the increasing independence which many nations, which once felt obliged to follow American policy willy-nilly, are now showing may well constitute one of the greatest triumphs of American foreign policy.

In regard to the adequacy of foreign aid, if there has been any shortcoming here, it is attributable to the country as a whole, rather than to any one man, agency, or political party. Observers in Washington generally agree that Eisenhower has fought more vigorously for foreign aid than for almost any other cause. In this he has been seconded by administration officials. If he has been frustrated in obtaining the level of aid desired, the fault lies as much with one political party as with the other.

Of the varying charges made against the present administration in Washington, whether sincerely or for political purposes, the one which has produced the widest repercussions is that of having neglected this country's defenses. Specifically, the charge is made that the United States has now fallen behind the Soviet Union in both conventional and space weaponry.

INFLUENCE SMALL

Such a charge belongs in a discussion of a nation's foreign policy only so far as it can be shown that the former affects the latter. So far, and this frequently comes as a surprise to Americans, there is little evidence that the influence of the United States has declined as a result of any change in this country's military strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The general feeling in the rest of the world seems to be that, regardless of any alteration in the American-Soviet military balance, both nations possess such tremendous military might that such alterations no longer are significant. How sound this view is remains to be seen. But to date there is little or no evidence that the United States has been seriously handicapped or set back in the conduct of foreign affairs through an alleged neglect of its armaments.

No serious observer would or could attempt to deny that many grave problems lie ahead of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. Equally, none would deny that this country has behind it many missed or but half-seized opportunities. On the other hand, there is citable evidence that, during the past several years, American foreign policy has had a number of quiet, yet effective triumphs and that, contrary to the predictions of critics, the United States is markedly better off in its foreign relations than these critics had forecast.

The Upward Adjustment of Residual Oil Import Levels Is Deplorable and Inexcusable

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned the Department of Interior was again bowing to the will of import companies. There is no justification whatsoever for this about-face which defies a Cabinet committee's security standards and strikes another cruel and unnecessary blow at labor and management in the domestic fuel and railroad industry.

The import levels were created to prevent foreign oil from encrvating the American coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade incoming shipments of residual oil have closed mines, relegated mineworkers to the ranks of the unemployed, shoved railroad cars into an inactive state of deterioration, and taken away the jobs of maintenance and operating personnel. The effect on our whole business community has been primarily responsible for the serious labor surplus prevailing in coal communities and railroad centers.

I say to you frankly that, while I was gratified at the White House order initiating the mandatory control program on April 1, 1959, I was not at all satisfied with the import levels decided upon. Using 1957 figures to establish the criterion reflected a generosity toward importing companies that was unbecoming from the standpoint of the domestic economy. In 1957 the importers had shipped a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil into fuel markets of this country. It was a record year. Those imports amounted in energy value to more than 41 million tons of coal.

Having seen the gradual erosion of what has taken place in Pennsylvania's mining communities as a consequence of the rising tide of residual oil from foreign refineries, I favored a cutback that would reopen employment opportunities in my State and in the other regions where foreign oil had literally wrecked opportunity for miners, railroaders, and other workers whoce livelihood is reliant upon a vigorous domestic coal industry. The White House, after careful consideration of the problem, came to the conclusion that it should adopt the quota limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee charged with the responsibility of deciding at what point oil imports become a threat to the national security. The 1957 figures were set as the safe level.

Those of us seriously concerned with the impact of oil imports accepted the decision with reluctance. We were at least pleased that the White House had finally taken this official recognition of the importance of the coal industry and its relationship to the mobilization base. So we sat by and waited for the results. We felt that the limitation on the volume of residual oil imports thus established might at least provide an indication to the coal industry of just how far importers are allowed to go. The coal industry could make its plans accordingly. Railroads could use this information in projecting their operations to conform with general economic expectations of the coming years.

Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior not long ago gave what I considered assurance that it would not cater to the arrogant demands of importers who willfully and flagrantly disregarded quota limits in the early part of this year on the assumption that they would be bailed out of an embarrassing market situation when their allocations had been exhausted. The upward revision has indeed paid off for the importers. They have now been cleared for delivery of another 12 million barrels of residual oil over the established limit.

This concession to major shippers is deplorable and inexcusable. I charge that the Department of Interior is inviting public distrust unless it hereinafter returns the quota limitations to the originally published levels and pledges that there will be no further concessions to oil importers under any circumstances. It is a solemn duty to the many families who depend upon coal production for a livelihood and to the millions more whose very security is interlocked with the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be required in an emergency.

Declaration by Wisconsin's Governor's Committee on World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that World Refugee Year was created by

the United Nations General Assembly in December 1958.

The purpose of designating a special year is: To focus attention on world refugee problems; to encourage financial contributions from both public and private sources; to stimulate modifications of immigration policies of nations for refugees; and generally to provide necessary opportunity for such displaced individuals to find new homes in which to seek, and attain, their individual aspirations and become members of a society.

According to U.N. estimates, about 15 million people still lack permanent homes as a result of World War II and political upheavals.

Until a successful refugee-settlement program is accomplished, this will continue to be a cause of disturbances and unrest. As well, it will remain a blight upon the face of the earth in terms of failure to provide opportunity for the needs of a large segment of humanity.

We recall that in 1958 and 1959, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation establishing the observance of World Refugee Year in the United States. The proclamation called for joint cooperation between the U.S. Committee for Refugees, private welfare agencies and the Government.

In addition, President Eisenhower this year proposed to Congress a revision of our immigration policies which—though not specifically called for in previous programs—is "in spirit" with the concepts of World Refugee Year.

According to reports, 69 governments have so far announced plans for participation in World Refugee Year. In addition, private efforts are being exerted to find constructive ways and means to deal with the problems involved.

Today, I was pleased to receive from Philleo Nash, the Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin, and chairman of the Wisconsin Governor's Committee on World Refugee Year, declarations endorsing four goals of the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

To give the Senate the benefit of this committee's endorsement of the U.S. program for helping to resolve the difficulties confronting the refugees, I ask unanimous consent to have the declarations printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declarations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 18, 1960.

DECLARATION

The Wisconsin Governor's Committee for World Refugee Year, meeting this day in Madison, endorses the four goals of the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

(1) Immediate allocation by the executive branch of the Federal Government of $10 million already appropriated by the Congress for refugee programs;

(2) Generous allocation of additional surplus commodities now in Federal Government storage, for refugee relief;

(3) New legislation permitting the annual immigration of 20,000 refugees beyond those authorized by existing quotas;

(4) Intensified action by voluntary agencies in their continuing programs and in their efforts to raise from the American people during the year at least $20 million over their normal campaign goals for refugee aid.

This committee calls upon the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action, and urges private groups and individuals in Wisconsin to cooperate in achieving these objectives.

PHILLEO NASH,
Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin and Chairman of the Committee.

APRIL 18, 1960.

DECLARATION

The Wisconsin Governor's Committee for World Refugee Year, meeting this day in Madison, supports the special message to Congress by the President of the United States, dated March 17, 1960, in which he calls upon the Congress for a complete review, reconsideration and revision of Federal immigration laws.

PHILLEO NASH,
Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin and Chairman of the Committee.

The Staggering Problem of Foreign Carpet Imports on Our Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, to underline the staggering impact of foreign imports on our domestic economy, especially the carpet industry which is located in my district in Amsterdam, N.Y., I include herewith under permission to extend my remarks an article from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of March 31, 1960:

JANUARY IMPORTS OF WILTON CARPETING ACCOUNT FOR 33 PERCENT OF SALES; MUCH FROM JAPAN

Manufacturing statistics showing that January imports of Wilton carpeting reached proportions wherein one out of every three yards of Wiltons being sold in this country is imported are being studied carefully in this city.

Not only is all Wilton production of Mohasco Industries being made in Amsterdam plants but upwards of 750 workers, about one out of every four engaged in carpet and rug making here, is employed on this type of floor covering.

The 538,000 square yards of January imports classified as Wiltons represent a gain of approximately two and one-half the imported yardage of January 1958. Washington reports show. All types of carpets imported in January totaled 790,000 square yards.

Accounting for a major part of the dismaying gain in imports is the 267,000 square yards brought into the country from Japan. A year ago the Japanese imports were only 71,000 square yards.

A former dangerous competitor of American companies, Belgium, enjoyed a relatively modest gain of 20 percent in January. Belgium's position among exporters to the U.S. slumped to 56 percent. A year ago it was 76 percent of the total yardage coming into this country.

Not only the 750 workers in the Amsterdam plant of Mohasco are affected by the tremendous growth of imports, it is realized. Supplying yarn for the Wilton manufacture here is the woolen mill with approximately 1,100 workers whose output is largely used by the Amsterdam weavers. The industrial tie-in is such that the continued increase in imports is certain to affect the entire local floor covering production.

Adding to concern being felt at local levels of the trade, is the fact that on April 25 the Government will publish a list of items that may come in for further tariff reductions under the Trade Agreements Extension Act. The present 21 percent might conceivably be reduced to a point as low as 16 percent ad valorem.

Back in the 1930's Amsterdam workers were protected from this type of foreign competition by a 60 percent import duty. This protection was gradually whittled away through the years, much of it being bartered in deals with foreign countries under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements.

One year ago when the carpet industry petitioned the U.S. Tariff Commission for a review of import competition, the Commission declared by a 3-2 vote that the imports were not of sufficient quantity to injure or even threaten with injury the domestic rug industry. Although it was said at the time that reapplication for further study by the Tariff Commission would be made, no step in that direction has been taken.

BILL INTRODUCED

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING has introduced legislation that would introduce a new tariff factor: The comparative labor costs in the United States and in countries from which imports are being received. Under the Keating bill, the Secretary of Commerce would have more authority than at present.

Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON of the 32d Congressional District has indicated that he will introduce somewhat similar legislation in the House.

The Wilton carpet and rug, presently more a symbol for Amsterdam economic health than ever before, is constantly assuming increased importance. The future of the community seems to be wrapped up in this particular product that must have Government protection if it is going to survive, area businessmen are discovering.

Statements by Presidents of Independent Petroleum Association of America and National Coal Association Demonstrate Importance of Mandatory Oil Import Control System and Need for a National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have read with interest two public statements which significantly point up the mutuality of interest of two segments of our great domestic fuels industry.

Both were comments on the weaknesses of the Government's oil import control program and its administration, and both pointed to damage which is being

done to critically essential domestic fuels as a result.

One of these was by Stephen Dunn, of Washington, president of the National Coal Association, and the other by Alvin C. Hope, of San Antonio, Tex., president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Mr. Dunn declared that the recent hasty and ill-advised action of the Department of Interior in increasing residual fuel oil quotas for this period means that the equivalent of almost 3 million more tons of coal can now be imported, in addition to the original allocation. This, he declared, substantiates the coal industry's contention that there should be an immediate and impartial study of the Nation's total fuel requirements, and he remarked that such study is essential to the development of a long-range program for the most economical use of all of our available fuel supplies, including oil, coal and natural gas.

Mr. Hope pointed to the current depressed condition of the domestic petroleum industry, with rising costs and declining prices, and reported drilling activity so far this year is 13 percent below the levels of 1959.

These conditions reflect a continuation of the depressed position the domestic oil-producing industry has suffered the past several years, which the establishment of the mandatory oil import program was expected to alleviate—

Mr. Hope declared.

Without this program, it is obvious, current conditions in the industry would be chaotic. However, the objective of a strong, healthy oil-producing industry capable of meeting all national security needs is not being realized—

He warned.

Mr. President, these two statements remind us of the immediate necessity for giving our attention to the vital fossil fuels produced in this country and on which we would have to depend in time of national emergency. The time is now when we should have a thorough investigation of the whole question of fuels and energy and the establishment of a sound national fuels policy in the best interests of each producing industry and of the national welfare.

The statements issued by both Mr. Dunn and Mr. Hope serve to illustrate the common interest of all of our great domestic fuel industries and the vital importance of giving full consideration to each in the establishment of a national fuels policy.

Because of the importance of this unsolved question, I ask unanimous consent that these two statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ALVIN C. HOPE, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, APRIL 4, 1960

Continued deterioration of crude oil prices as exemplified by the reductions made Wednesday in several oil producing areas by Sinclair Oil Co., are alarming and threaten the ability of independent oil producers to find and develop needed petroleum reserves.

The action by Sinclair, which follows on the heels of numerous other widespread reductions, further aggravates an already unstable price situation and is in direct contradiction to the existing trend of increasing finding and developing costs.

Unless this down trend in crude oil prices is reversed now, they soon will be at the same level they were in 1953.

In contrast, in the last 7 years the cost of finding and developing petroleum has steadily increased. The price of finished steel has gone up 37 percent since 1953. Wages have increased 30 percent; oil field machinery has increased 26 percent and oil well casing costs have risen 41 percent.

As a result of this cost-price squeeze primary oil finding activity has shown a marked decline. Total drilling activity so far this year is 13 percent below the low levels of 1959. The number of rotary rigs now in operation in the United States is down 14 percent.

These conditions reflect a continuation of the depressed position the domestic oil producing industry has suffered the past several years, which the establishment of the mandatory oil import program was expected to alleviate. Without this program, it is obvious, current conditions in the industry would be chaotic. However, the objective of a strong, healthy oil producing industry capable of meeting all national security needs is not being realized.

All factors which are contributing to the present weakened position of the domestic oil producer will be the subject of intense evaluation and action by the association's newly established Ways and Means Committee and the Import Policy Committee at our midyear meeting in Denver, April 25–26.

The industry must find a solution to these problems if it is to move forward with the general economy and provide the energy supplies vital to continued national growth.

STATEMENT BY STEPHEN F. DUNN, OF WASHINGTON, D.C., PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION, APRIL 11, 1960

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, said today he was shocked and keenly disappointed by the sudden Interior Department action increasing the residual oil import quota 12 million barrels in the April 1–June 30 period.

"This hasty and ill-advised move substantiates the coal industry's contention that there should be an immediate and impartial study of the Nation's total fuel requirements," Mr. Dunn said. "Such a study is essential to the development of a long-range program for the most economical use of all of our available fuel supplies, including oil, coal, and natural gas.

"As far as this most recent action is concerned, we in the coal industry were shocked and keenly disappointed that the Government would act without holding hearings and without consulting those whose interests are so vitally affected."

The 12 million barrels of foreign-produced residual oil which can be imported under the revised formula is the equivalent of almost 3 million tons of coal, Mr. Dunn pointed out. He recalled that Under Secretary of Interior Elmer F. Bennett only recently had said the Interior Department had "no information which would appear to warrant an upward adjustment in the residual allocation for this 6-month period."

"Apparently a limited number of the large international oil companies persuaded officials of the Government to change their previously expressed position," Mr. Dunn said. "The issue of an increase was raised in the first instance only because a few of the major importers failed to make the most judicious use of the quotas available to them during the first 3 months of this year.

"In addition to pointing up the neeed for a comprehensive study of available fuel supplies, this action also makes it imperative that the Government conduct a most careful study before issuing oil import allocations for the 6-month period starting July 1. I trust due consideration will be given to the very serious unemployment in coal producing areas, and to the effect that oil imports have, not only on the coal industry, but on such closely allied industries as the railroads and the mine equipment manufacturers."

Mark Twain 1835–1910

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, calling attention to the fact that today marks the 50th anniversary of the death of the great literary genius from America's Midwest, Mark Twain.

This excellent editorial follows:

MARK TWAIN (1835–1910)

In 1835 and in 1910, Halley's Comet made two of its infrequent appearances in our sky. In the former year, in Florida, Mo., one of the few authentic geniuses of American literature was born. He superstitiously expected to die in the year of the comet's return, and so he did—just 50 years ago today, aged 74. No other midwestern writer has achieved so lasting an orbit in the literary heights as has Samuel L. Clemens, better known by his pseudonym of Mark Twain.

His birthplace is a State park. The nearby home town of his bodyhood, Hannibal, is chiefly notable for him and his creations, Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn, whose likenesses cast in bronze stand at the foot of Cardiff Hill. A U.S. postage stamp (10 cents, brown, 1940) honors him. His books circulate by the million in the Soviet Union also. Biographical and critical writing about him is as lively as ever, a current instance being "Mark Twain and Huck Finn" by Walter Blair of the University of Chicago.

Chicago knew Mark Twain only as an occasional visitor. Once he left the Mississippi River, he went west to Nevada and California. Travel sketches about the Sandwich Islands (now called Hawaii) for a Sacramento newspaper led to further travel writing, issued as the book, "Innocents Abroad."

Established as a writer by this funny if philistine volume, and married to a woman from Elmira, N.Y., Clemens' homes henceforth were in upstate New York, Connecticut, and Europe.

But it was in Chicago that one of his most hopeful investments went sour—a typesetting machine of too great intricacy. The factory was here, and the newspaper plant (the Times-Herald) where it proved impractical. Delos Avery, in our pages a few years back, suggested that this unhappy association with Chicago may have caused the humorist to hang on Chicago a remark he attributed to Satan, speaking to some dissatisfied tenants of his realms: "The trouble with you Chicago people is that you think you are the best people down here, whereas you are merely the most numerous."

Mark Twain's principal public appearance in Chicago was a happy one. It was at the 1879 reunion and banquet of veterans of the Army of the Tennessee, on this occasion joined by their commanders, Gen. U. S. Grant and Gen. William T. Sherman. At the Palmer House, military heroes and business giants attacked a menu including roast prairie chicken, buffalo steaks, and wild turkey. The oratory began at 10. In the place of honor, last among 15 speakers, at 2 a.m.

Mark Twain responded to the toast: "The babies. As they comfort us in our sorrows, let us not forget them in our festivities."

The full text of: "The Babies" appeared in the Tribune the next morning—a scoop engineered by Editor Joseph Medill, who sat next to Mark Twain at dinner.

Mark twain swept to his climax with the suggestion that some 56 years earlier General Grant himself had been "giving his whole strategic mind to trying to find out some way to get his big toe into his mouth." As he expected, "the laughter ceased and a sort of shuddering silence took its place" at this undignified reference to General and ex-President Grant. But the last sentence scored: "And if the child is but the father of the man there are mighty few who will doubt that he succeeded."

Of all the successful men at the Palmer House that night, Mark Twain is the most affectionately remembered. Of them all, he alone had the power to speak to our generation—and to our posterity—as clearly and memorably as to his own.

Bridgewater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the first settlers in the valley of Virginia, in which I live, came to Virginia primarily from Pennsylvania. Some were of Scotch-Irish stock and some of German stock, but all seeking a home where they could enjoy religious freedom. Among the valley towns established by descendants of the first settlers is the historic town of Bridgewater, which this year is celebrating its 125th anniversary.

A Virginia historian and newspaper publisher, Kenneth E. Crouch, of Bedford, Va., has compiled a list of places named Bridgewater in the United States, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of places were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLACES NAMED BRIDGEWATER IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Kenneth E. Crouch)

Place names for communities have many sources of origin and include at least 15 in the United States whose name Bridgewater is closely associated with bridges over streams in or near the communities.

Of the 15 places in the United States named Bridgewater, 9 are located in the New England area and it is there that the first American community of that name, and most historic, is located.

The first of that name was the Old Bridgewater area in Massachusetts, associated with the Plymouth Rock settlers and appropriately enough situated in Plymouth County in southeastern Massachusetts. Old Bridgewater's history dates to March 23, 1649, when Capt. Myles Standish, Samuel Nash, and Constant Southworth, a step-son of Gov. William Bradford of Plymouth Colony, purchased from Ousamequin (formerly Massasoit) at Sachem Rock in what is now East Bridgewater lands for the "township of Duxbury" for 7 coats, 9 hatchets, 8 hoes, 20 knives, 4 moose skins, and 10½ yards of cotton. The first settlement in Old Bridgewater was on both sides of the Town River in what is now West Bridgewater in 1651 by some of the Duxbury people and it was then known as Duxburrow New Plantation. Originally there were 54 proprietors of the town.

Old Bridgewater was composed of what is known today as Bridgewater, East Bridgewater, South Bridgewater, West Bridgewater, and Brockton (formerly North Bridgewater). No proof is given to the name Bridgewater although some associate it with the town of Bridgwater in England—though the English town has no "e" in the "Bridge" part of its name.

By 1956 the population of Duxburrow New Plantation had grown until it was deemed best to incorporate and the name Bridgewater was selected. East Bridgewater was incorporated in 1823 and West Bridgewater in 1822. Brockton (originally North Bridgewater) was settled in 1697 and incorporated in 1881.

The historic Sachem Rock upon which the original land for Old Bridgewater was purchased is now the property of Clarence D. Hall and known as Sachem Rock Farm. Mr. Hall is an 11th generation descendant of Gov. William Bradford of Plymouth Colony and a signer of the Mayflower Compact.

Bridgewater, Mass., is one of two Bridgewaters that has a prominent college, Bridgewater State Teachers College which was founded in 1840.

In the northeastern part of Maine is the community of Bridgewater whose name originates from the Bridgewater Academy Grant. It is located on the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad and near the North Branch of the Meduxnekeag River on the Maine-New Brunswick, Canada, border. It was founded in 1858.

In northwestern Connecticut is the community of Bridgewater, located between the Housatonic and Shepaug Rivers, and its name is attributed to a bridge over the Housatonic River. Its founding dates to 1722.

In two counties of eastern Vermont are three communities with the name of Bridgewater. Deacon Asa Jones began the surveying for the Bridgewater area in 1779 and all three communities are located on the Ottauquechee River, which prior to 1927 had many covered bridges. Bridgewater and Bridgewater Corners are both located in Windsor County and across the line in Rutland County is West Bridgewater which is a part of Sherburne Center.

In central New York is Bridgewater which was settled in 1797 and named for Bridgewater, Mass. The first settlers were two cousins from Connecticut in 1789 and more came from that State and Massachusetts. In 1797 it was named when the township was formed. A small unnamed stream flows through the town, which is on the Cherry Valley Turnpike.

The only Bridgewater in the Southern States is located in northwestern Virginia in Rockingham County, the turkey capital of the world. The history of the community, in the historic Valley of Virginia, dates to about 1800. John Dinkle, between 1800 and 1810, built several mills on the north bank of the North River and around these mills was formed a village, first known as Dinkel Town, in honor of its founder. When iron mining developed in the area Dinkel Town became a river port and its name was changed to Bridgeport. When the town was incorporated in 1835 it was named Bridgewater. It is the site of Bridgewater College, founded in 1880 and operated by the Church of the Brethren.

West Bridgewater in western Pennsylvania, founded in 1834, is located at the mouth of Beaver River north of Pittsburgh. Aaron Burr lived here and built his barges for explorations down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

In the township of Bridgewater in southeastern Michigan is the town of Bridgewater which was founded about 1860. In 1836 the township of Hickston was divided and George Howe appointed the first supervisor. It is believed he named the community for Bridgewater, N.Y., where he formerly lived.

The community of Bridgewater in southwestern Iowa was founded in 1884 and its name is accredited to a bridge over the Middle Nodoway River.

The Bridgewater farthest west is located in southeastern South Dakota. It was first called Nation, for the first settlers, R. Nation and J. B. Nation. The name was changed to Bridgewater in 1880 by the workers on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and Pacific Railroad who had to carry their drinking water across a bridge. The community was incorporated in 1889.

There is a Bridgewater on the southwestern part of Nova Scotia, where the LeHave River enters the Atlantic Ocean. No information is available as to when the town was founded as original settlers came in by ones and twos from the nearby settlements of LeHave and Riverport. The first footbridge on the river was constructed about 1840 with a barrel of rum to keep the builders happy. So it seems the first settlers came between the 1820's and 1830's. The LeHave River is often referred to as the Rhine of Nova Scotia.

Location	Founded	Population	Origin of name
BRIDGEWATER			
Connecticut	1722	800	Bridge over Housatonic River.
Iowa	1884	206	Bridge over Middle Nodoway River.
Maine	1858	1,200	Bridgewater Academy grant.
Massachusetts	1628	10,000	Probably Bridgwater, England.
Michigan	1800 [1]	120	Probably Bridgewater, N.Y.
New York	1797	850	Bridgewater, Mass.
South Dakota	1880	748	Bridge over a stream.
Vermont	1779	903	Bridge over Ottauquechee River.
Virginia	1800 [1]	1,537	Bridge over North River.
BRIDGEWATER CORNERS			
Vermont	1779	(3)	Bridge over Ottauquechee River.
EAST BRIDGEWATER			
Massachusetts	1660	6,500	Probably Bridgwater, England.
SOUTH BRIDGEWATER			
Massachusetts	1628	(3)	Do.
WEST BRIDGEWATER			
Massachusetts	1651	6,500	Do.
Pennsylvania	1834	1,326	Bridge over Beaver River.
Vermont	(4)	(4)	Bridge over Ottauquechee River.

[1] Founded or established about this date.
[2] Part of Bridgewater, Vt.
[3] Part of Bridgewater, Mass.
[4] Unknown.
[5] Part of Sherburne Center, Vt.

Unemployment Insurance for Nonprofit Organization Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we have many programs which are designed to protect the population of the Nation against risks over which they have no control. These programs included social security, the public assistance program, and the unemployment insurance program. We are constantly striving to make the benefits amounts under these programs commensurate with the requirements of the recipients and to design new types of benefits which will meet changing needs. Yet, much as such improvements are needed, we should also be alive to the act the great numbers of people are as yet denied even minimum protection under some programs. This is particularly true of the unemployment compensation program. After the terrible experiences of the early thirties it was realized that our citizens must be afforded protection against the miseries which follow unemployment. Hence, Congress designed the present unemployment law to give a measure of income security to those who are unable to obtain work through no fault of their own. It is a sobering thing to consider that when we suffer periods of economic structure such as the recent recession, unemployment insurance is the only thing standing between many families and the public dole. I was surprised and shocked to learn that approximately 1,300,000 persons are presently excluded from this vital protection by the operation of existing law. I refer to those persons who work for nonprofit organizations. I find it difficult to see why this large and valuable segment of our working population should be treated with less concern than other portions of the labor force. The character of the organization for which a man works has not the slightest effect on his ability to endure a period of unemployment for which the economy, and not the worker, is responsible. When income stops people are hungry. I cannot agree that eligibility should hinge upon the character of the organization by whom the worker is not being paid.

After all, nonprofit organizations hire people to do the same kind of work as is done by profitmaking organizations. This fact has been recognized by Congress in making it possible for the employees of nonprofit organizations to obtain social security coverage. But, social security coverage provides only a portion of the protection to which such people ought to be entitled. We have constantly worked to improve the coverage of social security and have done so. But, unemployment compensation has not kept pace. I think we must take steps to close the gap. For many years, all the laws of this Nation have recognized nonprofit organizations as a special type, and have accorded them many privileges and immunities. This is because such organizations are devoted to the general good rather than the enrichment of any private individual. It seems to me that such organizations cannot continue to be "friends to man" and at the same time cheerfully contemplate more than a million workers without the slightest protection against the risk of unemployment.

I have therefore introduced a bill, H.R. 11594, which would eliminate the provisions of present law which exclude employees of nonprofit organizations from the insurance they need and deserve. I am happy that a similar proposal is contained in H.R. 7177 which was introduced by the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, jointly with the late Honorable Richard Simpson. I know that it will receive serious consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, and look forward to its adoption by the Congress as an important forward step in strengthening our unemployment insurance plan. I hope that this body will join with me so that my bill, or one embodying the same principles, can become law as soon as possible.

Israel Independence Day — Proclamation by Governor Rockefeller, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the establishment of the Republic of Israel 12 years ago marked a significant milestone in the history of human freedom. No less significant is the remarkable spirit of progress that has lifted Israel in 12 short years from an infant community to a dynamic, highly developed, and prospering member of the family of nations. The stature she has achieved is the more admirable because of the difficulties and frustrations, manmade and nature imposed, that Israel has had to surmount in her courageous march to the fulfillment of her destiny.

In commemoration of the historic date of Israel's founding as a free nation, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, proclaimed April 15 as Israel Independence Day in New York State. Mr. President, in view of the close, traditional ties that unite our Nation with Israel, I ask unanimous consent that this proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Twelve years ago the United States acquired a new ally, the family of nations, a new member, when the Republic of Israel was established.

Since that day the people of Israel have stood forthright as an independent state, a full member of United Nations.

They won their freedom in the face of obstacles which most people believed to be insurmountable. They owe their freedom to their own massed and individual valor, and to the fiery heroism of their leaders. As Americans we are proud to think that our sympathy, encouragement, and support also contributed to this happy consummation.

The progress of Israel, in 12 years has been nothing short of miraculous. Large areas of land that were desert have been made fertile and productive. Hundreds of thousands of the homeless and oppressed were welcomed and absorbed into the new state. Its government is one after our own hearts, since it is pledged to freedom, to equality of opportunity for all, and to respect for the dignity of the individual.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 15, 1960, as Israel Independence Day in New York State and I invite widespread recognition of this event which marked an epoch in world history.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Dr. R. L. Williams, Houtzdale, Pa., Prominent in Medical Circles in Central Pennsylvania, Celebrates the 80th Anniversary of His Birth and a Half Century of Dedicated Service in the Field of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the medical profession has many physicians who have served their fellowmen with outstanding ability and devotion for over a half century. Among them is Dr. R. L. Williams, prominent and highly respected resident of Houtzdale, Pa., who has enjoyed the honor of having been elected and having served three 4-year terms as coroner of Clearfield County, Pa. During his tenure of office as county coroner, Dr. Williams continued his private practice, maintaining daily office hours and making house calls that are among the many demands made of the family doctor.

During his 50 years of service to humanity and in particular to the residents of the Houtzdale area, Dr. Williams found time to fill a 20-year teaching assignment at the nurses school affiliated with the Philipsburg, Pa., State Hospital where for many years he served as chief of the medical staff.

The popular Houtzdale physician is among the many country doctors who in 50 years of practice have witnessed phenomenal changes in providing medical care and treatment. Through constant study and active membership in various medical societies physicians like the beloved Dr. Williams have been able to keep abreast of the breathtaking developments that have affected their profession in the transition from the so-called horse-and-buggy era to the wonders of the nuclear age. It is to their credit that they have availed themselves of the latest techniques in the treatment

of disease with the result that their patients have derived great and lasting benefits from their foresight and determination in continuing to seek knowledge and skill in treating the ills of mankind.

It is a great pleasure to salute Dr. R. L. Williams on the 80th anniversary of his birthday and to congratulate him on reaching his 50th year as a practicing physician. I join the many friends of the genial Houtzdale physician in wishing him many more happy birthdays and continued years of service in his chosen profession.

In conclusion, I should like to incorporate in my tribute to Dr. R. L. Williams the following article which appeared in the April 14, 1960, issue of the Osceola Leader, published at Osceola Mills, Pa.:

HOUTZDALE DOCTOR MARKS BIRTHDAY; STILL GOING STRONG

Dr. R. L. Williams, Houtzdale physician for 50 years and active in Clearfield and Centre County medical circles, celebrated his 80th birthday April 1.

A busy practitioner, Dr. Williams served as Clearfield County coroner for three terms and served as president of the Clearfield County cancer unit of the American Cancer Society from October 1948 to September 1954.

Dr. Williams became a member of the Philipsburg State Hospital staff on June 12, 1928. He served many years as medical chief of staff and taught pediatrics for 20 years in the nurses' school.

During his career he has been affiliated with the Clearfield County Medical Society, which he served as president for one term, a member of the Centre County Society, the Medical Society and the American Medical Association.

Born in Houtzdale April 1, 1880, he is the son of the late Rev. and Mrs. Robert G. Williams, the former a Presbyterian minister for 34 years.

His early education was acquired in the public schools of Clearfield County. As a young man he worked at various occupations to obtain money for higher education. Finally he found his way to the State Teacher's College at West Chester, graduating in 1903.

Upon graduating from the University of Maryland Medical College, Dr. Williams took examinations in both Maryland and Pennsylvania. He chose Houtzdale in which to practice, remaining there these 50 years.

Travel to patients in the early days was by horseback or horsedrawn buggies since there were no improved roads. Since 1913, however, Dr. Williams has traveled by automobile.

On June 3, 1908, the doctor married the late Lillian F. Bell of Kerrmoor.

He has two daughters and one son: Mrs. W. R. (Miriam) Fahringer of Mountain Lakes, N.J., a Penn State graduate who also holds her master's degree in education from Columbia University; Mrs. May Jo Love of Arlington, Va., wife of Lt. Col. D. S. Love; and Dr. Warren W. Williams. There are six grandchildren.

Export of Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a very timely article entitled "Export of Jobs Blamed on High U.S. Wage Scales," by the able columnist, Mr. Elmer Roessner which recently appeared in the Worcester Daily Telegram.

As Mr. Roessner indicates, "exporting jobs" is a phrase that has given the American people and some of their leaders greatest concern of late. Inasmuch as exporting jobs takes away as well as threatens their employment, American workers have come to realize the danger this practice presents to their continued and future employment.

It is clear that many American workers have already lost their jobs by the location overseas of American factories taking advantage of lower wage and price scales and lower labor standards in various foreign nations. It is undeniable that if this practice continues many other workers will lose their jobs and foreign workers will replace them, doing the same type of work in their own countries.

There are variations of the job-export practice all of which effect the general prosperity of this Nation.

First, there is the manufacturing concern which sets up an outlet overseas to produce and distribute its products by utilizing cheap, substandard foreign labor and escape paying taxes in this country, at least for the time being.

Second, there is the American concern which has deliberately set up plants overseas to take advantage of the foreign aid program that assists in building new factories and furnishing know-how, thus greatly reducing its cost of production, getting closer to foreign markets which they are able to exploit because of low production costs, and, finally, in some instances, shipping their products to the United States under prevailing low tariff walls to compete with our domestic economy and cause the loss of even more jobs in the home employment markets.

I do not desire to discuss these important questions extensively at this time, but I do wish to point out the most deleterious effect of this practice upon American working men and women, upon the national economy, upon our competitive situation in the world and upon the general, overall prosperity of the Nation.

I am concerned, too, about the way the statistics of foreign trade; that is, imports and exports have been handled. It has been said that anything can be proved by statistics and the recent publication of figures relating to the activity of those engaged in exporting jobs, and promoting foreign trade in other nations, seem to indicate that the full story is not being told to the American people.

As Mr. Roessner points out, something more than export sales are needed to complete the picture because travel, tourism, subsidized agricultural exports, foreign aid bounties, and offshore procurement spending are all factors in the general import-export picture that are oftentimes not taken into account and certainly not given proper weight.

It is hardly necessary for me to assert and reiterate that I favor foreign trade and commercial intercourse with all nations of good faith and good will with whom it is mutually advantageous to trade and conduct economic relationships.

What I object to is subsidized trade, whether it is subsidized by foreign aid, low tariffs, or reciprocal trade policies. In the first instance, the money comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers, and in the second, this trade is accomplished at the expense of the American workers who lose their jobs, and American families who are forced to undergo hardship and privation when the earnings of their breadwinners are cut.

I think it should be said, too, that many American companies located overseas are now bewailing the decisions that caused them to take this action. Many problems have developed that should have been, but were not, foreseen by so-called captains of industry.

Many obstacles have been set up against American companies operating overseas, high taxes and discriminatory controls have been imposed upon them, and to their deep chagrin, exchange restrictions have effectively prevented them from channeling funds back to the United States. Not even the intricacies of elaborately operated multination exchange and trade have helped in this situation, and if these companies had another chance to consider the problem, it is doubtful whether many of them, excluding certain great trusts and combines, would locate overseas again.

There is an element of punitiveness in the decision of an American manufacturing company to locate overseas, punitiveness against American workers. It is manifest in the attitude, "Well, if you don't work for less, we will move out to some place where workers will." This could mean Japan or other Oriental nations with a 10-cent scale, or continental nations with much lower scales than prevail here.

As is usually the case in human relations when persons act from motives of spite and greed, the laws of compensation and retribution operate and this pretty scheme backfires leaving its hapless authors holding the well-known sack. It has also developed considerable deep-rooted bitterness on the part of many workers and their families in this country who feel that industrial leaders who move their factories overseas and thus take away American jobs are not very much concerned about the welfare of the American workers.

Inevitably, this feeling is just the very thing that the Communists like to engender, because it develops arguments, resentments, and bitterness against our free enterprise system and its leaders which, in the long run, or in the short run, depending upon how fast certain trends move in this country, could bring incalculable damage and disaster to our free business institutions.

Moreover, the location of these factories overseas encroaching as they do upon businesses located in other parts of the world is also being deeply resented by foreign peoples and is the cause of additional anti-American sentiment added to that which has been generated so extensively in many countries since the end of the war when we started to

pour huge financial surfeits and grants into foreign countries.

American history will record that while America saved the world from fascism, from naziism and dictatorship and spent billions and billions and billions of dollars to rehabilitate, aid and relieve many nations and millions and millions of people from privation and hardship, we can measure the thanks we have received to date and are receiving daily from those we helped in small change.

What price glory? is a good way to put it, as we look upon the distorted world which is either leaning toward communism with accelerated pace, or putting a gun to its head so to speak, exclaiming "Give me more American aid, or I will go Communist."

There is too much of this palpable international blackmail, and we must not yield to it. Collaborate with and assist within reason nations of good will and good faith that are honestly standing with us for freedom against communism, but by all means, let us cut off aid to those who are openly or covertly playing the game of the great Soviet lie.

The article follows:

[From the Worcester Daily Telegram, Apr. 4, 1960]

SMALL BUSINESS—EXPORT OF JOBS BLAMED ON HIGH U.S. WAGE SCALES

(By Elmer Roessner)

"Exporting jobs" is a phrase you'll hear more often this election year. Here's an attempt to define and explain it.

A job is exported when a manufacturer takes a task away from one of his employees and pays someone in a foreign country to do the same work. That's the basic concept. By projection, a manufacturer exports jobs when he buys components in a foreign country instead of making them with his own force, or when an industry buys materials, components, or complete articles abroad which it might have made with jobholders in its own field.

The high wage scales in the United States are largely blamed for "job exports." A manufacturer may find it costs him $1 in American labor to make a component, but it may cost only 10 cents to have the same component made by labor in Japan. So he "exports" the jobs of making that component to Japan. American workers are laid off; Japanese craftsmen are hired.

DECLINE IN EXPORTS

Sometimes this job export consists of having articles crafted abroad and sent here. In other instances it may involve having an article made abroad for sale there, or in another foreign country. For example, the maker of a household appliance may find the cost of making the motor in America makes it impossible for him to compete with foreign manufacturers. So he may set up as assembly plant in France, shipping the stamped-out components from America and buying motors made abroad. While he may not have the assembled appliances shipped back to America for sale, he may find costs low enough to compete in the French market or in other European and perhaps African and Latin-American markets.

It is difficult to assess the amount of job exporting being done. American export sales are running $3 million to $4 million a year behind imports, but it's no true measure because figures include travel, tourism, subsidized agricultural exports, and other variables.

TARIFFS NO ANSWER

A solution frequently suggested for the imbalance of foreign trade and for the job-export problem is higher tariffs. While such levies could be effective in restricting imports of goods and components for the domestic market, they would not stop job exports when the end products were sold abroad.

A survey by Mill & Factory magazine provides some relevant facts. It polled 243 industrial firms and found that 6 percent bought foreign-made components for assembly in this country and that another 6 percent had entire products made abroad for sale here.

The figures are not definitive. The total amount, in either dollars or man-hours by these companies may be small or large. They could mean 100 jobs or 100,000 jobs. But other questions asked by the magazine may have more significance.

Of companies responding, 15 percent said they had plants abroad and 6 percent more said they had plans to build plants in foreign countries. While not definitive, those figures suggest a considerable export of American jobs.

And truly significant were the answers to the question: "If you said yes to the foregoing questions, what prompted your firm to seek foreign sources?" The answers:

	Percent
Low-cost labor	4
Better quality workmanship	4
Both of above	7
Access of markets	29
Tariff circumvention	20

Of those using foreign sources, 6 percent said they need more workers, 15 percent said they need fewer, and 79 percent said using foreign sources had no effect on the work force.

TAPE NOT A RECORD

In a characteristic demonstration of its unassailable logic, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has decided that a tape recording is not a phonograph record. There's an excise tax on records, but it does not apply to tapes, says Revenue Ruling 60–105.

Government Workers Need a Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYES' COUNCIL, AFL–CIO SALARY RALLY HELD AT THE NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 4, 1960

Whereas the 4,000 members of the Government Employes' Council (AFL–CIO) assembled here in the interest of their "crusade for economic equality" represent 2½ million Federal and postal employees who are vastly underpaid for the important and highly skilled work they perform; and

Whereas during the past 11 years Federal and postal employees have received only 4 small pay increases while workers in private industry have received an average of 10 pay increases during that same period; and

Whereas this discriminatory situation has resulted in appallingly low rates of pay for Federal and postal employees in relation to workers in similar positions in private industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference give its wholehearted and grateful endorsement to H.R. 9883, a Federal and postal employee pay bill, introduced by Representative JAMES MORRISON and more than 75 other Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, because this legislation, if passed, would put Federal and postal workers reasonably abreast of the national economic parade; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States; and to every Member of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, with the hope that it will call their sympathetic attention to the desperate economic need of Federal and postal employees everywhere in the United States.

Ten Years of Progress by the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia Celebrated at Anniversary Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated with approximately 150 educators, including President Elvis Stahr of West Virginia University and the presidents of other State supported and independent colleges, leaders of business, industry and the professions and governmental officials, at the observance of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia, on April 19, 1960, in Charleston, W. Va.

Also present for the luncheon which followed the morning meeting was Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, who spoke briefly. The secretary of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, David D. Johnson of Bridgeport and Pittsburgh, Pa., attended.

Officers and directors of the Education Foundation, Inc., all West Virginians, are Phil Conley, president; Charles C. Wise, Jr., first vice president; Dr. William R. Laird, second vice president; Sam T. Mallison, treasurer; Judge Elizabeth V. Hallanan, secretary; Boyd B. Stutler, managing editor; and directors, Marshall Buckalew, Cecil B. Highland, Jr., Charles Hodel, Kyle McCormick, R. Virgil Rohrbaugh, Raymond Salvati, Rupert A. Sinsel, Delbert S. Stout, and Earl H. Wilson.

PHIL CONLEY CALLED "MR. WEST VIRGINIA"

The Education Foundation is a nonprofit, nonshare West Virginia corporation which received its charter on May 31, 1950. Phil Conley, often referred to as "Mr. West Virginia," has given significant leadership and dedicated labor to the work. He has been one of the State's leading historians and publishers

for many years. I had the honor to have worked for him as a magazine writer 35 years ago when he was publisher of the West Virginia Review.

The foundation has made significant achievements in carrying out its purposes and objects, among which are the following:

To promote, assist, and encourage research and scholarship in literature, philosophy, and the history of West Virginia; to give financial aid to students, teachers, and other persons with interests and aptitudes in those fields of endeavor; to manufacture, bind, publish, and sell books and periodicals, and so forth.

In the past 10 years the Education Foundation, Inc., has owned and published 20 books on West Virginia subjects and by West Virginia authors. Among these is the textbook, "West Virginia Yesterday and Today," by Phil Conley and Boyd Stutler. This is the only official elementary history of West Virginia adopted by the State board of education. In the past few years, 41,000 copies have been published, most of which are in use in the schools. All of the money received from the sale of this book, as well as that received from other volumes, is used for the program of the foundation; no royalties are paid to authors.

At present five books are being written by West Virginia authors which will be owned by the foundation. Among these will be a definitive history of "West Virginia Oil and Gas Industry" by Dr. Eugene Thoenen. This will be a companion volume to the book recently published, "History of the West Virginia Coal Industry," by Mr. Conley.

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS ARE PROVIDED

Also during the past 10 years the foundation has awarded scholarships and loans to college students in the amount of $9,181.

The Education Foundation has never asked for any contributions from the public or individuals and its officers say the foundation does not contemplate doing so. However, several members of the board and a few others have voluntarily made gifts of $27,760. The sale of books has been and continues to be the chief source of revenue for the program of the foundation. Total sales of books in the first 10 years of the organization's life amounted to $136,269.

Dr. William R. Laird gave to the foundation all of the income from the sale of his book, "The Philosophy of Medicine."

In the official report presented by the foundation's secretary, Judge Hallanan, plans for the future were discussed. It was pointed out that West Virginia, on the eve of its 100th anniversary as a State, is in a period of great economic and social upheaval. Perhaps never before have our citizens been so thoroughly alert to the problems facing them, the report noted, and continued:

To help solve these problems, we believe a careful and objective study of the past century is essential. Our State has a rich heritage in her history, but many of her citizens are not fully aware of it. The time is at hand for extensive research and creative writing about West Virginia and her great men and women. The Education Foundation has a unique opportunity to make worthwhile contributions in this field.

FUTURE PROGRAM IS NOTEWORTHY

Mr. President, I enthusiastically endorse the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia in its five major recommendations, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

1. We hope graduate students in the 17 degree-granting institutions of higher learning in West Virginia will be encouraged to write theses and dissertations on West Virginia subjects when seeking advanced degrees.

2. The scholars serving on faculties in our institutions of higher learning are urged to write books on subjects pertaining to West Virginia and her people.

3. The newspapers of West Virginia, both daily and weekly, are invited to publish feature articles pertaining to their own communities, as well as those of statewide interest.

4. Teachers in high schools will be requested to assign subjects pertaining to the State for themes, orations, debates, and other curricular as well extracurricular studies.

5. We recommend a West Virginia library. Many citizens of this State have books in their private libraries pertaining to West Virginia and her people. It is hoped that many more will set aside a corner in their libraries for books on these subjects. If they do, we know they will receive much information and pleasure from their West Virginia library.

Cuban Slowdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, all of us are disturbed by the developments in Cuba in recent months and by the attitude and actions of Cuban Premier Castro, in particular. He appears to be casting aside all principles of democracy and freedom and doing his best to shatter the traditional warm relations between our two countries.

The Buffalo Evening News recently reviewed the developments in this critical area and, under previous consent, I include the editorial "Cuban Slowdown," at this point in my remarks:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Apr. 13, 1960]

CUBAN SLOWDOWN

The U.S. Government has long been patient in the face of Cuban provocation, not only the illegal seizure of U.S. property but the constant public insults of this country as economically imperialist, the capitalist enslaver of Latin America. That patience is now wearing thin.

The U.S. Government has just extended its arms embargo to the Caribbean to cover helicopters and light planes which the Cubans had requested, pointedly telling the present Cuban Government that their demands far exceed any normal need for self-defense. Simultaneously, the State Department has rejected the request for the rehiring of a labor leader at the Guantanamo naval base, fired for stirring up the workers against the United States.

Furthermore, President Eisenhower, writing to a Chilean student federation, has underlined the profits Cubans laborers and business derive from American investment and industry, decried the present trend toward anarchy, and publicly accused the Castro regime of betraying the ideals with which it came to power in January 1959: Democratic self-government, freedom of speech, and the press, equality before the law.

One Havana daily front-paged the Eisenhower letter and underscored its timeliness and truthfulness. It does not follow, of course, that all, or even a majority of Cubans would agree with the Eisenhower denunciation at this point. But the President's stand must surely give heart within Cuba to the anti-Castroists, and to some who though not anti-Castro fear his involvement with the Communists. But it is not likely to make their position vis-a-vis Castro's regime any the happier, for it is perfectly clear that it was not meant to soothe him or his friends. Nor is it now clear what form or what strength any active opposition to the present revolutionary government would develop.

But be it noted that the President's letter was not directd toward the Cubans themselves. It was addressed to university students in faraway Chile, one of the classes most constantly exposed to Communist and anti-American propaganda. In the past year the Castro government has been cultivating this element in every Latin American land, adding its share of U.S. slander to the general lot. Too often these voices have been left unanswered. Mr. Eisenhower's declaration is meant to fill a small part of this gap. It goes on record for reform, especially for agrarian reform. It supports, in short, evolutionary Latin American progress toward democratic process. But it warns against the destruction of the present order, against anarchy, against the uprooting of American financial involvement which pays so handsomely the peoples themselves. Economically it warns against killing the golden goose and politically against betrayal of the ideals that have sparked the flame of reform.

Arbor Day—A Memorial to Julius Sterling Morton of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the birthday of Julius Sterling Morton, a nationally famous Nebraskan.

J. Sterling Morton was one of a number of public-spirited citizens of the late 19th century who realized the importance of forestry and conservation and who were alarmed by the rapid deforestation of many sections of the United States.

Many notable people realized that the States might profitably plant trees every year at the proper time or supervise their planting; but it was Mr. Morton, then the Nebraska commissioner of agriculture, who was the first to propose the

setting apart of a day for that purpose. In 1872 he succeeded in inducing the State board of agriculture to adopt his resolution, which set April 10 as Arbor Day.

Great enthusiasm was aroused among Nebraska's citizens, and over a million trees were planted the first year. Three years later, in recognition of the important role he played in beautifying and reforesting an almost treeless Nebraska, Mr. Morton's birthday, April 22, was designated as "Arbor Day" in Nebraska.

At first the idea was slow in spreading, but after the program was so successful in Nebraska the movement began to catch on very rapidly. By 1890 over 26 of the States and Territories had adopted the observance as a legal holiday.

As a result of Arbor Day being created in Nebraska, the State was officially known as the Tree Planters State for 60 years.

Most of the trees in Nebraska stand as a living memorial to the contributions of Julius Sterling Morton, who served as this Nation's third Secretary of Agriculture from 1893 to 1897. He is especially credited today with tree-planting activities ranging from huge manmade national forests in the sandhills of our State to most farm shelter belts and tree-lined city and village streets.

Arbor Lodge is a State park in Nebraska City which stands as a constant reminder of the contributions that Morton made to the State and the Nation. Every year thousands of schoolchildren and tourists visit this beautiful park.

Over the years the nature of the Arbor Day celebration has changed slightly. At first the efforts to extend its celebration were made chiefly through agricultural associations and civic authorities, but in 1882, the plan of making it a school festival was inaugurated. It is this form of the celebration which is so popular throughout the United States and many other countries of the world. The scope and purpose of the program have been greatly broadened from the simple exercises and the planting of single trees. It has become the occasion for impressing on the minds of all schoolchildren the importance of forestry and the planting of thousands of seedlings to reforest what would otherwise be nothing but wasteland.

The people of Nebraska think so highly of J. Sterling Morton that he is one of only two Nebraskans honored by having their statues in the U.S. Capitol building. The statue of Morton is one floor below in the hall near the House restaurant.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman.

A BREATH OF COUNTRY AIR

That fresh country air that rural folks enjoy and city dudes dream about is all that you hear about it and more. Why? Well, for one thing, country air isn't always being polluted and loaded down with foreign matter as is city air. And, too, country air is always being cleaned and refreshed by nature.

Researchers tell us that trees, shrubs, and grass—all green vegetation—operate like a giant vacuum cleaner, taking in carbon dioxide and giving forth pure oxygen. At least a dozen good-sized trees, we understand are needed to clean up after a single automobile.

How many "air cleaners" will you plant in 1960 for future generations?

I would like to add that this material was prepared by a college student from Nebraska who is spending a few weeks in my office as part of a Colgate University government study program. Mr. Kenneth Ristau of Omaha is one of a dozen Colgate students who are spending 4 months in Washington, D.C., and learning firsthand how the Federal Government functions.

Adm. Arleigh Burke and the U.S.S. "Ausburne"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations on the occasion of the transfer of the U.S.S. *Charles Ausburne* to the Federal Republic of Germany under our ship-loan program at Charleston, S.C., on Tuesday, April 12, 1960.

Admiral Burke's speech is written both in English and in German. Both versions are included. I do this as a compliment to our distinguished ally, the great present West German Republic.

Admiral Burke's speech is written in the language of the sailorman. He speaks to the men who will run this ship. He speaks in a language that they will understand and he talks from a wealth of experience and with the gentle, kindly voice of a friendly advisor. He speaks in a firm tone, an unmistakable tone and to an ally who understand what it means to be free.

Mr. Speaker, Arleigh Burke is dedicated to peace and freedom. The free world knows this. His address follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, ON THE OCCASION OF TRANSFER OF U.S.S. "CHARLES AUSBURNE" TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AT THE U.S. NAVAL STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C., APRIL 12, 1960

The navies of our great nations are joined today as the sixth American destroyer, the former U.S.S. *Charles Ausburne*, the Z–6, is transferred to the Federal Republic of Germany.

I have a particularly soft spot in my heart for this fine ship. She was my flagship in Destroyer Squadron 23 during operations in the South Pacific in 1943 and 1944.

Seeing her today, and walking her decks once again brings back many wonderful memories of events and experiences—memories dimmed by time but never forgotten. It is like meeting an old friend after a long separation.

During these years of separation, changes have been made. Her fighting capabilities have been improved. Better, more effective equipment has been added to her stout hull. But she is still the beautiful, fighting ship which led the Little Beaver Squadron through its toughest battles.

I would like to tell you, as one sailor to another, you are getting a good ship—a hard-fighting ship—a proven ship. She was a good ship because of the men who sailed her. They were here pulse; they gave her heart, breath, and life. They fought hard, and so did she. She was a lucky ship because the men in her helped make history and made her lucky.

We are proud of this ship, proud of her record and proud that she will again be at sea sailing under the flag of a strong ally and friend, under the service flag of the Federal German Navy.

It is appropriate and proper that this beautiful ship be given new life under men who love and understand the sea, who respect a fine ship, who will add new honors to her proud history.

Flying the colors of Germany, she will be taken to sea by a crew whose heritage as seafarers is known, and respected throughout the world.

In the past the Germany Navy was respected for its seamen and for its daring, respected by friend and foe alike. This respect was not given, it was earned; earned by hard work, by hard fighting, by smart shiphandling, by sticking to the guns, by bravery, by being sailormen. This respect the Germany Navy had, this respect the German destroyer forces had, and had in abundance.

Navy men everywhere remember this—they remember, too, that even as World War II ended the Germany Navy was still an intact military organization, still ready to carry out orders.

You who are members of that Navy can be proud of this tradition, proud to be challenged to live up to such a reputation. You can be proud too that you are part of a force which stands ready to defend man's freedom, to defend Germany's freedom.

This ship is an important addition to your Navy, to your destroyer force. It represents a powerful package of versatile combat power. There is no ship more versatile than the destroyer. It can be used against submarines, against ships, against aircraft, and against land targets.

That is why destroyers are so wonderful, why they have such a proud past, and such an assured, brilliant future. They will be needed at sea for a long, long time. The *Z–6* is a destroyer, and a fine one, but the measure in which she fulfills her promise is squarely up to you.

As the men who sail her, who fight her, you hold the key to her success. Your ship will be everything you make of her. She is in good hands. May she serve you, as she served us, with courage, strength, and with honor always.

This print which has long been in my home as a reminder of this fine ship, and this book recalling the proud past of the *Charles Ausburne*, are presented to remind all who sail in her that she is a proud ship, a reliable ship, a fighting ship. She is now your ship—you are her crew. Together you are a powerful arm for freedom.

Today our nations stand side-by-side ready to defend the rights of human liberty, freedom, and justice. We are proud of this common purpose, and proud of the understanding that exists between our navies, and between our great countries.

To the captain, to the officers, and crew of the *Z–6*, I wish you all good sailing and Godspeed.

ANSPRACHE DES ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, ANLAESSLICH DER UEBERGABE DER USS "CHARLES AUSBURNE" AN DIE BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND, IN DER U.S. NAVAL STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C., DIENSTAG, DEN 12. APRIL 1960

Die Marinen unserer beiden grossen Nationen sind heute zur Uebergabe des 6. amerikanischen Zerstoerers, der frueheren USS *Charles Ausburne*, des Zerstoerers "Z 6", an die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, versammelt.

Dieses schoene Schiff nimmt in meinem Herzen einen besonderen Platz ein: Es war mein Flaggschiff im Zerstoerer-Geschwader 23 waehrend der Unternehmungen im Sued-Pazifik in den Jahren 1943 und 1944.

Wenn ich das Schiff heute sehe und wieder einmal seine Decks betrete, kommen mir Erinnerungen an Unternehmungen und Ereignisse, die zwar etwas verwischt, aber niemals vergessen sind. Es ist, als wenn man einen alten Freund nach langer Zeit der Trennung wieder sieht.

Waehrend dieser Trennungsjahre traten Veraenderungen ein. Bessere, wirksamere Waffen und Einrichtungen wurden in den festen Rumpf eingebaut. Aber es ist immer noch das schoene Kampfschiff geblieben, das die "little beaver squadron" in den haertesten Einsaetzen gefuehrt hat.

Ich moechte Ihnen, von Seemann zu Seemann, sagen, dass Sie ein gutes Schiff bekommen—ein kampfkraeftiges Schiff—ein erprobtes Schiff. Es war ein gutes Schiff, weil seine Besatzung gut war. Sie gab ihm den Pulsschlag, sie gab ihr das Herz, den Atem und das Leben. Besatzung und Schiff kaempften tapfer. Es war ein glueckhaftes Schiff, weil die Besatzung auf ihm Geschichte machte und ihm Glueck brachte. Wir sind stolz auf dieses Schiff, stolz auf seine (Geschichte) Vergangenheit und stolz darauf, dass es wieder in See gehen wird, unter der Flagge eines starken Alliierten und Freundes, under der Dienstflagge der deutschen Bundesmarine.

Es ist gut und richtig, dass dieses schoene Schiff neues Leben erhaelt durch Maenner, die die See lieben und verstehen, die ein schoenes Schiff achten und seiner stolzen Vergangenheit neue Ehren hinzufuegen wollen.

Unter der Flagge Deutschlands wird es von einer Besatzung gefahren, deren seefahrerisches Erbe bekannt ist und in aller Welt geachtet wird.

In der Vergangenheit war die deutsche Marine, ihrer Seeleute und ihres Wagemutes wegen, gleichviel von Freund und Feind geachtet. Diese Achtung wurde nicht geschenkt, sondern verdient, verdient in harter Arbeit, in harten Kaempfen, durch gute Seemannschaft, durch Aushalten an den Geschuetzen, durch Tapferkeit, durch "Seemann sein." Diese Achtung hatte die deutsche Marine, diese Achtung hatten die deutschen Zerstoerer-Streitkraefte, und sie hatten sie vollauf.

Seeleute ueberall wissen das, sie erinnern sich ebenfalls daran, dass auch, als der zweite Weltkrieg zu Ende ging, die Kriegsmarine eine intakte militaerische Organisation war, die immer noch im Stande war, Befehle auszufuehren. Sie, die Angehoerige dieser Marine sind, koennen stolz auf diese Tradition sein, stolz darauf, dass Sie auserwaehlt sind, solch einen Ruhm zu bewahren. Sie koennen dazu stolz darauf sein, dass Sie ein Teil der Streitmacht sind, die bereit ist, die Freiheit des Einzelnen, die Freiheit Deutschlands zu verteidigen.

Dieses Schiff ist eine wichtige Ergaenzung zu der Bundesmarine, zu der Zerstoerer-Streitkraft. Es stellt eine kraftvolle Zusammenballung von vielseitiger Einsatzmoeglichkeit dar. Kein Schiff is so vielseitig als ein Zerstoerer es ist, er kann gegen U–Boote, gegen Schiffe, gegen Flugzeuge und gegen Landziele eingesetzt werden.

Darum sind Zerstoerer so wundervoll, weil sie eine so stolze Vergangenheit haben und solch eine gewisse, glaenzende Zukunft. Sie werden auf See noch lange eingesetzt werden. Der "Z 6" ist ein Zerstoerer, ein guter Zerstoerer, jedoch das Mass, wie er seine in ihn gesetzten Erwartungen erfuellen wird, haengt ganz allein von Ihnen ab.

Sie haben als Maenner, die ihn fahren werden, ihn einsetzen werden, ganz allein den Schluessel zum Erfolg in Ihrer Hand, Ihr Schiff wird das sein, was Sie aus ihm machen. Es ist in guten Haenden. Moege es Ihnen dienen, wie es uns gedient hat, mit Mut, Kraft, und immer in Ehren.

Dieses Schriftstueck, das lange in meinem Heim als Erinnerungsstueck an das schoene Schiff gelegen hat und dieses Buch, das die stolze Vergangenheit der *Charles Ausburne* wiedergibt, werden uebergeben, um alle, die auf diesem Schiff fahren, daran zu erinnern, dass es ein stolzes, ein zuverlaessiges, ein Kriegsschiff ist. Es ist nun Ihr Schiff, Sie sind die Besatzung. Zusammen bilden sie eine starke Waffe fuer die Freiheit.

Heute stehen unsere Nationen Seite an Seite, einsatzbereit, die Rechte der persoenlichen Freiheit, die Freiheit und das Recht zu verteidigen. Wir sind stolz auf die gemeinsame Aufgabe und stolz auf das Verstehen zwischen unseren beiden Marinen und zwischen unseren grossen Laendern.

Dem Kommandanten, den Offizieren und der Mannschaft des "Z 6", wuensche ich allzeit gute Fahrt und Gottes Beistand.

Resolution by Junior Chamber of Commerce of Bloomsburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Bloomsburg, Pa., on March 10, 1960. I am making this insertion at the request of the junior chamber officers who do not at the present time have congressional representation, Bloomsburg being located outside of my congressional district:

Whereas the greatness of the United States of America is a direct result of the free enterprise system and the basic American idea of freedom opportunity; and

Whereas the Jaycee creed contains the statement "that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise"; and

Whereas an integral part of the free enterprise system is the incentive provided by the opportunity afforded to every individual to make of himself what he will, and to prosper in proportion to his success in taking advantage of the economic opportunities which are available to everyone in our American way of life; and

Whereas the present income, gift and estate tax laws of the Federal Government tend to stifle economic progress under the free enterprise system, to discourage individuals from putting forth maximum effort, investors from continuing to provide capital necessary to the development and growth of private business and thereby stunt the economic growth of our country; and

Whereas legislation is now pending before the Congress of the United States which would alleviate this serious situation by accomplishing a planned gradual reform of the present tax rates and structure relating to income, gifts and inheritance and at the same time preserving the necessary tax revenue to maintain the Federal Government: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Bloomsburg Junior Chamber of Commerce at Bloomsburg, Pa., this 10th day of March 1960, That the said assembly go on record in favor of the endorsement of H.R. 3000 and 3001, commonly known as the Herlong-Baker bills, and that the said assembly urges the balancing of the Federal budget and the adoption of all possible practices which will tend to make the operation of government on every level more efficient and economical.

LEONARD R. SCHAFE,
President.
W. E. WEIHBRECHT,
Secretary.

Testimonial Banquet in Honor of National Junior Vice Commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks at the testimonial banquet in honor of National Junior Vice Commander George M. Leary by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held in the Hotel Bradford at Boston, Mass., on Monday evening, April 18, 1960. The program was as follows: Clifford H. Harris, chairman of the committee on arrangements, of Quincy, Mass., who acted in the capacity of toastmaster, and who introduced the following:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. Callahan, who gave the invocation; Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy, of Malden; State Senator Charles W. Hedges, of Quincy, Mrs. Olive Morton, national president of the National Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Indianapolis, Ind.; Massachusetts Department President of the Ladies Auxiliary Mrs. Edith Healey, of Charlestown; Massachusetts Department Commander Frank Farnham, of Springfield; Mrs. Catherine B. Byron, of Lawrence, regional president; Mrs. George M. Leary, wife of the honored guest; and George M. Leary, national junior vice commander, of Quincy.

Presentations were made to Mr. Leary and National Commander Charles A. McCarthy and several others wired messages of congratulations.

The remarks follow:

Ours is the only veterans' organization that is suffering from those pleasant symptoms that are diagnosed as growing pains.

Since the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. was born, I have noticed a bright look in the eyes, and more bounce in the steps of my comrades.

At last we have an outfit of our own to belong to, with a special program that is not to be confused with others.

When the younger generation returned from World War II, and joined the existing veterans' organizations, we found that we had lost our identity. They outnumbered us. They had a different experience and perspective, and we became the forgotten veterans—but not for long.

It was clear that we needed an organization to distinguish the veterans who had served in World War I from those who had served in other conflicts. A place where we could meet with those who talked our language; work with them toward a mutual objective; and rediscover the pride of comradeship that was ours over 40 years ago.

We established and developed the Veterans of World War I for that purpose.

The response to the new organization's call for volunteers was prompt and enthusiastic.

As if tens of thousands had been waiting over the years for leadership that would have the skill and the energy to create an organization exclusively reserved for the veterans of World War I.

An organization that would not only provide a measure of fulfillment for us, but would ever remind the Nation of the meaning of World War I, and of the service given by 4 million men in defense of American ideals.

Tonight we have assembled from barracks all over the State, to honor one of the charter members in the establishment of our national organization.

Genial George Leary was born with the talent for bringing people together.

His capacity for making friends is limitless.

It took a lot of confidence and hard work and traveling on his own time and at his own expense to help organize barracks in the various cities and towns. But George was more than equal to the task, for he put his whole heart into the movement.

No part-time buddy was he.

He was the go-through guy for the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. from the very beginning.

Sooner or later in this world, ability and devotion must bring recognition even to those who do not seek it.

So it was with our good friend and guest who was promoted to the position of national prominence among the older veterans of our Nation.

We who have had firsthand experience with his tireless efforts in behalf of our group, know that the spreading knowledge of his merits will raise him eventually to the position of national commander.

On the eve of Patriot's Day, we express our appreciation to a Massachusetts man whose leadership is one of the reasons for the growth and prestige of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

To say that we are proud of him is not enough.

The fact is we are very happy that this well-earned honor has been conferred upon the man who never spares himself in building up the Veterans of World War I—our popular comrade—National Junior Vice Commander George M. Leary.

The Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of the complex and important question of ending the testing of nuclear weapons I include a thoughtful editorial from the Oneonta Daily Star:

[From the Oneonta Daily Star, Apr. 9, 1960]

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE A RISK IF NUCLEAR BAN WILL RESULT

The Geneva talks on a possible United States-British-Soviet nuclear weapons test ban have been in progress for 15 frustrating months. At times the Russian fog of "nyets" and unworkable proposals has obscured all hope that a treaty might eventually be signed. Behind the fog, nevertheless, advances have been made. There is a rising body of evidence which suggests that the Soviet Union really does want a test ban and is willing to make concessions to get it.

Certain notable concessions already have been made by Soviet negotiators. They have agreed—and considering that secrecy is a way of life for the Kremlin this is a very great concession—to permit establishment of detection and control posts across their territory. They have backed down on their earlier insistence that the experts mainning these posts on their territory must all be Russians. They have further agreed to an annual quota (though the number has not yet been decided) of veto-free inspections on Soviet territory by international teams. Western views have prevailed in some pertinent matters, also.

Tough negotiations lie ahead. The Russians are not going to soften up all at once. But it appears that the one big roadblock to a test ban treaty is the U.S. position with regard to small underground tests which present monitoring methods cannot surely detect. This country fears that, until such detection is possible, the Soviet might go ahead with underground tests even if it agreed to a ban.

That is a risk. But it is a small risk, ameliorated by Kremlin agreement that scientists of the three nations would work together to devise better detection methods. We think it is a risk the United States ought to take in hopes of securing a ban agreement which might well be a great turning point in the struggle against war.

Pennsylvania Mother of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Monday, April 18, 1960, reporting the selection of Mrs. Edna Phillips Rosenbaum, of Philadelphia, as Pennsylvania Mother of the Year for 1960:

PENNSYLVANIA MOTHER OF 1960—LAWYER'S WIFE SELECTED TODAY

HARRISBURG, April 18.—Mrs. Edna Phillips Rosenbaum, of Philadelphia, an internationally known musician who has provided free concerts for thousands of schoolchildren, today was named Pennsylvania Mother of the Year for 1960.

Governor Lawrence personally congratulated Mrs. Rosenbaum, a former harp soloist of the Philadelphia orchestra and an authority on the harp. Her selection was announced at a Pennsylvania Mothers Committee luncheon of which Mrs. Gustav Ketterer was chairman.

Mrs. Rosenbaum is chairman and originator of the Music Committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of Young Audiences, Inc. The nonprofit organization provides free concerts and musical education for schoolchildren.

HUSBAND IS LAWYER

She lives in the Germantown section of Philadelphia with her husband, Attorney Samuel R. Rosenbaum.

They have four children: Mrs. John Todd, assistant to the dean of foreign students at the University of Pennsylvania; David, a senior at Haverford College; Mrs. Georges Bernier, copublisher with her husband of an art magazine in Paris, France; and Mrs. Heather Jimenez, a writer, of London, England.

LANGUAGE OF MUSIC

Mrs. Rosenbaum, a native of Reading, believes that music is a language that children understand instinctively and that lifts them above meanness and vulgarity.

She was the first woman member of the Philadelphia orchestra and the first woman to hold a first chair in a major symphony orchestra.

In 1955 she was honored by the city of Philadelphia, when she received the mayor's award for artistic preeminence as a citizen.

HARPIST AT 17

Mrs. Rosenbaum became a harpist at the age of 17 after having studied and mastered the violin and piano. She studied the harp under the noted Carlos Salzedo and later at the Curtis Institute of Music, Philadelphia.

After 5 years of study, she was engaged by the Philadelphia orchestra, then conducted by Leopold Stokowski. She thus became the first woman member of this world famous group and the first woman to hold a first chair in a major symphony orchestra.

During her career as harp soloist with the Philadelphia orchestra (1930–46), Mrs. Rosenbaum performed under the batons of some of the world's greatest conductors. In addition to Stokowski, these included the late Arturo Toscanini, Sir Thomas Beecham, Fritz Reiner, and the current conductor, Eugene Ormandy.

TOURED WITH ORCHESTRA

She also toured South America with Stokowski's Youth Orchestra, appeared in countless symphonic, operatic, ballet, and chamber music engagements, as well as public and private recitals, radio, television, and film appearances.

The library of harp music has been enriched by the many compositions created for and dedicated to Mrs. Rosenbaum. She gave the premiere performances of many of these works throughout the country.

Completely devoted to her work with children, Mrs. Rosenbaum believes that "music is a language that children understand instinctively and that lifts them above meaness and vulgarity."

"In these times when so many juveniles must resist the temptations of delinquency," says Mr. Rosenbaum, "we feel that our efforts contribute to giving them an interest that keeps them out of trouble."

"This philosophy," continued Mrs. Rosenbaum, "is expressed in the motto: 'kids who carry fiddle cases don't become court cases'."

GETS AWARD

In 1955, Mrs. Rosenbaum was honored by the city of Philadelphia when she received the Mayor's Award for artistic preminence as a citizen.

Head of the harp department of the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music since 1932, Mrs. Rosenbaum is a member of the board of directors of the Settlement Music School, an inter-racial, nonsectarian organization which provides musical instruction for young and old.

She also is a member of the Germantown-Chestnut Hill Committee for the Philadelphia Orchestra, the advisory committee of

the Friends of Music of Bryn Mawr College, and the music advisory committee of Young Audiences, Inc., nationwide.

She also is a member of the Art Alliance, the Cosmopolitan Club of Philadelphia, and an honorary member of Sigma Alpha Iota.

The Rosenbaums are members of The Church of the Good Shepherd, Germantown.

Eighty-sixth Congress Must Meet Challenge of Hospital-Medical Insurance for America's Numerous Aging Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the great challenges that the Members of the 86th Congress must meet is that of adequate prepaid hospital and medical insurance for the growing number of elderly persons in this country who now cannot obtain coverage against that day when they might be stricken because of illness or accident.

This is an issue which has generated volumes of mail from the people back home, pleading with their Congressmen and Senators to do something to help resolve the prospects of burdensome hospital and medical costs on America's aging citizens.

Many of these citizens unfortunately become indigents at a time in their lives when their earning capacity is nil, and they are trying to eke out an existence in dignity principally on the benefits of private or social security pension plans. They do not ask anyone to pay their way in retirement. But hundreds of them in my congressional district have told me that they do worry about that day when they might require hospitalization because of an injury or serious operation, the cost of which would wipe out their savings of a lifetime, or place them deeply in debt.

This Congress is going to have to face up to the realities of this problem. I am asking permission to have printed with my remarks two excellent editorials dealing frankly with the issue of medical assistance for the aged. They are taken from the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram on April 8 and the Boston Globe on April 15:

[From the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Apr. 8, 1960]

TOO LATE FOR COMPROMISE

Behind all the rough language used by Senator DIRKSEN and IUEW head Carey at a Senate hearing on health insurance for the aged lies the fact that the administration has come too late with a compromise on this issue. It may thus become a campaign issue to plague the 1960 GOP standard bearer.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming reported at the same hearing that the administration is trying to hurry up a plan of voluntary health insurance for the aged using Federal-State subsidies. It is doubtful that it can be ready for congressional action this session.

Perhaps such a plan would be the best way to approach the growing problems of the health needs of the aged. Our current population situation suggests, however, that it is time for the Federal and State Governments to work out together an overall program covering all the basic needs of the aged, in health, housing, and financial assistance.

Whether reluctance to do this is due to indifference, pressure from such private interest groups as the huge insurance industry, or medical associations, or those who oppose further government action in social welfare, we don't know. But obviously the program which Mr. Flemming now describes should have come before, not after, the proposal of the Forand bill.

The question of direct Federal health insurance for the aged is one that deserves thorough discussion in a nonelection year. It is socialized medicine, but that is not necessarily a reason to condemn it. The question is whether our present medical services are capable of meeting the needs of the aged and whether they are, in fact, doing so.

We hope it may not be too late for sound exploration of a middle course such as the administration concedes. The issue is now a hot one, being argued in emotional terms and with little thought to cost, operation, or need. Senator DIRKSEN will need all his famous political skill to fight this one off, and Vice President NIXON is already heavily embarrassed by the whole situation.

[From the Boston Daily Globe, Apr. 15, 1960]

THE NEGLECT OF THE ELDERLY

The neglect of the sick aged of the country is close to a national scandal and various Members of Congress are moving to remedy the situation. The increased solicitude on the part of some is prompted by the impending national election. In the United States, there are 16 million persons 65 years of age or older which represents a considerable voting bloc. The health care issue has been so publicized that the great majority of our elderly citizens are determined to make their votes felt in the presidential election to show their approval or disapproval.

Recognition of this lifted the Forand bill overnight from semiobscurity to national discussion. The issue has brought all but open conflict between GOP presidential hopeful RICHARD M. NIXON and President Eisenhower. A counter plan for medical care for the aged was prepared by Secretary of Health Arthur S. Flemming with the enthusiastic support of NIXON, according to Washington reports, but was vetoed in the White House.

But the facts cannot be "burked." The report of the McNamara committee after 8 months of hearings painted a highly disturbing picture of the plight of the country's aged. Of the 16 million elderly about half are not covered by any kind of health insurance. Almost 50 percent have incomes of less than $1,000 a year; and another 20 percent have less than $2,000. They are poorly housed.

The committee found that the "large majority of nursing homes," for example, "provide no more than bare custodial care, generally directed by untrained personnel, thereby consigning hundreds of thousands of patients to pitiable vegetation." Housing for the Boston aged was neglected until the tragic shortage was pointed out by Frank P. Harris in his continuing articles in the Boston Globe on the problems of the Bay State elderly. As a result the legislature is speeding action.

The McNamara report made it clear what the Forand bill would mean to our worried senior citizens. The flood of mail to Congress showed their own determination not to be shunted aside. The Forand bill did not win committee approval after the American Medical Association and others protested that it was in effect "socialized medicine." The need for a substitute measure remained obvious.

The White House is having another bill prepared to provide a voluntary participation health insurance plan. The Democrats, their Forand bill turned back, are forging a new measure. This would increase compulsory social security payments to finance health insurance in old age. The Eisenhower administration is flatly opposed to compulsory plans.

More than likely Congress will pass some sort of bill this summer to provide some medical care for the aged. Both parties realize the scope of the problem, the needs of the old people, and also the power of their protest if they are left unsatisfied before November.

But the legislation should not become a patchwork affair, to save political face at the last minute, nor an attempt to placate the elderly without really providing a system that will adapt to the projected increase of aged persons in the country. Nor should the McNamara committee's suggestion for the establishment of a U.S. Office for the Aging be forgotten. Health insurance is only a beginning in the problem of bringing them necessary employment and dignified retirement.—Uncle Dudley.

Lanny E. Unruh, Prizewinner in American Legion Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues no doubt are aware, Kansas this year produced the young man who was first-place winner in the national finals of the 1960 American Legion high school oratorical contest. The high honor went to 17-year-old Lanny D. Unruh of Newton, Kans. His talk, "The Constitution—Ours To Defend," includes, among many other worthwhile observations, a challenge to citizens who fail to exercise their privilege to vote. I ask unanimous consent to have the oration printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION—OURS TO DEFEND

(By Lanny D. Unruh)

The place is Valley Forge; the time is the winter of 1777.

"What is this thing we are fighting for—this thing called liberty?" A battle-weary soldier addressed this question to George Washington one stormy night during the Revolutionary War.

The Father of our Country gazed at the soldier with steady eyes, crowned by unflickering eyelashes which frequently caught a speck of falling snow. The General answered, "It may be only a dream. It may be that it will never come to pass, but I believe that men can rule themselvs."

The dream to which Mr. Washington referred was the impelling force that had driven the colonists across the stormy Atlantic to an untamed wilderness that held the promise of freedom. It was the spark that kept alive hope in the breasts of the freezing, starving patriots at Valley Forge.

The dream was the silent specter that entered a red brick building known as In-

dependence Hall in Philadelphia, a May morning in 1787—a silent specter that hovered like a guardian angel over a hall half a hundred feet square, guiding the hands of a group of 55 distinguished statesmen as they carved out the destiny of a new nation.

What the framing fathers did that hot summer was known as the great American experiment. Could a new Nation, so small and so immature as this one, thrive in opposition to the towering monarchies with their trained diplomats, their power, and their wealth? The answer to this question came with the inauguration of Washington as President. He, with the help of two pioneer statesmen, Jefferson and Hamilton, safely piloted the Ship of State through the test of infancy.

Then came territorial expansion. New States were added to the Union, and the Constitution marched on.

But soon came the fear of defeat, as the storm clouds of civil strife enveloped the United States, and the Constitution was faced with the test of unity. Out of this mighty conflict came the immortal words of Daniel Webster, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

After the crucial test of disunion came the industrial revolution and the swift growth of power. Science and invention erased geographical boundaries, and international trade carried the Stars and Stripes to the uttermost parts of the world. Soon America was not only the land of the free and the home of the brave, but it afforded her people the highest standard of living in the world.

Yes, the words of Elizabeth Ellen Evans are true. We do have more roast beef and mashed potatoes, more automobiles and telephones, more public schools and life insurance policies, more laughter and song than any other people on earth. Even two world conflicts did not topple us from our supremacy.

As we assumed this new post of world leadership and dominance, we felt ourselves unchallenged. As a people, we considered ourselves the untouchables. Yet, during this phenomenal period of prosperity and growth, the deadly seeds of complacency and smugness found nourishment and began to take root.

Now, today, we are being challenged. Representing the last great fortress built on the principles of democracy, our Constitution is being threatened on every basic American issue—even self-government. At a time when democracy after democracy is being overthrown, our Constitution is far from secure.

As a nation, we are still united by words that were penned on parchment more than 170 years ago, "We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union * * *"—united by the belief of George Washington, that men can rule themselves—united because of the undying efforts of 55 statesmen, as they poured into the mold of the Constitution every ounce of their hopes, dreams, and ideals.

But, as a people, we are divided. Just as there was dissension among the colonies, there is lack of cooperation among people today. We have become a Nation of color against color, labor against management, rich against poor, religion against religion. We are undermining the democratic processes set forth in the Constitution. We are destroying that great charter of liberty through our greed, our neglect, our selfishness. Through our own actions, we are committing national suicide.

Friends, the vital question that must be answered by every American citizen is, "How can we save, how can we defend the United States?"

When we speak of defense, we are prone to think immediately of the weapons and guided missiles created by American ingenuity. For, at the touch of a button, we are able to annihilate any city on the battle-scarred face of the earth. At the shout of a command, we are able to employ weapons that are more destructive than anything ever imagined by our forefathers. Yes, we are making rapid strides in surpassing the military efforts of any would-be aggressive nation. But are we making the same strides in strengthening the real fortress of America—the Constitution?

It is with regret that we realize that our military defense is being offset by an indifferent electorate. The pioneers of our Government made Washington's belief of self-government a reality, when they placed into the hands of the people the sacred privilege and responsibility of electing the Nation's high officials. The suffrage was the insurance policy of the American people. Here was America's answer to tyranny, to monarchy, to oppression. Now this weapon, too, lies dormant at our feet. A wave of complacency, like a fog, enshrouds us. Surely, our forefathers never dreamed that by the year 1960, only one-half of all eligible Americans would bother to exercise that privilege. They would probably have stared in disbelief, if told that one-half would decide the destiny of the Nation.

I ask you, "Of what value are a thousand atomic bombs if we, as a people, do not attempt to defend our basic rights and privileges first?"

Make no mistake. No one would suggest that we be oblivious to the threat of missiles. Military strength there must be. Good judgment tells us we must defend ourselves with armed might. But good judgment also tells us that we must defend ourselves with a force far greater than armed might.

It is my generation that must defend the United States. It is in me, and thousands just like me, that is vested the immense responsibility of upholding, preserving, and defending our Constitution.

The only defense we hear about lies in the glories of war, in missiles, huge navies, and large armaments. But we must also be told of the other form of defense—the defense of the principles of the Constitution—the defense of the basic and inalienable rights of every American. These principles can be found in the Bill of Rights, which guarantees every American citizen—whether he be black or white; whether he be Protestant, Jew, or Catholic; whether he be of English descent, or of Russian descent—the same sacred freedoms.

If we lose sight of that vision that was made articulate by the father of our country at Valley Forge, we are a doomed Nation. How true, the words of James Curran, "The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance."

My generation has no misgivings. We know that if America is to survive, the task is ours to defend her. For some of us, we may be called out to fight a tangible enemy, with jets and missiles. But for all of us, there are more sinister enemies we must combat—apathy, divided loyalties, and half-hearted allegiance to our Government.

As for me, as for my generation—we accept our inheritance with gratitude. We dedicate ourselves to the perpetuation of that American heritage. We may not be tramping the snows at Valley Forge, but we are facing an enemy that is just as insidious and just as destructive as King George's men.

Let us lift the stifling cloak of apathy and indifference. Let us cast away prejudice. Let us carry out our duties as loyal citizens, and, in doing so, may we be willing to sacrifice as much; may we be willing to portray the same courage as that tattered and weary army at Valley Forge.

Would that it were possible that I could speak for my generation, and say to that weary soldier at Valley Forge, "This vague ideal that you fought for—this dream your general told you about, is still the guiding light of our lives. Men can rule themselves.

The Constitution—ours to defend.

Statements in Support of Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread criticism of this program during this annual debate, both in the Congress and in the public press, I believe that the American people have a right to hear both sides of the argument. And further because of my firm conviction that our foreign aid programs have been and continue to be successful in stopping the spread of communism throughout the world, I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Committing the Uncommitted" by Richard Lowenthal, which recently appeared in the London Observer, a letter from the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and attached statement, which I received, and my own supplementary statement appearing in Union Calendar No. 594, as a part of the report of the special study mission to Asia, western Pacific, Middle East, southern Europe, and north Africa, to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD to supplement the speech which I gave on the floor today:

COMMITTING THE UNCOMMITTED

(By Richard Lowenthal)

Watching President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on their presummit travels, a newspaper reader might be forgiven for believing that, under this form of "competitive coexistince," the East-West struggle has been reduced to a combination of popularity contest and giveaway competition. The visitors speak their sermons and hand over their presents; the journalists count the crowds and the applause; the uncommitted countries pocket the cash—and stay as uncommitted as before.

It is an idyllic picture, but a misleading one. In fact, both sermons and presents have their place in a continuing struggle for power. The immediately obvious part of these worldwide hustings is concerned with winning the backing of "world opinion," and of votes in the United Nations Assembly, for some of the issues to be discussed at the summit, particularly in the field of disarmament. The more long-term, but probably more vital, part concerns the effect of different types of economic aid on the pattern of development of the receiving country.

Take the summit issue first. Any scheme for disarmament will be judged by its effect on the world balance of power. Khrushchev's plan for the eventual abolition of armed forces aims, above all, at creating obstacles to any increase of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's conventional forces, which are still inferior to Soviet forces in Europe and hence in a poor position to withstand political blackmail.

During his journey through Asia, Khrushchev everywhere enlisted sympathy for his

plan, never failing to point out that, apart from its service to peace, it would free billions of dollars for help to underdeveloped countries. He thus hopes to make it difficult for his summit opponents to reject his plan without isolating themselves in the United Nations. He himself cheerfully ignored the U.N. Assembly's recommendation of the Western disarmament plan in 1957, and even refused further negotiation in the framework favored by the U.N. at that time, but he knows that at least American and British domestic opinion is highly sensitive to world opinion as expressed in the U.N.

Today, the West can no longer obtain the two-thirds majority required for an Assembly recommendation (or for the election of a nonpermament member to the Security Council) without the support of the hard core of uncommitted nations not predictably on one side on most issues. Hence, any diplomatic approach that enlists the sympathy of this hard core is likely to limit the freedom of maneuver of the Western negotiators.

Apart from this immediate issue, the Soviet Premier, while carefully respecting the military nonalinement of his Asian hosts (he went out of his way to express his approval for it in every communique), has sought to aline them politically with the Soviet bloc where possible. Failing that, he has attempted to aline the Soviet bloc with their interests wherever they happened to have national conflicts with any Western or pro-Western country—as Indonesia over its claim to Dutch New Guinea, and Afghanistan over its claim to Pushtunistan at Pakistan's expense.

But the most serious and substantial effort to "commit the uncommitted" is being currently made by the Soviets in the economic field, and on a more long-term basis. In the last few months, Soviet pledges of development aid to non-Communist countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have been more concentrated and massive than at any time since the policy was first introduced in 1954. They are now increasingly accompanied by Soviet warnings against the alleged harmful effects of Western aid. What emerges from these warnings—voiced by both Khrushchev and Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on their recent travels and in Soviet books on the problems published in the last few years—is that the Kremlin regards its own aid not merely as a means to court popularity but as likely to commit the uncommitted countries to a specific path of development.

Briefly, the Communists charge that the imperialists wish to prevent the independent industrial development of young nations, in order to keep them in their traditional role as exploited suppliers of foodstuffs and raw materials. This purpose, once assured by keeping them as colonies under political tutelage, is now allegedly pursued by limiting economic aid to such fields as agricultural improvement or at best local consumer goods industries. Only the Soviets, it is claimed, are willing to help the underdeveloped nations in building up their own heavy industry, power resources, etc.—that is, in ceasing to be economic colonies.

This Communist argument obscures the most vital problems now facing many underdeveloped countries by mixing it up with an issue of the dead past. The traditional colonial pattern of private capital investment did indeed concentrate on extractive industries and export crops as the most immediately profitable fields, and thus tended to preserve a lopsided colonial economy in a lopsided international division of labor.

This could be overcome only by some form of publicity planned investment, and that is why all the newly sovereign nations have introduced such planning and talk of a Socialist economy.

But postwar development aid has from the start been agreed upon with these newly sovereign governments and has been channeled through their planning boards, with the express purpose of overcoming the traditional lopsided character of underdeveloped economies. It is at this stage that the planners, in allocating indigenous and foreign investment, have been faced with the choice whether to aim at a balanced, all-around development, raising the low agricultural productivity and living standards of their people parallel with the building up of industry, or whether to rush ahead with a one-sided concentration of heavy industry at the price of long-term severe sacrifices by the people. The last is, of course, the Communist pattern, as practiced in Russia and China, and made possible by totalitarian dictatorship.

The planners in the underdeveloped nations are, of course, conscious of this choice; and those who care to preserve free institutions do not wish to give too high a priority to long-term investments in heavy industries. But if massive foreign capital aid is accepted for these specific prospects, it may also tie down a large share of indigenous resources—labor, raw materials, transport—to enterprises which will not bear consumable fruit for a long time. Such aid has invisible strings—committing a country to a pattern of economic development which, as the Soviets know, has its own political logic.

Moreover, as Soviet aid is always given in the form of long-term loans and often specific export crops are earmarked in advance for repayment, the commitment to the steep Soviet road of development may be reinforced in such cases by a long-term dependence on the Soviet market. This is remarkably similar to the old type of colonial dependency, or to the type which Nazi Germany established before World War II by its barter contracts in the Balkans.

All these dangers are involved in the present rush to bring aid to the underdeveloped nations. It is in the interest of both the receiving countries and of the West that the total amount of aid from all sources should be as large as possible; and the fact that the Soviets are now contributing substantially along with the traditional exporters of capital is in itself a cause for satisfaction rather than concern. But it is also in the interest of both the receiving and the Western nations that such aid should not be given on terms which tend to "commit the uncommitted"—to distort their road of development into the Soviet pattern, making it needlessly hard and painful, or to create a one-sided long-term dependency on Soviet markets.

That Khrushchev is setting out to achieve just that is suggested by his angry rejections of the idea of pooling a major part of all foreign aid in the hands of some impartial United Nations agency. Perhaps the Western Powers, just setting out to coordinate their own aid programs, should have another look at that idea.

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1960.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C.:

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended an amendment to the statement of policy of the Mutual Security Act, to express the opposition of Congress to economic warfare such as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways. The committee has reported that the amendment is an outgrowth of navigation restrictions in the Suez Canal.

The proposed amendment is a timely and welcome reaffirmation of American policy. We hope you will support it when the MSA comes up in the House.

We believe that the intensification of the Suez Canal blockade during the last 12 months is a glaring example of the failure of the United Nations to enforce its charter and its decisions. It is a major factor in the aggravation of tensions in the Middle East.

The Danish freighter, the *Inge Toft*, was held up in Port Said for 8½ months and was finally forced to yield her cargo to the United Arab Republic on February 4. The UAR has just seized the cargo of a little Greek freighter, the *Astypalea*, which was carrying cement from Israel to Djibouti and which has been detained at Port Said since December 18. This drew public rebuke last Friday from Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, who declared that such action "goes against" the principles of the United Nations.

We continue to support economic assistance to underdeveloped countries and we urge you to vote for the MSA authorizations for this purpose, including those for special assistance, technical cooperation, and our nation's contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

We will be grateful for your sympathetic consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

I. L. KENEN.

P.S.—We enclose texts of the proposed amendment, the committee's comments and two relevant newspaper editorials.

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON H.R. 11510

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Section 2, amending section 2 of the Mutual Security Act: Statement of policy.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has followed closely developments relating to the use of the Suez Canal and believes that the United States has not done as effective a job as it should have in urging the removal of the restrictions on the free movement of commerce through the canal. With this and other situations in various parts of the world in mind, the committee proposes an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations, and that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under the act wage economic warfare against other nations receiving such assistance, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways. The amendment further states that it is the sense of the Congress that the Mutual Security Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be administered so as to give effect to these principles.

The amendment leaves to the President full responsibility for the determination of the application of the policy and of such action as is to be taken in these matters, but requires that the President report to the Congress on the implementation of this section.

TEXT OF THE AMENDMENT

(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

(1) The United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

(2) The purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all

negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY HON. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

While signing the study mission's report, and while approving it in general, I wish to add this additional statement of my own.

On February 16, 1960, President Eisenhower in his message to the House of Representatives relative to the mutual security program, had this to say:

"A year ago in my message to the Congress on the mutual security program, I described it as both essential to our security and important to our prosperity. Pointing out that our expenditures for mutual security are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces, I stated that the mutual security program is not only grounded in our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of our greatness."

Because I am fully in agreement with the statement of the President, and because of my on-the-spot observations of the operation of the mutual security program in the 20 countries which I visited as a member of the study mission; I am convinced that the mutual security program in most of these countries is succeeding in its overall objectives.

The responsibility for the administration of economic assistance under the mutual security program is vested in the International Cooperation Administration. This executive agency must accept full responsibility for the recurring charges of maladministration. In spite of repeated evidence of such maladministration over the last several years, there is no indication of administrative corrections. Because of this situation, the mutual security program is carrying an unnecessary burden of criticism which has affected its acceptance by the American people.

Without the foreign aid programs of the United States since World War II, the map of the world would be vastly different today. Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, Laos, Vietnam, Korea, and Taiwan, as well as many of the nations of Western Europe, are free today because of the aid which we have given.

While fully cognizant of the validity of the situation emphasized in this report of both the ability and the willingness of the American taxpayers to continue to carry the heavy burden of the mutual security program, and further recognize that our own economic growth is moving forward at a faltering pace as compared to the last several decades, it is still true that we, as a Nation, enjoy a standard of living far above that which has been achieved under any other form of government in any other part of the world.

Would it not, therefore, be a tragic mistake if we placed emphasis only upon a strong military shield both within and without our borders? Military assistance has and continues to require one-half of all of the expenditures under mutual security. The fast growing economic strength of Communist Russia and Communist China, with or without any directly implied threat to the free world, would denote the changing pace and direction of the cold war in the 1960's.

While agreeing with the conclusions of the study mission report that military assistance must be continued to our allies, it is my observation that both the executive department and the Congress should give careful attention and study to the future balance of military assistance and economic aid in the underdeveloped countries.

Finally, I would emphasize that from my experience in visiting the countries of Asia and the Middle East as a member of the study mission, I am convinced that because of the success of the mutual security program, the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, and the Eisenhower doctrine, we have built a great wealth of friendship and understanding on a people-to-people basis in these areas of the world. The recent visit of President Eisenhower has demonstrated that dynamic friendship.

TWUA Resolution on Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution dealing with the subject of area redevelopment which was adopted by the executive committee of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, on March 11, 1960.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION
OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution dealing with the subject of area redevelopment legislation which was adopted by the executive committee of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, on March 11 of this year.

We request that you bend every effort to see to it that the House of Representatives brings S. 722 to a vote at the earliest opportunity.

Very truly yours,
JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative.

RESOLUTION—AREA REDEVELOPMENT

While the American economy as a whole is enjoying high activity, the festering sore of chronic unemployment continues to blight hundreds of communities in all parts of the Nation.

The distress suffered by millions of people bypassed by the general rise in incomes can no longer be ignored. The specter of poverty in the midst of plenty should not be allowed to tarnish the record of American growth. We cannot permit complacency to blind us to the serious problems faced by the people in areas which are in urgent need of economic redevelopment.

Tolerance and indifference to the continuance of chronic unemployment in the depressed urban and rural communities of the United States is not the American way of life. We have helped foreign countries to redevelop their entire economies and have assisted underdeveloped sectors to initiate their growth. We have recognized that unemployment and underemployment are wasteful and feed unhealthy discontent.

There are more than 177 distressed labor markets in this country, representing some 15 percent of the Nation's work force, with 26 percent of the Nation's jobless. Among them we can count many textile communities which have lost their mills and have not yet been able to reestablish themselves. These are viable areas with vast resources of manpower and billions of dollars of investment in public and private facilities. They have suffered from the loss of an industry and the obsolescence of some of their facilities. They often lack the funds for modernizing their public facilities and the leadership and know-how with which to reconstruct their economies.

These areas are suffering from inadequate employment opportunities as a result of structural changes in their economies. Industries such as textiles have contracted their operations in many communities because of technological changes or stagnant markets. The aircraft industry is threatened by missiles. Other industries have been shut down by the depletion of natural resources and changes in consumer demand. The mechanization of farming has displaced hundreds of thousands of agricultural workers. The areas affected by these developments must be redeveloped in order to provide opportunities for gainful employment for their residents.

The Congress has been considering legislation to provide Federal assistance to distressed areas for several years. In July 1956 the Senate passed an area redevelopment bill but it was pigeonholed by the House Rules Committee until Congress adjourned. Again in 1958, an area redevelopment bill was passed by the Senate, and this time the House also adopted it. But the President vetoed it.

The Senate has again passed a bill (S. 722) which would enable distressed areas to rebuild their economies. The House Banking and Currency Committee recommended a bill last May. Again the Rules Committee has bottled the bill up, preventing it from going to the House for action.

America can no longer afford to permit millions of workers to be trapped in pockets of economic distress. Our posture as the leader of the free world in the competition with communism cannot tolerate the existence of 177 urban areas of persistently high unemployment and 690 counties of extreme rural poverty in the United States. The Federal Government must act now to erase the blight of economic stagnation which impairs the health and welfare of our distressed communities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, That we urge the Congress to force a vote on S. 722 in the House of Representatives by circumventing the House Rules Committee and to enact this bill, and that we urge the President to sign the bill.

Imprisonment of Bishop Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are shocked and saddened at the cruel imprisonment of Bishop James Edward Walsh by the Red China Government. The vicar general of the Maryknoll Fathers has said of Bishop Walsh:

If love is a crime, then he is guilty; if opposition to a brutal and tyrannical regime is a crime, he is guilty; if allegiance to his church is a crime, then he is guilty.

It is imperative that our Government exert sustained pressure to obtain the

release of Bishop Walsh and other American victims of Communist persecution. I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the following communication received from the Essex County Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, protesting this outrage:

ESSEX COUNTY BOARD,
ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
Newark, N.J., April 18, 1960.

Hon. HUGH ADDONIZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADDONIZIO: The members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Essex County wish to express their displeasure in having Bishop James E. Walsh of the Roman Catholic Church imprisoned by the Communist Reds in China and urge you to do your utmost as our Representative to see to it that this man of God who has given of himself for many, many years is given his freedom.

His Excellency Bishop Walsh is an American citizen and as such should be treated accordingly. This sentence which the Communists handed out reflects on the attitude they have toward all Americans and it's time we stood up and be counted.

Again many thanks for giving this matter your immediate attention.

Sincerely yours,

J. ROY FASTOW,
Recording Secretary, Essex County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Every American Should Have the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1960, it was my privilege to appear before the House Judiciary Committee in connection with House Joint Resolution 529.

My testimony before the committee was as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE 13TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APRIL 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. It is always a pleasure to be here, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the invitation extended to me to give you my views on this important piece of legislation.

May I say at the outset that I appreciate the statement made by the chairman with reference to the home rule discharge petition, which, incidentally, happens to be my petition No. 2 at the desk, and at the same time take issue with the statement that has been made here that the two problems are different problems.

They are the identical problem, even though it is essential that they be treated differently, because of the legislative technicalities involved. The greater weight of legal opinion seems to be that the only way we can give to the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and the right to representation in the Congress, is by constitutional amendment. On the other hand, none seem to deny but that home rule can be granted to the District of Columbia by legislative enactment through the usual procedure of a bill being passed by both Houses and the President affixing his signature to it.

When it comes to the further technicality of whether or not we can muster two-thirds in support of the constitutional amendment, let me indicate to you that the platforms of 1956, of both parties, urge representation for the residents of the District of Columbia, both by home rule and by representation in the Congress, and by the right to vote for President and Vice President.

That points up the fact that I think all will agree that at least in the free countries of the world, those that believe in democracy with the small "d" and the republican form of government, with the small "r," as we subscribe to it and advance it, will agree that government is not set up to govern people, but is set up by people so that they can govern themselves. And if we start with that premise we necessarily subscribe to the principle that brought this country into being as a free country; that taxation without representation is tyranny.

May I most kindly call the attention of this committee to the political facts of life. And if they sound partisan, please understand they are not of my making, because I have done my best and will continue to do my best to see that both home rule for the District and representation in the Congress, and the right to vote for President and Vice President, will remain on a bipartisan basis with bipartisan support.

But when we hear the argument that you may not be able to muster a two-thirds vote of the Congress in support of this very fundamental principle, I am constrained to call your attention to the fact that although it is in both national political platforms alike, Republican and Democratic platforms of 1956, and I am sure if the legislation is not enacted at this Congress they will be in both in 1960—they will be in both 1960 platforms.

The CHAIRMAN. The trouble is that a platform is nothing to step on. It is something to get in on, as I understand it.

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate the humor with which the chairman makes that statement. From my long experience with him I know that he does not subscribe to that. I hope most of the members of this committee do not. And I know that the American public is very fast getting educated and getting to the time when they are going to point their finger, and do more than point a finger, at the politician or statesman or the man who runs for public office on a promise which he forgets the day he takes his oath of office.

I think this is the year when many people will be called to account for not having fulfilled their promises. And this is one of the platform pledges that I think people are going to call Members of the Congress to account for if they do not implement it.

In that connection, as I started to say, if we take the home rule petition on the House desk——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that the Member restrict his remarks to this bill instead of the home rule bill, because we certainly have a lot of witnesses and it will only complicate the issues if we have too much testimony on home rule.

The CHAIRMAN. I am in favor of home rule, and a good many members of the committee are. I do hope that the gentleman will confine himself to the resolution before us.

Mr. MULTER. I intend to, and it will not complicate the issue to call the attention of this committee, and to all concerned, that of the 187 signatures on the petition for home rule, only 26 percent of the Republicans have signed it and 80 percent of the Democrats have signed it. Now that is the practical side of the situation.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, of course there has been a great deal of talk down through the years about Members of Congress signing petitions to discharge committees of further consideration of bills that may be before them. I have had a long legislative service at both the State and national level. At the State level, in positions of leadership as the minority leader of my party, and as speaker of the House of Representatives of my home State of Ohio, longer than any man who ever served in that position.

By reason of that experience, and by reason of certain other fundamental convictions that I have, I do not sign petitions to discharge committees of further consideration of bills, whether they be bills which I have introduced and sponsored, or whether they be bills introduced and sponsored by others. I am sure the chairman and the members of this committee know that that was my position on the civil rights bill which I sponsored along with the chairman and which left this committee on August 20, 1959, but which did not have a rule until late February or early March of 1960.

I just want the record to show that there are many people with long legislative experience who do not follow the practice of signing petitions to discharge committees of further consideration of bills.

The CHAIRMAN. However, I don't want to let the impression to go forth that signing of a discharge petition is something unorthodox. It is prescribed in the rules. It is a deliberate method by which a bill can be pried loose from the Committee on Rules. Since it is in the rules, it was the result of great deliberations on the part of the House itself. There is no stigma attached to anybody signing a discharge petition because it is in the regular performance of his duties, and he has the right and sometimes he may have the duty, if his conscience so dictates, to sign that discharge petition.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the gentleman from New York saw fit to inject this partisan politics into this issue as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. I, of course, support your resolution, Mr. Chairman, and in addition thereto I am in full accord with your statement. There is nothing unorthodox, nothing unusual, about signing a discharge petition. I just happen also to agree with my minority leader, Mr. MCCULLOCH, that as a matter of practice I don't sign it. That is not the important point. The important point is that the same argument, of course, could be made as to the signatures which were attached to the civil rights discharge petition. And yet, when the civil rights bill passed the House, it passed the House with a vote of over 90 percent of the Republicans, and you can't say the same about the Democrats.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the shoe is on the other foot.

Mr. MILLER. So I think that when this bill passes the House it will pass with a greater majority of Republican votes, percentagewise, than Democrats. So we won't talk about the discharge petition, I hope, from now on.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's forget about that and get down to business.

Mr. MILLER. Let's talk about the resolution. I agree.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think I have touched upon a spot that is quite sore and vulnerable to some of our colleagues. Again I say it is not of my making. If the only way that we are going to get members of both parties on the record to show whether or not they are supporting that which they say they support, it will probably be necessary to have a discharge petition. And there is where the noses will be counted, because before they vote on the record, under a rollcall——

Mr. MILLER. Are you talking about this resolution that we are considering now.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I am pointing up the facts of life with reference to this resolution.

Mr. MILLER. You don't think this committee is going to pass this resolution out?

Mr. MULTER. I didn't say that at all.

Mr. MILLER. What are you talking about when you talk about a discharge?

Mr. MULTER. If you will let me finish my statement you will probably grasp the point I am trying to make.

Mr. MILLER. Are you talking about home-rule again?

Mr. MULTER. I am talking about this resolution before this committee and the basic principle which is the same in both instances.

Mr. MILLER. Do you think we are holding these hearings for nothing, that we are going to have a discharge petition?

Mr. MULTER. I have been in Congress too long not to know why hearings are held and which hearings will be effective and which will not be effective.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the witness complete his statement.

Mr. MULTER. The fact of the mater is, whether we like it or not, a "voice" is not representation. And whether that voice is on the political platform or in Congress, it is not representation. A voice, as a voice, is guaranteed to the citizens of the United States, even to those in the District of Columbia, by the right given to them by the Constitution, to petition their Congress.

We know that the filing of a petition with the Congress does not redress any wrongs or correct any of the injustices or inequties that prevail, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere. So that when you consider this resolution I beg of you, don't be concerned with whether or not you are going to get the two-thirds vote if and when the bill gets to the floor, or the resolution gets to the floor.

Let's address ourselves to these fundamental principles for which we declare we stand, and put them into a resolution that will do more than just give voice to the citizens of the District; let's give them the right that they should have, which is the right to govern themselves, the right to participate in the Government of their country.

They have a right to vote for President and Vice President. They have a right to vote for representatives in both Houses of Congress. And when electing those persons to represent them in the Congress, giving them the right to introduce a bill or to argue or to debate in committee or on the floor is not giving them their basic right of representation in Government unless those representatives elected to both Houses of Congress will also have the right to vote for them, for and against bills.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it you are for the principle of the right of franchise, the full right of ballots to the people of the District of Columbia. But you don't mean to imply thereby that you would not, as a first step, shall I say, adopt the resolution which we are now considering?

Mr. MULTER. Of course, I would not take the position that we shouldn't take this step by step. I have learned the hard way that good legislation is the result of compromise. And if you fight for every last thing you are entitled to, you may get none of it. So you take it step by step.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, at that point, I wonder if our colleague from New York would not, in line with his most recent statement, join with Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RODINO, and the gentleman from New York in saying that it would be better to set up a broad platform that would be all embracing, and then have the situations meet each particular instance, rather than select the District of Columbia, omit Puerto Rico, omit Guam, omit any other of our possessions. Doesn't the gentleman think that would be a better way?

Mr. MULTER. That would be the ideal way. It would be the better way. Whether Senator KEATING, who preceded me as a witness, is right or not, I am not prepared to say as to whether or not you could get all of that at one time.

Certainly, however, in considering this bill now, which as it applies solely to the District, we ought to at least be sure that we are going to give the people of the District all of their rights, and not a little piece.

We gave them the right to nominate by electing delegates to the conventions. What good is the right to nominate if you don't also have the right to elect? We gave them that little piece. We held out some bait to them, and said, "Here, be satisfied, we will let you elect delegates," as we did in 1956 to the national conventions, "so they can nominate candidates for you." That is only giving them a little piece, but you don't follow through and say we will also give you the right to choose the President and Vice President on election day.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say in comment to the question offered by my distinguished colleague from New York, for whom I have high regard, that if we attempt to make something in the nature of a general constitutional amendment here it is going to involve us in a great deal of controversy. Our objective is to grant some modicum of relief to the people of the District of Columbia; namely, grant them some form of ballot; in this instance, the right to vote in Federal elections. If we are going to be bogged down with all manner and kinds of controversies that would arise if we have some general proposition, I am going to repeat what I said in this committee not long ago, and those who heard me will forgive the repetition: Cervantes once said that by the street of Bye-and-Bye you get to the house of Never. And if we do anything of the type that is suggested by the gentleman from New York, we will never get anything done whatsoever.

We have an opportunity now, and we should get right down to work and seize time by the forelock. The session is getting short. If any action is to be accomplished it must be accomplished now. And if there is any postponement I fear that it will be postponed indefinitely and no relief will be granted.

In that connection I am going to ask all witnesses to be as brief and cogent as possible. We have a long line of witnesses. I am going to ask the members of the committee to be brief in their questioning, and, if possible, I am going to ask the witnesses to submit their statements. The remaining session is very short. I hope to get action before we conclude this Congress.

But if this matter is going to be drawn out, if these hearings are going to be drawn out, I am afraid we are going to meet with all kinds of obstacles.

I would ask that the witnesses, in self-interest, in favor of this legislation, be brief, and that applies to every witness, whether they are Members of Congress or non-Members of Congress.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude with the recital of some facts which I think you should have in the record, and with which facts no one, I am sure, can find fault.

In the District of Columbia today we have in excess of 850,000 residents. That is more than the population of 12 States: New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, New Mexico, Alaska, and Hawaii.

That 850,000 population in the District of Columbia is more than the combined total of Alaska, Nevada, and Wyoming. Those three States have nine representatives in the Congress. By that I mean one each in the House of Representatives and two each in the U.S. Senate with the full right to not only voice their opinions and introduce bills, but to vote.

In World War II the District of Columbia sent more persons into the armed services, voluntarily as well as by virtue of the draft, than many of the States whose citizens have full right to vote and full representation in the Congress.

In 1924 the United States appropriated to the District of Columbia, to the operation of the District of Columbia, more than 40 percent of its budget, at a time when the total budget for the United States was in excess of, or just about, $3 billion. Today, with our U.S. national budget approximately $75 billion, the Congress is appropriating only 11 percent of the governmental budget for the District of Columbia. With proper representation in the Congress I think a better job would be done for our National Capital.

That National Capital, incidentally, has been the model, to some degree at least, for every major republic of the free world, with this distinction: In every one of those capitals their citizens have the full right to vote for all officials of their government, with full right of representation in their congress or their parliament.

I think that we can do no less, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TOLL. May I make an inquiry of that figure of 850,000?

Doesn't that include one-third of the people who vote in their hometowns?

Mr. MULTER. I think that is correct.

Mr. TOLL. You want to eliminate them from this picture, do you not, so that you won't lose the constituents who help you get into Congress?

Mr. MULTER. Those people who are voting back home, if given the right to vote, I think they cherish that privilege and that right and will not give it up simply because they live in the District, where they are earning their livelihood and actually living day in and day out; they would vote here rather than at home.

Mr. TOLL. And they would lose their sponsorship.

Mr. MULTER. Isn't that what we mean by self-government?

Mr. HOLTZMAN. If they lost their sponsorship from the respective States, certainly they would have new sponsorship from the District of Columbia; isn't that so?

Mr. MULTER. We do hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. The 850,000 are residents of the District of Columbia they can vote outside the District of Columbia, either in Virginia or Maryland?

Mr. MULTER. I think the census figure includes those who reside within the District but maintain their original residences in their original domicile for voting purposes.

Mr. Chairman, if I have hurt anybody's feelings, I am sorry.

That is my statement, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. MILLER. I have one question.

You talked about this resolution and home rule. Of course, you understand that home rule is not before this committee, don't you?

Mr. MULTER. No, it is not.

Mr. MILLER. That is before the District Committee.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. You have a discharge petition on that issue?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. A discharge petition would be unnecessary if the committee reported the bill out, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. If this committee reports this resolution?

Mr. MILLER. If the District Committee reported the bill out on home rule you wouldn't need discharge.

Mr. MULTER. No, we would not need a discharge petition.

Mr. MILLER. All you need is a majority vote on the District Committee to report it out?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. What is the complexion of the District Committee, Democrats and Republicans?

Mr. MULTER. If you eliminate the southern Democrats——

Mr. MILLER. No, no; Democrat and Republican?

Mr. MULTER. Don't try to put words in my mouth.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought we would have a cessation of politics.

Mr. MULTER. May I answer the question? I think the question carries a connotation which requires an answer, otherwise we will get a record that is not fair.

The complexion of the District Committee is such that the southern Democrats, who traditionally have made pledges during the course of their campaigns, against home rule for the District, will not vote for it, and will not sign a discharge petition; but if the northern Democrats and northern Republicans on that committee join together, we can vote it out. And if they sign the petition we can get it before the House. That is the situation there.

And on the other hand you will have the same situation in the Rules Committee with reference to this very resolution as you had with reference to civil rights. You will probably have to pry this loose from the Rules Committee by getting almost enough signatures on a discharge petition before you will get it out of rules.

Israel: Laboratory in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an excellent and constructive article written by Rev. Father Vincent S. Kearney, S.J., entitled "Israel: Laboratory in Asia." The problems of the Middle East are vital ones and they deeply affect the foreign policy of the countries of the free world. Father Kearney's article is one which is devoid of partisanship. His thoughts are constructive and enlightening:

ISRAEL: LABORATORY IN ASIA

(By Vincent S. Kearney)

All eyes were upon them as the contingent of a dozen or so young Africans strode into the dining room of Haifa's Hotel Dvir. In late February the tourist season in Israel begins to gather momentum. It was quite obvious that the presence of the Africans was, for curious Western visitors, an unexpected aspect of life in Israel.

For Israelis, however, the sight of black-, brown-, and yellow-skinned individuals has become a familiar one. In late 1958 representatives from 17 Afro-Asian countries assembled in Israel to participate in a seminar conducted by Histadrut, Israel's unique labor organization. Delegates from Burma, Ceylon, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, the Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, northern and southern Rhodesia, Senegal, French Sudan, Chad, and Thailand met to exchange ideas on cooperative economic development. For Israel the venture was a chance to break out of the isolation forced upon the new nation by 10 years of hostile Arab encirclement. For the Afro-Asians the meetings provided an opportunity to learn how Israel had met and overcome economic problems similar to their own and finally, after 10 years of struggle, had set itself well on the way toward economic self-sufficiency.

For Israel the seminar fulfilled the country's fondest hopes and expectations. Israeli trade is slowly expanding along both coasts of the African continent and into South Asia. The steady stream of Afro-Asians who come to Israel to learn continues. They have discovered that Israel is a sort of economic pilot project whose methods of development are, in many ways, easily adaptable in their own countries. True, the Israeli economic achievement has depended on generous outpourings of financial help from the outside. But, is not this one of the pressing problems confronting the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia—how to make the best use of the assistance they so sorely need?

A NEW LAND

The visitor who returns to Palestine after a long absence should be prepared for a surprise. This writer was last in the Holy Land during the war years. Then it differed little from the surrounding countries of the Middle East, except perhaps busy little Lebanon to the north. The Judean hills, for example, were worn away by erosion and neglect. Today, as one drives from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, he weaves through terraced agricultural plots. Galilee to the north is one vast and lush farmland. The Negev, whose sterility is rather a freak of nature than the result of human indifference, remains the only barren area in Israel. Though it comprises 55 percent of the country's land area, the confidence with which Israelis speak of development to the south is but another indication of their determination to make of Israel a going concern.

When the new state was proclaimed in 1948, there were 800,000 people within Israel's borders. Within the short space of 3 years 685,000 immigrants poured in. The population today is 2 million. Such an unprecedented 100-percent growth in a decade would have created difficulties for any well-established country. In Israel the shortage of skilled workers and the lack of raw materials even to construct adequate housing compounded the problem. Until 1951 less than two-thirds of the immigrants were able to find permanent lodging. A quarter of a million people were housed in work camps, immigrant housing and maabarot (transit camps).

The next year, however, the housing picture began to change for the better. Immigration slackened off. Some 20,000 skilled workers were slowly being added to the work force. The building industry boomed. Israel began turning out cement, glass, ceramics, structural iron, pipe, asbestos and other products. In the ensuing 6 years no less than 396,000 new dwelling rooms were completed—only slightly less than the per capita increase in population.

Today Israel's housing problem is largely licked. The maabarot no longer exist. Yet the building goes on. Everywhere one looks, housing developments are in the process of construction. The new city of Jerusalem is fanning out westward into the Judean hills and is encroaching on Ain Karin. Soon the traditional site of the birth of John the Baptist and scene of the Visitation will be a suburb of the Israeli capital. Tel Aviv is expanding to the north, east and south. Haifa, Israel's Mediterranean port, is spreading out along the slopes of Mount Carmel. During the next decade Israel expects another 50 percent increase in population. The country will be ready with permanent housing for the new immigrants.

Food production has kept pace with housing construction. Israel's agricultural output is growing at the average rate of 16 percent a year—almost twice as fast as the number of farmworkers and crop areas. The country has almost reached the point of self-sufficiency in food. Local agriculture supplies all vegetables, potatoes, eggs, fruits, poultry, mutton and milk. Moreover, a growing surplus has enabled the country to increase significantly its agricultural exports. Their value has risen from $17 million in 1950 to $57.3 million at the turn of the new decade.

What Israeli has achieved in the way of food production is of worldwide significance. To us here in the United States, food surpluses—and what to do with them—are an annual headache. The world at large, however, particularly because of the more than 1 billion people who live in the underdeveloped areas, falls far short of meeting its food requirements. Israel has demonstrated that a phenomenally expanding population can be an incentive to greater food production. Though its population has increased at a greater rate than anywhere else, though its soil is not particularly advantageous by normal standards and though its people have come to Israel with little or no previous agricultural experience, Israel not only has been able to supply its own needs but has enough left over for substantial export.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

Israel's agricultural productivity thus compares favorably with typical Western achievement. New farming skills, improved methods of irrigation (the lack of water is the Israeli farmer's chief preoccupation) and a more intensive use of machinery and fertilizer are no doubt responsible. But there is an intangible factor—the emphasis on cooperative effort characteristic of the free Israeli society. The kibbutz and the moshav are two forms of cooperative agricultural settlement which, perhaps more than anything else, have contributed to Israel's economic self-sufficiency.

The writer has long tended to regard the kibbutz with suspicion. Its distinguishing feature is the abandonment of the institution of private property. All assets of the group are collectively owned. Members work without pay. They are dependent on the cooperative for food, clothing and lodging. Children become the collective responsibility of the group and are looked after by members chosen by the kibbutz. This leaves the women free to work in the fields beside the men or in the communal laundries or kitchens.

Despite the similarity, it would be inaccurate to compare the kibbutz to the commune system of forced labor which has set the pattern for Chinese society in recent years. Membership in a kibbutz is voluntary. Just as the new immigrant is free to join or not to join, he is free to leave any time he chooses. Moreover, the kibbutzim represent all shades of ideology, political and otherwise. Some find their inspirational forces in orthodox Judaism. Others profess allegiance to one or another of Israel's various political parties. None are connected in any way with the Communist Party which, though it still possesses legal status, has gone into a sharp decline in recent years.

True, as a movement the kibbutz has today begun to lose some of its original impetus. Membership requires a rare dedication. The individual must learn to subordinate his interests to those of the movement and ultimately to those of the state, for which the kibbutz produces. In recent years immigrants to Israel who decide to become farmers seem to prefer a more individualistic way of life. In consequence, and because

of the continually growing need for increased agricultural output, the kibbutzim very often find themselves in the paradoxical position of being forced to resort to hired help. The practice is a source of worry to the leaders of the movement since it is contrary to the fundamental principle of cooperative labor.

As Israel prospers, so have the kibbutzim. Some have the air of country clubs rather than farm cooperatives. One can detect the same lapses from the communal ideal that one often finds in the religious community—the neglect of common property and the trend toward individualism in defiance of the demands of common life.

Nevertheless, as a unique sociological experiment, the kibbutz merits study. At first view the kibbutz nursery, for example, appears repellant to anyone who considers the strongly knit family as the nucleus of society. But would not the phenomenon, or some variation of it, provide the answer to a genuine difficulty in our occidental, contraceptive-minded society, which considers it has fulfilled its housing obligations with the construction of two- and three-room apartments? One priest who has worked exclusively among Arabs for many years, expressed to this writer the desire to visit Israel for one reason alone—because it is a sociological laboratory where one might find the answer to many of the problems that beset modern society, particularly in the Middle East.

In contrast to the kibbutzim, the moshavim are cooperative villages, each comprising a system of independently managed farms. The theory behind this system is simple enough. The farmer's job is farming. He should not, therefore, be bothered with the business details that go with purchasing seed, fertilizer, etc., nor even with selling his own produce. The cooperative is on hand to do both for him. The only conditions under which he operates are that he purchase his supplies at the settlement's cooperative store and that he use his land for agriculture. Success or failure in his operation depends on his own initiative. But the individual moshav can count on the movement to help plan its farming operations and to obtain credit. The level of mechanization on these settlements is high. The moshavim own hundreds of tractors, combines, bailers, and trucks.

Most of these cooperative settlements have been founded by immigrants who have sought a more individualistic way of life than that afforded by the kibbutz. The family is the social and economic unit of the village. Like the kibbutz, the moshav works on the basis of self-labor and cooperation. But, while each family starts on an equal footing, income varies with the amount of produce supplied by the family to the moshav's cooperative marketing agency.

ISRAEL'S LABOR MOVEMENT

The emphasis on collective agriculture in Israel is no accident. Nor is it due solely to Socialist idealism. It is the product of the harsh reality of history. In the early 20th century the need for agriculture and industrial development in Palestine was crucial. Without it the already settled Jewish community would never have survived. It would have been impossible to continue the flow of immigrants essential to the fulfillment of the Zionist dream. But the immigrant youth of the time had no previous agricultural experience. They were ignorant of what were then modern industrial processes. In the circumstances these pioneers had but one simple choice—cooperate in developing the land or go under. Out of the need for cooperative agricultural effort grew the organization of the labor movement in Israel.

No discussion of Israel's economy would be complete without reference to the Histadrut, the country's unique labor organization. Nowhere else in the world is there a trade-union movement similar in its organization. It cannot be compared to the AFL–CIO, since the Israeli worker is first a member of Histadrut, through which he becomes a member o. the particular trade union appropriate to his occupation. Histadrut is not, in other words, a loose voluntary association of independent unions. It is, moreover, more than a mere trade union movement. It is at the same time entrepreneur, social scervice organization and cultural movement. Here again history has been at work determining the precise direction Histadrut has taken.

Histadrut did not come into being by organizing exploited workers who were at the mercy of fluctuations in the labor market. There were very few wage earners in the country when the movement was first organized in 1920. Its first objective, therefore, was to create a class of workers. Before it could talk of bargaining and improving working conditions, it had first to establish the very sources of employment that were nonexistent in the undeveloped country of the time. As Histadrut pointed out in its first policy statement:

"The Histadrut considers it its duty to create a new type of Jewish worker, and to see to it that, while settlement is being fostered, the Jewish worker who comes into being as a result of this very process shall be assured the place he deserves. The Histadrut includes all workers who live by their own labor without exploiting the labor of others; it regulates all matters concerning the working class in the field of trade union activities, settlement and education, with the aim of building a workers' community."

The "Israel" of the twenties was perforce a labor economy. It remains so today. The country still must cope with a continuous flow of immigrants to its shores, most of whom are untrained candidates for the labor market. Over the years, therefore, Histadrut's objectives have remained basically unchanged. From the huge (by Israeli standards) modern building which houses Histadrut's central offices in Tel Aviv, there radiates a network of economic enterprises. Their purpose: to open up new sectors of the economy in order to provide employment opportunities. At the same time Histadrut trains workers for the jobs it creates. If the country has indeed been transformed in the past decade, the labor sector of the Israeli economy has been in large part responsible.

Though the labor movement has concentrated chiefly on the fields of agriculture and building, of late it has begun to branch out into industry. Histadrut affiliates are now responsible for more than 20 percent of Israel's total industrial output. Koor, a Histadrut holding company, engages in heavy industry. It has built up an extensive chain of quarries and factories, is erecting a complex of iron and steel plants and is active in the exploration and development of the mineral resources of the Negev.

In addition, some 250 producers' cooperatives, also affiliated with Histadrut, are engaged in light industry. Nearly everything needed to equip a house, from furniture to light bulbs, from bathtubs to telephones, from washing machines to refrigerators, is produced is Israel. Such items have also found their way into the world market. The Scandinavian countries, West Africa, and Holland are among the most satisfied customers of Israel.

Israel has not yet attained economic self-sufficiency. Nevertheless, one cannot be in the country long without succumbing to the realization that a great economic and sociological experiment is there taking place. Given a chance, it could have a profound effect on the world of the so-called underdeveloped nations. It is this which has attracted hundreds of Afro-Asians in the last 2 years. They see there what may be a shortcut to the collective system of society they seem to favor and one which will not sacrifice democratic ideals. In January, 51 Burmese returned to their homes after a year's stay in Israel. Retired servicemen with a desire to settle on the land, they had come to study village development and the various types of agricultural coperative to be found in Israel. As a result, two villages of the moshav type, together with a training farm for future settlement, will be established in Burma during the coming year. The Burmese, who have a common frontier with Red China, recognized the advantages of an agricultural settlement which also serves as a defense outpost.

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS

It is perhaps impossible to write in a vein favorable to Israel without drawing fire. The writer expects to be condemned as a Zionist propagandist or, what is worse, as being insensitive to the plight of the million Arab refugees who once made their homes in what is now Israel. This must therefore be said. What is written here does not imply a judgment one way or another on Arab grievances against Israel. Those grievances do indeed exist. But Israel also exists. It is the writer's conviction that the new State can be appraised objectively without prejudice to Arab claims.

What the eventual outcome of the Arab-Israeli quarrel will be no one can know for sure. This much is certain: the solution must not lie in another war of destruction in the Holy Land. Nor is it reasonable to expect Israel to commit national suicide by opening her borders to a million potential enemies—the displaced Palestine refugees. Israel still protests it is ready to negotiate a settlement. We cannot know what Israel will propose, unless the opportunity is given it to meet Arab leaders face to face.

Not all Jews in Israel dismiss the Arab problem in cavalier fashion. To paraphrase one Israeli: it is a tragedy that "our redemption" should have been accomplished at the cost of so much suffering to so many of the Arab people. Once that spirit permeates the country, we may yet see the day when Israel will be in a position to communicate some of her vigor and vitality to her more immediate neighbors.

India Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD, a letter which my good longtime friend Sirdar J. J. Singh, the former president of the India League in the United States, now of New Delhi, has sent to a number of his friends in America.

Jag Jit Singh, an outstanding Indian and American civic leader, was educated both in India and in Great Britain. He lived for 33 years in the United States, was the founding president of the Indian Chamber of Commerce of America, and for many years was president of the India League until he returned to India in March 1959.

The article is entitled "India Today," which Singh states "deals with some

basic issues," and I believe the Congress and the American people should have the opportunity to know of the current opinions of this good Indian friend of America as he has always spoken clearly and plainly to us.

I believe that this article and letter will contribute to the continuation of good Indian-United States relations and for better understanding between our two great people. It should be read by every intelligent citizen in order to improve our ties with this giant nation and the friendly people of India:

FRIENDS COLONY,
New Delhi, April 20, 1960.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
Congressman From Pennsylvania,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed article was written before the Chinese invasion of Tibet and of Indian territory. Thus it does not cover that aspect of political developments in India.

However, as in parts, it deals with some basic issues, I am taking the liberty of having it sent to you.

I hope you will have a chance of glancing through it and sending your comments if you care to.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. SINGH.

INDIA TODAY

(By J. J. Singh)

"What is the state of our nation?" I asked Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, when I called upon him in his Parliament House office.

The Prime Minister receives visitors at three different places. When appointments are given for the day time, while Parliament is in session, he receives them in his Parliament House office. Otherwise, being Foreign Minister, besides being Prime Minister, he meets visitors in the Foreign Office. And whenever he has to combine entertainment and interview, then the guest comes to his house.

Soon after our arrival in New Delhi, Prime Minister Nehru asked my wife and I to have lunch with him at his house. Lady Mountbatten, who was a house guest, was also present. And so was his daughter, Indira Gandhi, who has recently achieved a great deal of importance and prominence as the new President of the Indian National Congress Party. Indira, who is called Indu by her father and other intimate friends, is married to Feroze Gandhi, the crusading member of the Indian Parliament. Feroze has the same last name as did Mahatma Gandhi. But Feroze, who is a Parsi, is no relation of Mahatma Gandhi, who was a Hindu. However, both Parsis and Gujerati Hindus have this surname, "Gandhi."

At this luncheon, I did not have an opportunity to ask many political questions from the Prime Minister. So, I sought another interview. And it was at this interview, which lasted 40 minutes and at which tea was served, that I asked the question, "What is the state of our nation?"

Nehru replied in a very forthright and definite manner. "The state of our nation is good. I should say very good," he said. Nehru then covered various facets of Indian life—economic, political, civic, and the problems of the 14 states, which comprise India. The impression I got was that, by and large, there was nothing that bothered Nehru and that he was fairly satisfied with the progress that India was making. He said, "I am aware that there are many reasons to be dissatisfied with one aspect or the other, but these dissatisfactions are not the result of stagnation. These dissatisfactions are a sign of an alive and active society." However, he said, there was one thing that bothered him a great deal and that is when Hindu-Moslem animosities manifest themselves. He said this communal (Hindu-Moslem relations are called communal) hatred, "with deep, dark passions" is one of the greatest dangers facing India.

Most Americans generally see only the facade of India. They are worried whether or not India will be able to maintain its economic progress under democratic institutions vis-a-vis the economic progress of Communist China under a ruthless dictatorship. They are interested in whether or not India is pro-Western or she is "soft" toward world communism. Americans' preoccupation with world communism leaves them little time or, for that matter, inclination to probe into another, and, perhaps, worse problems a country may face. I am afraid very few Americans know that India's greatest problem is not world communism or even the slow and tardy economic progress. India's main problems are casteism, communalism and provincialism, which is tied up with lingualism.

It is hardly 3 years ago, that in the premier city of India—Bombay—I witnessed passions aroused to the extent that hundreds were killed and thousands were wounded. This was not due to communal friction, but it was a lingual problem. This clash between the Maharastrians and Gujeratis, each of whom wanted the premier city of Bombay to be part of their state, resulted in leaving deep resentments and animosities between neighbors. Right now, Master Tara Singh, leader of the Sikhs, in East Punjab, is again threatening to launch a "morcha" (nonviolent defiance of law) for creating a Punjabi Suba. (A Punjabi speaking state.) A very powerful movement is going on in Madras between non-Brahmins and Brahmins. There is also a movement to create a Dravistan—a land of Dravidians. It will be recalled that the Dravidians were the original inhabitants of India as were the American (Red) Indians, the original inhabitants of America. In India, the conquering hordes, called the Aryans, came from the Caucusus regions and drove the Dravidians to the southernmost parts of India. The Dravidians have felt that the conquering Aryans and the generations that have followed, have denied them the opportunity to live on equal terms with others. And so it goes. These are the fissiparous tendencies and movements which if allowed to flourish could break up India into pieces.

How do these problems of caste, religion, provincialism and lingualism have any bearing on world communism or America's interests in this part of the world? The answer to that question is that a "Balkanised" India split into small areas and at loggerheads with each other, will offer the greatest possible opportunity to world communism to flourish.

Quick economic progress which may reduce unemployment amongst the educated and raise the general standard of living may help in fighting these three evils, but they are so deeply ingrained in our society that active and persistent educational work will have to be done for a long, long period, before these three curses disappear from this land.

Thus, the time has come that Americans who are getting increasingly interested in India should be made aware of the dangers that face this country, beyond the dangers of world communism.

Nehru said to me that it is Hindu-Moslem antagonisms more than anything else, which actually frighten him. It must not be forgotten that the creation of Pakistan did not remove all the Moslems from India. There are 40 million Moslems in India today. By and large, they live in amity with the Hindus. But then something happens—something trivial—and lo and behold, the brute in man comes to the forefront and Hindus and Moslems are at each other's throats.

In Nehru's mind was fresh the recent communal outbreak in the State of Orissa. Nehru's fears about these communal happenings and what they may do to India brought back to my mind that the same kind of fears were felt by Mahatma Gandhi, who all through his life worked for Hindu-Moslem unity. It was in 1947 (Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated in January 1948) that I went to see him when he was traveling in the interior of the State of Bihar. In this State, it was the Hindus who had perpetrated heinous crimes against the Moslems, just as in some other parts of India. Moslems had perpetrated similar crimes against the Hindus. Gandhi traveled into the interior of the State, trying to assuage the feeling of the Moslems, just as he had traveled in Bengal solacing the Hindu victims of Moslem cruelty. As I, too, had recently seen these inhuman acts committed both by Hindus and Moslems in Lahore and Amritsar (in the then undivided State of Punjab) I asked Mahatma Gandhi, "Sir, is there something wrong with us as a nation, which makes us perpetrate such inhuman acts?" Mahatma Gandhi answered, "No, there is nothing wrong with us as a nation because if you read history, you will find that many nations on many an occasion and in many different parts of the world, have shown the same kind of ruthlessness and brutality. Man will never become civilized and this ruthlessness will not disappear unless he believes in nonviolence and adopts it as a basic principle of his life." How true Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence is. And how true it is that until man will have eschewed violence, he will not be civilized in the true sense of the word.

But, as I said above, Nehru feels very hopeful about the general conditions as they obtain in India today. I talked to nine other Cabinet Ministers. And I asked the same question from them: "What is the state of our nation?" Invariably, the replies of the Ministers indicated a sense of achievement and good hope for the future.

Undoubtedly, as Nehru said, there is a great deal of dissatisfaction, especially amongst the well-to-do people. They complain of high taxation, redtape, government interference, bureaucracy, nepotism and corruption. These people remind me so much of my Republican friends during the Roosevelt-Truman era.

What has impressed me, however, is the stupendous activity which is so evident. Be it in roadbuilding, manufacturing of freight and passenger cars and locomotives, or the building of schools and hospitals in the urban areas and improving the status of farmers and peasants in the rural areas, the country is humming. One young American educated and trained Indian industrialist told me, "In India today, you can start anything and it will flourish."

It would be safe to assert that India today is on the march and that India today is offering virtually the same challenge and opportunity to the people of India as did America offer to her pioneers.

India is both young and old. Our known history dates back to more than 5,000 years, (in some parts of northern India, relics of more than 10,000-year old civilization have been discovered) but as an independent, modern nation we are hardly 12 years old. And that is why the job of the present generation is similar to that of the American pioneers who made sacrifices to build up their country so that their childrens' children are now reaping the benefits.

Something else that strikes one is the preservation of law and order whereby life,

property, and honor are safe. Neither my wife nor I will hesitate to go out any time of the day or night in New Delhi. And yet, if one were to look around at the other newly freed countries whether in the Middle East or in southeast Asia, one does not find the same assurance of protection by the law.

Today's India is wedded to the principles of democracy and freedom under law. India's judiciary is above reproach. Freedom of expression is complete. Whenever we are amongst the well-to-do and the so-called upper strata of society, we hear criticism of the Government and of Nehru. But what is heartening to me is that no one looks over the shoulder to be sure whether he or she should be openly critical of the Government or not.

Parenthetically, I may mention that my old belief has been strengthened by my study on the spot that world communism has little or no chance to get a toehold in a united and progressive India. There is a personality of India which rebels against regimentation of thought and action. There is also religion which plays an important role in the average Indian's life. Even a small village has a gurdwara (Sikh temple), a mandir (Hindu temple), a masiid (place for Moslems to pray). Most Indians, be they Hindus, Moslems, Christians, Sikhs, Parsis, Jains, or those belonging to any other small cult are God-fearing and God-believing people. A society like that cannot easily fall for the atheist dogmas of world communism.

Sometimes, I wonder whether it is "empty stomachs" that make Communists or whether it is empty minds that make Communists. Because in India and elsewhere, one finds communist cells amongst educated and well-to-do people, but hardly any amongst the peasants and farmers. Furthermore, if it were correct that empty stomachs or substandard of living is fertile ground for communism, then why would Russians give billions of dollars worth of economic aid to backward and underdeveloped areas of the world? By giving such aid, they will undoubtedly be raising the standard of living of the people. And, if substandard living is the proper breeding ground for world communism, then their economic aid to change that status would obviously defeat this purpose. I am beginning to think that it is not the poverty-stricken people of India who can and will fall victims to world communism. I know this is a debatable subject and space will not permit me to delve into it more deeply, but I unhesitatingly repeat that the makeup of India which is 85 percent villages, is not fertile ground for world communism.

To a very great extent, credit for what India is today, must go to Prime Minister Nehru. But, what or who after Nehru? This is the perennial question. It is on the minds of many, both in America and in India, and for that matter, in other parts of the world, too.

Nehru, who will be 70 this November, enjoys excellent health. His alertness of mind and excellent grasp of domestic and foreign affairs is the envy of many a younger man. What makes this man so vibrant and active when the woes and perplexities of the problems of 400 million people fall upon his somewhat slender shoulders? It would seem that one of the major sustaining elements in his life and something that gives him great inner strength, is the love and devotion the people of India shower upon him. He has no fear of opposition. He has no fear of rivals for the Prime Ministership of India. He has no fear of the victory or failure of his party. He has no fear of losing his prestige or position. And all this because he is the most beloved political leader that any country, at any time, has had. This is a challenging statement, but let us ponder and think which political leader (I am not including Mahatma Gandhi because he was more a spiritual and religious leader than a political leader) has had such devotion of almost 100 percent of his people, as Nehru has. Once, recently, addressing a mammoth gathering of a million people, Nehru said, "I have loved you a lot. But I have great satisfaction in knowing that you have loved me in return." And who can deny that one of the greatest things in any human being's life is to "love and be loved in return."

I feel that we do not have to worry about, "What or who after Nehru?" One Cabinet Minister told me Nehru is good for "2 plus 5." He meant the balance of the 2 years of the present life of the Government and 5 years after the new elections in 1961. (Under the Constitution of India, general elections are held every 5 years. The coming elections will be the third since freedom.)

It is quite clear that Nehru has given up the idea of retiring. He once threatened to do so. The day we lunched with Nehru, I had received a cutting of former Gov. W. Averell Harriman's article from New York. In this article, Mr. Harriman had said that Nehru had told him that he had no intention of retiring from office. I looked at Nehru and said, "Bhai; (brother) I was delighted to read in Harriman's article that you have no intention of retiring." Nehru looked at me and with a boyish smile said, "I can change my mind."

Practically everyone in India, even those who are critical of Nehru, hopes that he will not change his mind and that he will remain healthy and strong so that he may continue to be at the helm of India's destiny for at least "2 plus 5."

Those Old Folks Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the New Republic of April 18, 1960, entitled "Those Old Folks Back Home," which describes well the shilly-shallying, do-nothing approach of the administration to the gravest problem faced by the 15-million-plus Americans of 65 years of age or more:

[From the New Republic, Apr. 18, 1960]

(By Gilbert A. Harrison)

Once it was commonplace to say that American partisan politics was a tweedledee-tweedledum affair. But the maneuvering of Republicans and Democrats these past weeks on proposals to provide better medical care for the elderly knocks that cliché in the head. Who is on which side of this welfare debate can be seen by observing the controversy over the Forand bill.

Nearly 2 years ago, Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, introduced his modest and at that time relatively obscure proposal to amend the Social Security Act to provide medical care for about 11 million people who are receiving or who are eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. All hospitalization costs for no more than 60 days (in hospitals that have entered the program) would be covered—except for the attending doctor's fee (and this too would be included if it is for surgery). Under FORAND's insurance scheme all surgery done in the hospital or, in an emergency, in the doctor's office would be covered; likewise convalescence in a nurings home up to 120 days a year. And the benefits would be financed not out of general revenues but by an additional one-quarter of 1 percent on the social security tax levied on both employers and employees.

Letters from the folks back home for some program are becoming irresistible. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself has pointed out that, "older persons have larger than average medical care needs. As a group they use about 2½ times as much hospital care as the average for persons under 65." To this, add that there are now about 15½ million Americans who are 65 or older, and that three-fifths of them last year had less than $1,000 on which to live. By using the present structure of social security to finance medical services, as Mr. FORAND suggests, benefits would not be handouts but would be paid by the beneficiaries; the cost would be spread over virtually the whole working population and their employers; it would immediately cover a very large majority of those who are in greatest need; and it would not impose on voluntary insurance rates the added costs attributable to the aged whose medical demands are the heaviest.

Suddenly, like an oily rag stuffed in the corner of a closet and forgotten, the Forand bill has caught fire, thanks in part to the nearness of November, but in greater part to massive opposition by the Doctors Doolittle of the American Medical Association. Since there are about 80 older folks for every one member of the AMA, some kind of legislation is going to be passed. But when, in what form and under whose auspices?

It was the President who made the widely reported decision to block Welfare Secretary Flemming's "positive" program of aid to the aged. But it was the Vice President who got credit for wanting to do something. Not at all against NIXON'S wishes, reporters implied (not for attribution) that he had put pressure on conservative Republicans to support a liberal alternative to the Forand bill. A spokesman for the Vice President and a GOP member of the House Ways and Means Committee both, however, privately denied that this ever happened. In several meetings with Secretary Flemming, Mr. NIXON had urged that some kind of "acceptable" solution be found (acceptable first to the AMA and the insurance companies, then, hopefully, to the aged). But there is no evidence that he at any time discussed the details of the many proposals drafted by Health, Education, and Welfare; nor did he endorse any of them. On the contrary, from the beginning, NIXON has insisted he would not support any "compulsory" scheme, thus ruling out four HEW draft formulas which called for an enforced hike in social security taxes.

During the first 2 weeks in March, debate within the administration reached a critical stage. House Ways and Means hearings were scheduled to begin on March 14, with Mr. Flemming as the first witness. He had argued with the Bureau of the Budget, with White House officials and even before the Cabinet, but the tide was against him. Plans requiring a boost in social-security taxes were rejected because of their "socialistic" flavor; the formula of increasing Federal-State subsidies to public assistance programs was then turned down because of its cost. Thus, at the opening of the committee hearings, Flemming had to confess he had nothing to recommend. He pleaded for, and got, a 9-day reprieve, which he wanted because he had started work on a new watered-down plan he hoped might win over the administration, calling for Federal-State grants to help the aged purchase catastrophic illness coverage from voluntary health groups and

private insurance companies, with premiums pegged to individual incomes and the Government picking up some of the tab.

Struggling to muster support for this compromise, the Secretary called in leaders of the AMA, the American Hospital Association and the insurance companies and bluntly warned them that if the administration did nothing, some conservative Congressmen would be driven to back the Forand bill because of massive constituent demand. He made no converts.

The showdown came at a secret White House meeting, which Mr. NIXON did not attend, on the Friday before the Secretary was supposed to make his second appearance before Ways and Means. The conference adjourned without Flemming's receiving the go-ahead he wanted. And so, on the following Wednesday, March 23, the Secretary repeated to the House Committee that "we have not reached a conclusion. * * *" He was, however, beginning "immediately to consult further with experts in Government, with outside experts and groups, and with State officials." But, "it is of course not possible to predict the length of time it will take for these consultations. Moreover, I am not now in a position to predict just how long it will take to resolve the basic issues I have just identified and any others that may arise."

Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, asked whether the Vice President had exerted any pressure at the White House. "You had better ask the Vice President," said Mr. Flemming. Mr. BOGGS noted that NIXON was being credited with breaking the logjam within the administration on this matter: "Now, Mr. Secretary, has this logjam been broken?" In the outburst of laughter, the Secretary never got to answer.

Representative FORAND (who will retire from the Congress this year) thereupon announced he would file a discharge petition for his bill, which had been turned down by Ways and Means—all eight Republicans voting against. A second White House meeting was hastily called. This one NIXON did attend, and when it was over the press was advised that the administration, though it did not yet have a "plan," had some "guidelines." What were they? Well, the program would have to be "voluntary," a euphemism for nongovernmental. It would have to be administered by the States, which is to say administered by State welfare and health departments, totally unequipped for this complicated task and which would require complete restaffing; its coverage would be "somewhat limited," which is self-explanatory; insurance would be provided by private companies and based on the income of the insured, which is to say by applying a means test; and the program would be financed out of general tax revenues, which is to say by increasing Federal spending—to which the administration generally and strenuously objects.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and the Aging which met the next day, April 6, was not satisfied. The more liberal and politically sagacious Republicans were feeling poorly. Mr. DIRKSEN shouted "stinking" and "insane" at witnesses testifying in favor of the Forand bill and seemed to be running a high fever. Secretary Flemming had no more to say than he had said previously. Asked why, after 7 years, a proposal was not yet ready he replied: "It probably reflects the complexity of the problem."

All this was too much for Senator JAVITS, who 2 days earlier had called and then abruptly called off a press conference to put forward "an affirmative alternative" to FORAND. On April 7, JAVITS and seven Republicans in the Senate introduced their "entirely independent venture," that is to say one that did not have administration backing. Senator JAVITS, realistically anticipating Treasury opposition, predicted the administration "would bridle at the amounts involved." It was a gesture, no more. Mr. NIXON was noncommittal.

Upon examination, the Javits proposal appears to have most of the weaknesses of the guidelines hinted earlier by the administration. The extent of the benefits would be determined by the States, since the States would be required to match Federal subsidies. The history of matching programs illustrates how few States are able and willing to appropriate maximum amounts for social services. In this case, the cost to the States is estimated at $640 million a year. Some of the richer States might do their share, but these are the States where the needs of the aged are usually the best met: one of the problems all along has been the inequality of services, State by State.

Moreover, even if the States were to subscribe their full amounts, benefits would be inadequate. For example, the bill would allow a maximum of $250 a year for hospitalization, and according to an HEW survey submitted 12 months ago by Mr. Flemming to the House Ways and Means Committee, "The median costs (in 1958) for those couples (65 or over) reporting at least one episode of hospitalization for either member (excluding those receiving a free service or with unknown costs) was about $700."

There will be more than a few bloody noses by the time this fight has gone another round. The AMA has just released a letter dated April 1, 1960, which was sent to thousands of doctors throughout the country by the Vice President's administrative assistant, Robert Fitch, one paragraph of which says: "He (the Vice President) believes that the best way to handle the problem of people over 65 who do not have and cannot afford health insurance is through a program which will enable those who desire to do so to purchase health insurance covering catastrophic illnesses from private group carriers on a voluntary basis." That shows where Mr. NIXON stands. Meanwhile, Mr. FORAND's discharge petition is being circulated; it is rumored that Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, is preparing another proposal; the White House is still murmuring about a plan it will unwrap in a week or so, perhaps while the President is in Augusta for spring training; and by late summer the medical gap may have shoved the missile gap way to the rear as a campaign issue.

The Fight Against Offensive and Obscene Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great importance of putting an end to the flow of offensive and obscene material to our young people, I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues a fine editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, of April 8, 1960, on the work of the joint legislative committee of the New York State Legislature to study the publication and dissemination of offensive and obscene material:

TIME TO TAKE STEPS

Findings of the Joint Legislative Committee To Study the Publication and Dissemination of Offensive and Obscene Material were recently submitted to the legislature.

Among the revelation and recommendations was the startling fact that youth in New York State are being bombarded by literature dealing with crime, illicit sex, immorality, perversion, brutality, and violence.

Included in the list of offenders are magazines of a highly questionable nature, along with foreign and even domestic films, produced solely for the sake of their money-making shock value.

The committee recommended that the State education department be authorized to issue an advisory opinion as to suitable motion pictures for youngsters. It also recommends an intensification of law enforcement and the establishment of a permanent decency commission.

But perhaps the most significant recommendation was that a constant effort be made to alert and educate the public to the dangers of obscenity and pornography. After all, that is the crux of the problem. With proper education, adults would be more effective guardians of the minds and hearts of their own youngsters.

This might require a little added effort, but it is not too much to ask. Certainly we owe it to our youngsters to do everything in our power to combat the menace of the merchants of smut who would poison young minds.

The Typewriter Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, two domestic typewriter manufacturers, representing only a fraction of the total U.S. industry, have recently petitioned the U.S. Tariff Commission for a 30% percent import duty on typewriters—an article which, even under the Smoot-Hawley tariff, was not subject to any import duty.

This petition has resulted justifiably in a storm of protest from consumers and typewriter distributors across the country. A duty on imported typewriters would mean retirement from business for many office machine dealers who, like Mr. Lloyd O. Linabury, Business Machines Co., Long Beach, Calif., felt the squeeze of a large domestic typewriter manufacturer, for whom he was local representative for 7 years. The squeeze came when the company took over Mr. Linabury's business and opened a factory branch. He, like several thousand independent typewriter dealers, found the only way to stay in business was to handle a line of imported typewriters which he could sell with confidence to his customers.

The pattern here is a rather typical one applicable in a number of fields. The large companies figure it is all right to squeeze out their small dealers, but when the dealers fight back, the companies run to the Tariff Commission and try to cut off the livelihood of the independent dealers.

Office machine dealers' associations in northern and southern California, and

the State's East Bay Association have passed resolutions opposing the tariff proposal. I understand that more than 30 dealers' organizations throughout the country have recorded vigorous objections to the imposition of artificial trade barriers against foreign typewriters. The National Office Machine Dealers Association, headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif., in its resolution adopted recently in opposition to this petition, included the following statement:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the National Office Machine Dealers Association is strongly opposed to any increase in the pricing of typewriters to the dealers therein and in turn to the general purchasing public without benefit of better profit or product resulting therefrom.

The request for a 30-percent import duty should be rejected. This should be done as a lesson to manufacturers of any other products who might be contemplating the same unfair practices toward their dealers as these typewriter companies engaged upon. Let them know that if they attempt to gobble up the retail business, and force the retailers thereby to foreign markets for a product to sell, that they are going to have to suffer the delayed consequence of the foreign competition that results thereby.

This is not to say that where legitimate national interests indicate some protection is needed from extremely low wage scales in some foreign countries that it should not be given. There are always many factors which must be resolved in deciding whether any protection is needed in specific instances and if so, how much. The typewriter case does not fall into this catagory, however. It is a special case, deserves to be treated as such, and deserves to serve as an example of what practices American firms should not engage in as to their retailers.

An editorial on this subject from a somewhat different standpoint appeared in the Journal of Commerce on April 8, 1960. It is as follows:

THE TYPEWRITER CASE

Typewriters constitute a rather modest ($700 million) proportion of the $7 billion annual business in office equipment in this country; but not so small that manufacturers of these items have not appealed to the Tariff Commission for protection against imported competition.

On the surface there appears some reason for this. In 1949, this country exported 224,200 typewriters, only to see its exports decline to 50,600 units last year. Sales of U.S.-produced typewriters in roughly the same period mounted from about 490,000 to 740,000 units, but imports have expanded at a much faster rate—from 33,000 units less than a decade ago to 454,000 last year.

Last year, slightly more than one in every three portable typewriters sold in this country were of foreign make. Slightly more than one in five office manual machines were likewise imported. Hence some domestic manufacturers are seeking a tariff increase to prevent the deterioration of U.S. production into the role of what Fortune P. Ryan, executive vice president of the Royal McBee Corp. fears may be a "fringe industry."

Graphically as this picture has been presented in Washington, there is an important element missing from it. It is this: About a third of the "imported competition" about which U.S. producers are complaining is provided by American firms which have set up facilities abroad to manufacture, among other things, typewriters.

To put it more specifically, of the 381,000 portables (an average figure) imported annually between 1957 and 1959, about one-third were produced by American-owned factories abroad, and were brought here for the account and under the label of U.S. typewriter companies. Since portables account for the bulk of all typewriters imported, it is around them, rather than around other types, that the issue has developed.

It is true that the machines were not produced here and did not require American labor (though the money paid for them would inevitably return in the form of oversea demands for some other U.S. goods or services). Yet the sales, cash earnings, and dividends of the U.S. producers involved were sustained by the opportunity to sell cheaper machines in this market through their own strong distributive systems and under their own labels.

In view of the fact that, to some extent at least, the American producers were providing their own imported competition, it is necessary to take another look at the figures some of them have presented to the Tariff Commission.

If the total import figure of 381,000 units is reduced by one-third (as in all fairness, it ought to be) and the resultant 127,000 units are added to domestic production, which averaged 740,000 portables in the same period, the actual relation of bona fide imports to U.S.-controlled production becomes 254,000 as against 867,000 units, or nearer one out of four than to one out of three typewriters sold in this country over the past few years.

Actually, of course, there is nothing reprehensible about the establishment of American production subsidiaries overseas, or about the sale of their products in this country. It is all part of the complex fabric of foreign trade and generally mutually rewarding to all sides.

But when an industry engaging in this practice points to the imported competition it has played a considerable part in generating as a reason for raising tariffs or imposing quotas, the whole question becomes a horse of another color. In such circumstances the American manufacturers involved are not, naturally enough, trying to create difficulties for their own foreign-made goods in their own market. We can assume they are motivated by the discovery that their foreign competitors are doing better here than they had expected them to, and would like to shift the main area of competition between foreign-made products elsewhere, giving the products of their domestic manufacturing plants greater play in the home market.

To raise the tariff on typewriters under circumstances such as this would set a most unhappy precedent for this Nation's foreign trade policy.

Such an action could be construed as an invitation to almost any domestic producers of manufactured goods to set up production facilities abroad, import part of their output, and then point to their own imports as a reason why higher tariffs, quotas, or other restrictions are essential to the protection of domestic production.

There are a number of other industries where the establishment of such a precedent could create trouble, one of them being in automobiles. We hope such troubles will not develop, and the Tariff Commission can do much to assure that they won't by keeping this whole issue in perspective as it weighs the typewriter case.

Medical and Hospital Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the matter of health care for our aged citizens. Frankly, there has been too much sound-and-fury on this subject, too little emphasis upon the basic facts. Too little discussion has been devoted to the fundamental, important question: What will help the elderly?

Let me set forth some questions and answers which people are entitled to know. I am convinced that too many aspects of this have been neglected.

Question. Is there presently a program designed to meet the health requirements of the aged?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is this a local, State, or Federal program?

Answer. All three levels of government are active in this program. Also active in the program are the churches, health agencies, fraternal and benevolent organizations, and private groups.

Question. Is this program producing results?

Answer. Yes, very marked results.

Question. Is sufficient progress being made?

Answer. In my opinion, emphatically yes. Yet I recognize this is the issue for public debate, as it applies to the number of persons receiving health care, the adequacy of the health care received and the effect of the cost of health care on the financial position of the aged.

Question. Is the availability of health care for the indigent aged sufficiently broad?

Answer. The statement has been made publicly many times that today there are no indigent persons in the United States who do not receive health care or could not receive health care upon application. These statements remain unchallenged.

Question. Speaking broadly, who is presently financing the health care for the indigent aged?

Answer. Many groups in our society presently share in these efforts. These include the Federal Government, through old age assistance grants; the programs of the States and the counties; private charities and churches; private training hospitals, and persons in the medical profession who donate their services.

Question. Is financing health care of the indigent a problem?

Answer. Only to the extent that financing anything is often a problem. The money to pay for this health care must be raised by the public. That means it must come either from taxes or community giving. But this is the same sort of problem we have been solv-

ing since the 18th century—not only in the provision of health care for the indigent, but in such programs as aid for dependent children, assistance to the blind, and so on.

Question. Where else has great progress been made?

Answer. In the quality of health care facilities and skills. In fact, the very rapid improvement in drugs, hospitals, doctors' skills, and so forth, has helped to bring about the situation I am discussing today. Largely due to advances in the health care field, people are living 10 years longer. These 10 years of being alive represent a wonderful advancement.

Question. Are present medical costs justified?

Answer. Yes. Progress by its very nature costs money. However, technological advances and new skills in treatment have brought about a longer, healthier lifespan. We are paying for these advances through higher priced equipment and an improved salary level for the more intensely trained and skilled medical technician. But we should never forget that these advances have alleviated suffering and reduced the term and intensity of illnesses. These are values which must be measured in terms of human life. They cannot be reckoned on the basis of dollars and cents alone.

Question. Is there a doctor shortage in the United States?

Answer. Our doctor-patient ratio has remained nearly constant for the past 10 years. In 1950, there were 133 physicians for each 100,000 of our population. However, productivity has increased greatly through the wider use of telephones, improved transportation and better equipment and skills. But because our population is growing so rapidly and the continuing discoveries of modern medicine already take the physician into every area of life and environment, America in a few years will need many, many more young doctors to maintain and protect the health of the Nation's citizens. Doctors will be needed in family practice, specialization, research, teaching, public health, the Armed Forces, industrial health, administration, school health, and in government. The Nation's medical schools are now expanding at an unprecedented pace to provide additional facilities for their growing enrollments. Medical faculties and the medical profession are engaged in an aggressive, nationwide recruitment program in every community to assure a continuing and increasing supply of well-trained physicians for the future. All of this costs money. However, even more serious than costs would be legislative restrictions on their freedom to practice medicine under a private system. This would discourage young men and women from choosing medicine as a career.

Question. How about facilities?

Answer. There still is need in some areas for more hospital facilities. Considerable study also is being devoted to more efficient use of the hospital facilities we now have; for example, in the care of the chronically ill.

Question. How do private nursing homes fit into this picture?

Answer. Many older people and convalescents do not need full hospital care. If private nursing homes were available, these persons could be cared for in private nursing home facilities at about one-third the cost of hospitals. Crowding of our hospitals would also be relieved. There is need for more good nursing homes, the cost of buildings designed for private nursing homes is only approximately one-third that of hospitals. The daily charge to patients can be reduced accordingly—an important factor in long-term care. The FHA guarantee to encourage construction of private nursing homes which meet high standards of health and safety is the most recent Federal program and one that will meet one of the greatest needs today. This law was passed just last August, and the regulations to handle applications were announced February 25. Already 1,500 applications or inquiries have been received.

Question. Are there other areas where skills and new facilities are being developed?

Answer. Yes, of course. One of the greatest needs today is to extend the organized home care plan. The hospital is needed for the most serious cases, the nursing home is the next step, but there is a third step, namely organized home care, which is less costly, than the nursing home. This third category permits the older person needing just a limited amount of health care to remain in his home. Organized home care is a team approach normally including at least a physician, a nurse, and a social worker. The visiting nurse in many cases teaches the family how to care for the older person, and the nurse comes periodically to the home when needed.

Question. How about health insurance coverage for those over 65?

Answer. Within the last 3 years tremendous progress also has been made in health insurance coverage for people over 65.

Question. Why do you say 3 years? Isn't this a fairly short period?

Answer. It points up the rapid progress. Just a few years ago, for example, Blue Shield and Blue Cross dropped from coverage in group plans persons reaching 65 and retirement status, and the plans had no health care coverage to offer persons over a certain age. Today, this is all changed. There are 39 Blue Shield plans in 36 States offering coverage for elderly persons, and there are 14 additional plans in 8 States which have proposed programs for this coverage underway. With rare exceptions, the Blue Cross plans have taken similar actions. Furthermore, private insurance companies have been moving into the field of health insurance for the aged. The figures are dramatic. According to a Social Security Administration report in 1952 some 26 percent of all persons over age 65 had health insurance coverage. That represented an estimated 34 percent of persons in that age group who needed and wanted such protection. The 1956 Social Security Administration report showed that the 1952 figure of 26 percent had increased to 37 percent of the total represented some 48 percent of those who needed and wanted the coverage. Some well-documented analyses (assuming a continuation of recent trends) predict that during 1960 some 65 percent of persons 65 and over who want and need insurance will have it and that the figure will increase to 80 percent by 1965.

Question. But are these policies adequate and are the premiums within the means of older persons?

Answer. My answer to both those questions would essentially be "Yes." Much is being accomplished, particularly in extending catastrophic-type insurance.

Question. What is catastrophic-type insurance?

Answer. It is insurance to protect against the catastrophe of a prolonged and costly illness. The premiums for this kind of insurance are relatively low, based upon the deductible amount assumed by the insured.

Question. What is the Forand bill supposed to do?

Answer. The Forand bill is supposed to set up a form of Federal compulsory health insurance which everyone will purchase by paying additional social security taxes. Under this scheme, only those eligible for social security would receive a limited amount of hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits.

Question. How many persons 65 and over would be omitted from coverage under the Forand bill?

Answer. There are about 4½ million older persons who would receive no consideration under the Forand bill.

Question. Will the Federal Government then go into the health insurance field?

Answer. Yes, but with a program just the reverse of the catastrophic-type policy most needed. In other words, the Federal insurance would take care of the first 60 days of hospital care—from then on the older person requiring hospital care is on his own or on relief. Catastrophic insurance has the patient assume the cost of the first few days, but then bears the cost burden throughout his illness.

Question. What could this mean to you as an individual?

Answer. As a patient, you would have to choose a hospital, nursing home or physician under contract with the Federal Government if you were eligible for treatment under the Forand bill. Of course, the Federal Government would have to regulate provisions for treatment and charges. Doctors would have to conform to regulations which hamper them from prescribing treatment that they, as professional men, believed patients needed. That's why doctors and others in the health field say such action is the beginning of socialized medicine.

Question. What is socialized medicine? Is that just a scare word, or does it mean something specific?

Answer. Yes, it means something specific. Socialized medicine is one form or another of compulsory national health insurance—medicine controlled and administered by the Federal Government, in other words the State rather than the patient selects the doctor and medical facility.

Question. But does not the Forand bill permit the choosing of ones own doctor?

Answer. On the surface, yes—but only on the surface. Suppose the doctor or hospital the patient wants does not reach an agreement with the Federal Government on fees and charges. Then the patient would have to go to a doctor and a hospital which has reached such an agreement. It takes little insight to see what power the Federal Government would have over doctors and hospitals, because the Federal Government would decide which doctors and which hospitals qualify or are disqualified according to the Federal regulations.

Question. Does the Forand bill apply to all old persons?

Answer. It does not. It applies only to those eligible for social security retirement and survivorship payments. The millions of persons over 65 who never were covered by OASI because of the program's limited coverage in its beginning will not receive benefits. These include, of course, such persons as retired police officers and firemen, retired railroad workers, teachers, self-employed professional people, and so forth.

Question. Does the Forand bill cover the indigent aged?

Answer. It does not.

Question. Are there other things in the social security program that could affect the aged in the matter of health costs with which the Forand bill provisions are not concerned?

Answer. Yes. I feel the most important area in which to help the older people in their financial problems is to liberalize the $1,200 work clause. Furthermore, liberalization of this clause conforms to the social policy that all of us should favor—namely, to utilize the talents of our older citizens who can work longer because of the advances in the field of health. There is also the great psychological factor of helping the older person to be actively useful, as well as helping his economic status.

Question. Why is not the work clause liberalized?

Answer. Primarily because of opposition of the leaders of the AFL–CIO.

Question. Why are they against it?

Answer. They say it will cost money.

Question. But would not the Forand bill cost money?

Answer. Certainly. I believe the fundamental reason for their opposition to liberalizing the work clause is that they want to keep older people out of the labor market. This, to me, is an anti-social policy. For reasons stated previously, it is in this area we can help our older citizens the most.

Question. How about the program which Senator JAVITS and some others have advanced to have the Federal Government finance a voluntary health insurance program along with the States?

Answer. I would have to be convinced that the present program is not showing the remarkable progress which is clearly evident before I would abandon it in favor of something that is untried. We know what progress we are making, and this has not required Federal Government intervention.

Question. Is it true that 60 percent of the people over 65 have a per capita income of $1,000 a year or less?

Answer. It is a juggled figure. It is a very misleading statistic taken out of the context of the entire picture. It would be just as accurate and just as misleading to state that in 1957—the most recent year to which the misleading figure applies—63.7 percent of all Americans had incomes of $1,000 or less per year. In 1957 almost half of those persons over 14 years of age also had incomes of $1,000 or less per year. And 47 percent of those between the ages of 14 and 65 had incomes below $1,000 a year. Actually most people over 65 own their own homes and their own furniture. Except for medical costs every item in their budget is less than that of persons under 65.

Question. What about the future as far as health care for those over 65 is concerned?

Answer. I think the situation is good, and it is getting better. I suggest that we use the approaches we have on hand, if evidence indicates that action must be taken. We have the device of public assistance—locally administered and locally disbursed, on the basis of known need. We have already hard at work the voluntary efforts of civic, religious, and health leaders at the community level. We have operating effectively the machinery of health insurance. There is still evidence to be gathered, and President Eisenhower has called the White House Conference on Aging for January 1961, to get more complete facts to see where, if anywhere, we can help. Congress has appropriated $2 million for use in preparing for this conference. We in the United States have the healthiest nation in history. Our prospects for the future to better this record are excellent.

Just what are the motives of those who ignore the facts, falsify the records, and try to propagandize the people about this system of private medicine, which has brought this about? Should we tamper with this system because some demagogues think it will get votes in the 1960 election? I hardly think so, and when the people find out that that is what has been attempted, I have no doubt what their judgment will be.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 11, seems to ask the age-old question posed by the confused: "Where do we go from here?" I wonder, too. The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 11, 1960]

SHIFTLESS SAM

Then there's the story about the shiftless fellow who had a leaky roof. He couldn't fix it when it was raining; and when it wasn't raining, why bother?

This has been pretty much the attitude of the Democrats in Congress toward the Government's leaky fiscal structure.

When interest rates were high and rising the Treasury found it impossible to borrow any money at all on bonds at 4¼ percent, the maximum the law permits it to pay. But, said the Democrats, the law shouldn't be fixed then because it wouldn't do to let Uncle Sam pay more when money was already tight. Then when interest rates dropped somewhat, and it looked as though the Treasury might float a 4¼ percent bond issue, the Democrats said, "Why bother about changing the law?"

Now it's turned out, of course, that the Treasury can't borrow money that way in any appreciable amount. Secretary Anderson offered the public a 25-year 4¼ percent bond issue, expecting to sell a minimum of $500 million and hoping for $1.5 billion to bail him out. Mr. Anderson got offers of barely $370 million. So there you are.

Naturally, this altered the Democrat's views not a whit. With much grave shaking of heads they decided the failure of the Treasury's bond issue meant this was not the time to fix the law. In one of the most magnificent nonsequiturs of the season, Senator DOUGLAS said this was just "proof that the Treasury should develop better methods for marketing bond issues"—without the slightest intimation that meeting the market price for bonds is one of the best methods ever devised.

Oh, well. We suppose nobody should be surprised. After all, it's the same attitude that says Uncle Sam can't afford to cut his budget in hard times and in good times it ain't necessary. Shiftless Sam is just goin' to set 'till the roof falls in.

Letters in Birmingham News Decry Salisbury Articles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert in the RECORD herewith, several letters which appeared in the Birmingham News on Tuesday, April 19, 1960, in which the people deplore the two articles written by Harrison E. Salisbury, of the New York Times, dealing with race conditions in Birmingham, Ala., my district. Mr. Salisbury's articles were gross distortions of the truth and I urge that all Members of Congress read the following comments by constituents of my district. These letters will give a far more accurate and truthful picture of Birmingham.

[From the Birmingham News, Apr. 19, 1960]

POINT AT SOMEONE, THREE POINT BACK

I have written the following letter to the New York Times:

"Do you have proof of the slanderous accusations made about Birmingham by Mr. Harrison Salisbury and published by you in the New York Times? Or do you accept as

the whole truth the biased account of a prejudiced reporter whose words prove that he has only a smattering of the truth?

"Of course I do not expect you to answer those questions. If you were the kind of man who would answer them, you would be the kind who would not have published such a diatribe in the first place.

"Your Mr. Salisbury quotes a Negro pastor: 'If you sow hate, you reap hate.' He might have added: 'And if you sow love, you reap love.' Do you think, Mr. Sulzberger, that in publishing such a distorted report you have sowed seeds of love? Apparently you are as lacking in conscience as you are in courtesy, else you would have bothered to substantiate accusations before you published them as fact. If in answer to my ring of your doorbell you had slapped my face a resounding blow that sent me sprawling on the floor, I could not feel any more outraged than I do feel over what you published—you who are supposed to stand for truth, integrity, and understanding. When I was a child, an evangelist in our church absconded with church funds. The shock I felt then is repeated and intensified in what I feel now. I am disillusioned; I had thought I could depend on you and your paper for honest reporting. What you have done is unforgivable and unforgettable. If you have a conscience, may it wake up and be a better guide in the future.

"Who am I to tell you these things? Just an average Birmingham woman, a teacher, a widow, a grandmother, and a loyal citizen who cannot find it in her heart to hate even you, though I do hate the evil seeds you, your reporter, and your paper have sowed.

"I believe that forcing integration on the South is as wrong both to Negroes and whites as you seem to think it is right. It is no more natural for whites and Negroes to integrate than it is natural for wrens and sparrows to integrate. Neither the wrens nor the sparrows would be happy if you tried to force them to integrate. This is a simple law of nature that defies the laws of man. As a justice-loving American I say may both the wrens and the sparrows have the right to flock with their kind and to nest with their kind.

"I believe I am more sickened than you are with crimes, whether they be in my city or yours. There are too many in both. But don't you think it would be more becoming to you as a publisher to concentrate your clean-up campaigns on New York's backyard rather than Birmingham's? A Negro woman once said: 'When you point your finger at others, remember you have three fingers pointing back at yourself.'"

Mrs. Lillou B. McCain.

[From the Birmingham News, Apr. 19, 1960]

"Southern Yankee" Says South Best for Family

Below is a copy of a letter to the editor of the New York Times:

"I am a 'southern Yankee,' born and raised 'back of the yards' in one of the toughest sections of Chicago. I lived 12 years in Birmingham, Ala., and have been in the South for more than 15 years. Having lived a long time in both sections of the country, I can honestly say the South is the best place to raise a family.

"I feel that the Negro in the South is a lot better off than he is in the North. I can remember some of the race riots, the crime, the squalor of the Negro sections in the great 'melting pot' of the Midwest. Sit-in demonstrations are nothing new. Check Chicago newspaper records and you will find that the same thing was pulled in the restaurants in Marshall Field's shortly after World War II. It took Field's 3 or 4 months to break this practice up but they succeeded. As far as I can see, the North tends to like the Negro as a race and despise him as an individual. The reverse is true in the South.

"Harrison E. Salisbury fails to mention some of the good things done for the Negro in Birmingham. A Protestant, a Catholic, and a Jew, all outstanding men in their churches and in the civic life of Birmingham, were cochairmen of the fund-raising drive to build a Negro hospital to be operated by Catholic nuns. The drive was a success. In this small city of Andalusia, we're building a new Negro grammar school and a new Negro high school. Race relations in Andalusia are excellent.

"I commend Police Commissioners L. B. Sullivan, of Montgomery, and Eugene 'Bull' Connor, of Birmingham, for taking strong steps to prevent race riots and possible bloodshed in these two cities. Riots and bloodshed in the South are just what the leaders of CORE and NAACP want to stimulate the flow of white sucker greenbacks into their personal coffers.

"Whites and blacks alike tend to mix with people in their own economic and social position. Integration cannot be legislated. Integration in schools inevitably will lead to intermarriage. I certainly don't want my four little 'rebels' to mix socially with Negroes.

"So, let's quit painting such distorted pictures of the Negro in the South. Of course, we have our 'knuckleheads' just as you have. Let the South work out its problems peacefully.

"You sure don't see these vote-hungry politicians, who are trying to shove integration down the throat of the South, sending their kids to integrated schools, or permitting their children to mix socially with Negroes."

C. T. Kelly.

[From the Birmingham News, Apr. 19, 1960]

Some Questions for Salisbury

I have sent the following to Harrison E. Salisbury, of the New York Times:

"Birmingham, Ala., has been my home for the past 12 years and although I am 'white' I have never worn a hood, carried a weapon, nor attacked any member of any race. I have resided on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line and it has been my experience that there is, if anything, less race hate in Alabama than in many other of our illustrious States in which it has been my privilege to reside.

"From your article, I assume that you spent only a few hours in our city. Had you looked beyond the nose on your face you could not have written such a gross untruth. You came here with one thought in mind: To look up all the dirt you could find to print to promote sales. You have not only insulted the citizens of Birmingham, you have insulted the intelligence of your own readers by expecting them to be so gullible as to believe such misquoted and misguided information as you have printed.

"I feel sure that any out-of-town reporter could go into New York City and walk down one street, 'the Bowery,' and review your own newspaper for the past 18 months and write several pages of dirt without using half your imagination.

"One of the direct misquotes of your article was, 'A drive is on to forbid Negro music on "white" radio stations.' Several days ago a reporter for the Birmingham News, Roger Thames, made the comment in his daily article that in his opinion there were many people in Birmingham who preferred popular, swing-type music as opposed to rock and roll and rhythm and blues. He specifically stated that he was not making reference to music presented by Negroes but to a general type of music which he referred to as 'hollering.' He further commented that he personally was all for good Negro performers such as, and he named Nat King Cole, Marian Anderson, Mahalia Jackson, and Harry Belafonte. His article could not even be broadly construed as a drive to forbid anything. He merely stated his musical preference and invited his readers to state theirs.

"We here in Birmingham have been and are proud of the fact that we have not had the racial problems that other cities in the South have experienced. Although you imply that this is due to suppression, I know that this is due to the fact that our Negro as well as our white citizens are trying to use a sensible approach to this problem rather than be influenced by radical, communistic thinking organizations.

"True, we have 'Bull' (Connor) and, although his words were reported out of context, he has made many statements that you take for fact that we here in Birmingham find to be the amusing ramplings of a little man trying to carry a big stick. You and your readers may be assured that this little man does not run in Birmingham. Your city has had its share of politicians and can, therefore, understand our feelings regarding them.

"You have taken one small minority group and exploited their actions as the actions and feelings over 600,000 people. To use the words of one of the Negroes that you interviewed, 'Don't they know there is a limit to what people will stand?' You say and I quote, 'No New Yorker can readily measure the climate of Birmingham today.' Undoubtedly this includes yourself. There are two sides to every issue and your one-sided report of Birmingham brings to mind the fairy tale entitled 'Chicken Little.' An acorn fell on someone's head and you cry the sky is falling.

"People who live in glass houses • • •

"Let he who is without sin • • •

"I ask you these questions in rebuttal: Are there any tapped phones in New York? Are there people there who prefer good music as opposed to rock and roll? Were there any swastikas painted on Jewish buildings in New York?. Are there any slums? Any radicals? Are there immigrants such as the Puerto Ricans who live in segregated sections of your city? Could any citizen of the United States walk into the Stork Club and demand service? Do you have any vagrancy laws? Any crooked politicians? Has anyone ever been beaten or raped in New York? Do you condone the action just because it happened there? Can you show me one Negro's picture in the society section of the New York Times? Could this be segregation on their part?

"Congratulations, I know you are proud of yourself and of the 'good' that you have done."

Paul Williams.

Employment Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the administration's concern for underdeveloped areas in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East is commendable. Its lack of concern for our own domestic needs here at home is lamentable.

Just recently the Secretary of State rebuked the President of South Korea and urged its President to end repressive measures unsuited to a democracy.

Think of the hundreds of millions of dollars that up to now have been poured into that country in foreign aid. The South Korean situation is just another dismal example of the wasteful failure of our foreign aid program to win friends and bolster democracy throughout the world.

Such waste, however, seems perfectly acceptable to the President. He goes so far as to urge the Nation in prepared television talks to support his foreign aid requests. But when it comes to programs designed to fill our own needs here at home he remains distantly silent at his farm, golf course, or hunting lodge. And when he does speak or act it is to thwart congressional action designed to solve our domestic problems.

One of our most serious problems is that of persistent, chronic unemployment. A measure designed to alleviate this problem—the Area Redevelopment Act—was vetoed by the President in 1958. A similar measure now pending in the Rules Committee is under threat of another veto once it passes the House. Another measure which would do much to provide employment and bolster our economy is the community facilities loan bill which would assist municipalities in the construction of needed public works. Because of administration opposition, action on this measure has been postponed.

The economic danger signals on the horizon, however, make it imperative that Congress act in these two fields. An area redevelopment program would bolster the economies of our distressed areas. The community facilities loan program would provide both employment and needed facilities to financially hard-pressed communities. Taken together they would shore up our economic base and head off the economic hard times that loom ahead according to practically every economic indicator.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial from the New York Times for April 13 entitled "Employment Trends":

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Yesterday's Government report on labor market trends last month is less than pleasant reading. Contrary to normal seasonal fluctuations for March, the number employed fell by a quarter of a million persons, while the number of unemployed rose by 275,000. Moreover, the average work week declined somewhat to 39.6 hours, while the number of persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer rose by 250,000 to 1,217,000. But if the marginal changes last month were in the wrong direction, there is the more important basic fact that even last month well over 64 million Americans had jobs.

The Labor Department's comments on its report properly called attention to the impact of the unusually bad weather which had much of the Nation in bondage during the survey period. Farm employment, in particular, fell to a record low of 4,565,000. Fortunately, the weather this month has been and is likely to continue to be better, and the April statistics will feel the positive influence of the improvement. The fact must be faced, however, that even improved weather is no necessary guarantee that a sharply improved labor market situation will be shown in the next batch of data. The most unhappy augury now has come from the steel industry, whose output has dropped below 80 percent.

Our economy is so large and diversified that even temporary weaknesses in the automobile and steel industries is no necessary harbinger of general difficulty. But certainly the latest data on employment and unemployment, as well as on production trends, suggest that this is a time for increased alertness among economic observers in business and Government. The balance of probability is still in favor of this year being one of the most prosperous in our history. But it would not be inappropriate for those in responsible positions to start thinking about what might be done should the present spotty weaknesses in the economy show signs of becoming cumulative and more general.

Smog To Be Fought Statewide and Nationwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of what appears to me to be a very pertinent and timely editorial treatment of the smog situation in my native State of California—and elsewhere too. The following article appeared on the editorial page of the Los Angeles Examiner on Thursday, April 7, 1960:

HEAVIEST BLOW AGAINST SMOG

Smog will be fought now on a statewide front and soon will be attacked nationally by the automobile manufacturers.

This dramatic breakthrough in the long war against air pollution was made by the California Legislature when the senate passed the Cameron-Richards bill previously adopted by the assembly.

Approval by Governor Brown is assured.

In simplest terms, the law will require new motor vehicles to be equipped with adequate controls over smog-making vapors and exhausts 1 year after the devices have been certified.

In the second year all cars resold must have these devices. After the third year all motor vehicles must meet the requirement. Counties proving they have no smog problem can exempt themselves from the last two provisions.

Authorities in the smog war have been convinced the greatest remaining cause of this menace are the millions of motor vehicles which produce fumes from exhaust and other vapors adding to the pollution that bears the odious name of smog.

The State first must certify the devices to be efficient and economical. Machinery for this will be set up by the law's provisions.

Reports of the automobile engineering staffs have been heartening. Now that a great market like California demands anti-smog action by the manufacturers it is reasonable to assume a giant step has been taken toward national progress.

Smog is by no means a Los Angeles area problem alone. It is a curse of all metropolitan centers in greater or lesser degree. Already it has been recognized as a national menace by the Congress. Countrywide research on a Federal basis in under way.

Action by the California Legislature is a major victory, even though the effect will not be appreciated for a few years.

We are rapidly running out of time in our struggle to keep the air fit for living.

Thousands of tons of pollutants are removed daily from the atmosphere by laws now in force. Without these we would have chaos on heat inversion periods when the air long remains stagnant.

Many persons joined in giving us new legal weapons in this fight.

Supervisor Dorn and his fellow board members spearheaded the plea from Los Angeles County. State Senator Richard Richards, Assemblymen Cameron and Rees were backed by the Los Angeles contingent in the legislature. All these knew our problem at first hand.

But many parts of the State couldn't have cared less.

That is why we give a cordial bow of appreciation to those northern senators who looked beyond the parochial limits of their own districts and perceived the statewide need.

For instance Senator Collier was chairman of the committee which reported out the bill without a dissenting vote. He is from Yreka in the northern mountainous part of the State, far removed from befouled air.

Most credit, however, must go to Governor Brown. He personally backed the bill with all his strength, knowing smog really is a State problem that cannot be solved on a local basis.

Our Way of Saying Thank You to a Man Whose Presence Has Meant Much to City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing in the Thursday, March 31, issue of the Washington County News in which tribute is paid Albert Deermont, a transplanted New Yorker whose time, talents, training, and leadership abilities have been given freely to the Chipley, Fla., community and surrounding areas since 1933. That community will honor Albert Deermont at a dinner on April 29 at which time he will receive recognition for his more than a quarter of a century service as an outstanding civic leader.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington County News, Mar. 31, 1960]

OUR WAY OF SAYING THANK YOU TO A MAN WHOSE PRESENCE HAS MEANT MUCH TO CITY

The Chipley Kiwanis Club a few years ago adopted a custom of honoring some citizen each year for his or her contributions to this community. Receiving the Kiwanis recognition thus far have been L. E. Sellers on the observance of his 30th year as publisher of the Washington County News, the Reverend Lacey McDuffie upon his retirement after 15 years as pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and Lee Wells, who was and remains Chipley's senior merchant and one of the city's senior civic leaders.

This year, the Kiwanians selected Albert Deermont as the recipient for the honor. That was a happy choice—and, we might add, a unanimous one. Few people in Chipley today have made a greater contribution to this community. In the first place, the honoree has been blessed with some outstanding talents and qualities of leadership. But, more important, he never permitted his talents and leadership qualities to become paralyzed by prejudice. Thus, he has "got on" with the job of doing things—in spite of the rest of us sometimes—for Chipley.

A New Yorker by birth, Albert Deermont is a graduate of Cornell University's College of Engineering, class of 1909. He later worked in Cuba and several Latin American countries as an engineer. He came to Chipley in 1933 as manager of the Birmingham, Columubs, & St. Andrew's Bay Railroad. He has made his home here since that time.

Actively interested in the community's progress and welfare, he could always be depended on to furnish help and guidance in community betterment projects.

He has given freely of his time, taken away from an otherwise busy schedule. He was a charter member and later became president of the Kiwanis Club, for example. He served as mayor of Chipley and was instrumental in obtaining and later expanding a hospital for this county. He has helped—and is still helping—to operate that facility by serving on its board of trustees. That board's plans call for still another addition to the hospital. Albert Deermont, within the past few years, has been instrumental in building Falling Waters County Club house and reactivating the golf course.

Extending recognition to such citizens is a worthy custom—and one on which the Kiwanis Club deserves commendation. The 1960 event, like those before it, will include a dinner. It will be held Friday night, April 29. Scores of Chipley area residents will want to join the Kiwanians and their wives in paying tribute to the community's 1960 honoree. It will provide us all an eloquent means of expressing our esteem and saying thank you to a man whose presence has meant much to our community and to most of us as individuals.

Religious Freedom

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present to participate in the excellent discussion of religious freedom in our country which took place on the floor of the House earlier this week. For this reason, I would like at this time to associate myself with them on a subject about which I feel very strongly. To begin with, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a recent letter from one of my constituents along the same lines as Tuesday's debate:

I have personally been very much concerned in recent weeks in regard to the recent publication of the Air Force manual and the incident which received much public attention in regard to the innuendos and implications involved in the use of the various materials which have yet to be proven valid.

Such accusations of the church without absolute proof are indeed a negative contribution to our society and way of life, let alone to speak of the stabilizing force that the church has been from the outset of our country even to the present day.

I am concerned that there will be more investigation and information and consideration of these matters following the Easter holiday of our legislative group and I seek your integrity and moral fortitude in these matters, for this is indeed serious business in which we are engaged.

JOSEPH H. YEAKEL,
Pastor, Fifth Evangelical United Brethren Church.
YORK, PA.

I thank the Reverend Yeakel for his letter and I would like to observe that in my judgment he was being most moderate in his tone. For I might have called the now withdrawn Air Force manual a sordid, shameful and inexcusable abuse of Government power in the wrong direction at the wrong time and against the wrong enemy.

It is my prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the unhappy affair of the Air Force manual is now happily in the past. I suppose the best that one can really hope about going through an experience like this is that we will be a sadder but wiser Nation.

It is, I trust, no longer necessary to din into the Air Force the error of its manuals at this point; but it is perhaps necessary to speak to the men and women who have the same frame of mind as the author in the infamous paragraphs in the manual which labeled the National Council of Churches as "Communist associated."

That sort of thinking seems to me to show contempt for the institution of democracy itself. The target of such a mind is not just the National Council of Churches but thinking people of any sort. For the Christian, if he be a true Christian, must be free to question his government or anyone or anything that does not measure up to the standards of Christianity. If to question government or government action is communistic, then all of us in this Chamber must plead guilty to the charge. If deploring Pearl Harbor, which the Russian Government deplored, or deploring race riots which the Communists have deplored, or holding the same idea as a Communist on a particular subject is to be associated with Communists, then most of us, possibly all of us, might have to wear the label.

Events of the last few months have demonstrated that much as good Americans wish it were otherwise there are still juvenile delinquents among us capable of smearing swastikas on churches and synagogues, and that there are still adult delinquents among us capable of smearing the patriotism and loyalty of good churchmen and honest Americans. It does not cheer one to recognize these ugly facts but, I submit, it does no good to deny their existence or to refuse to admit that they do exist.

I particularly want to pay tribute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the other Members who arranged and participated in the discussion of this important matter. It is my judgment that in the doing they have rendered a great public service. By what they said they have given public demonstration that there are Americans of every creed who clearly recognize and abhor the un-American smear technique inherent in the every word of Air Force Training Manual 45-0050. What is more, the words uttered in the well of the House of Representatives this week demonstrate that such Americans can and are elected to the Congress of the United States and that they come from the four corners of our country and wear the label of both major political parties. As long as this is so we have every reason to hope that America will not be destroyed in the name of Americanism.

Americanism is many things but certainly at its very core it is and always must be freedom. No American can sacrifice any of his freedom without America being less of what it should be. Certainly members of the clergy are no less free Americans than, say, Members of Congress. They have the right, in fact, they have the duty, to speak out on the economic, social, and political issues of our country when those issues involve moral questions. If they fail to do so, they would be something less than good clergymen and, at the same time, something less than the best Americans.

These are days when in another connection there has been much debate about the separation of church and state. This, of course, is the sound fundamental constitutional doctrine upon which this Nation was built and, I pray, it shall always rest. But just as we, as Americans, have a strong belief in the necessity of a separation of the church from the state we, as people, have had an equally strong belief in the importance of the church, the necessity of religion and the essential need for sound moral training in our children and ethical conduct on the part of all citizens in and out of Government. It would be a sad day indeed if America ever reached the point where the church and the state were not in fact separated. It would be an even sadder one should we ever reach the point where the actions of the state were completely divorced from moral and religious considerations.

Whether they realize it or not, those people in and out of the Air Force, in or out of the Congress, who would say or write or do anything which would have the effect of intimidating members of the clergy of any church expressing their views on what they believe to be the true application of the moral law to the social issues of our age are indeed hurting and harming America as much or more than any dedicated Communist could ever hope to do.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in the true spirit of the Easter season we can and should forgive them because surely they know not what they do.

Depressed Areas and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the semiannual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and

Financial Problems reached my desk just 10 days after the U.S. Department of Labor's periodic statistics on the unemployment situation. I am not going to refer to statistics presented in the latter publication because by now every Member of Congress should be familiar with the labor surplus problem.

Committees of both the House and Senate have in recent years conducted studies into the matter of chronic unemployment. The persistence of economic stagnation in numerous areas of this Nation has been a matter of public record. Hardship and privation in surplus labor areas have been recognized by both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, and an urgent need for remedial action has been admitted by spokesmen of both political parties. Yet week after week, month after month, year after year there has been a sabotaging of every honest effort to enact necessary legislation.

Today it is the House Rules Committee that refuses to release the brakes on the rescue train whose cargo is economic assistance assigned to depressed areas. While I am hopeful that this opposition will be dissipated shortly under the continued barrage of criticism from an angry public that has become impatient of the delaying tactics of those responsible Democratic Party leaders, Congress must remain on guard against attempts to encumber this relief mission with the kind of legislative gallimaufry that was used to derail the area development program at a previous session.

Now let us take a look at the goings-on in the Development Loan Fund, as reported by the National Advisory Council. Since its establishment in 1957, Development Loan Fund has made loan commitments amounting to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars for—to quote the report—"economic development in the less-developed areas of the free world."

During the first half of 1959, the most recent period covered in the report, Development Loan Fund has authorized new loans for such projects as: power transmission lines, a gas treating plant, and equipment for charting inland waterways in Pakistan; roads and bridges in Malaya; and what are described as "economic overhead projects" in Uruguay, Haiti, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Chile. For Red Yugoslavia, a total of $14 million was earmarked to assist in financing the purchase of diesel locomotives and the construction of a thermal powerplant.

I ask my colleagues to keep this imponderable situation in mind, whereby vast sums of American funds are made available to friends and foes alike in far-off reaches around the world while U.S. communities are denied a small percentage of such expenditures for the express purpose of getting our own people back to work. If this discrepancy is considered when our area development bill comes to the floor, I cannot understand how a single Member of the House could fail to object to the continued neglect of our own citizens in favor of more favors for those abroad.

A West Virginian Proves American Ingenuity Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today we hear many stories about the lassitude and softness in American life, the loss of our drive and incentive, the decline of rugged individualism.

Particularly singled out for criticism are our younger people, who are said to be without ambition or sense of purpose.

I do not believe this is true—and I would like to call the attention of the House to a shining example that refutes the claims that young Americans no longer can control—or want to control—their own destinies and to make a name for themselves on their own.

A young man from my district, in less than 10 years, starting with a minimum education and absolutely no venture capital, has parlayed his talents and energy into the presidency of a growing electronics and telemetry firm.

And while doing this, he has contributed several valuable developments to our Nation's defense efforts in one of its most critical areas—the science of missilry and missile communications. I believe his success story is worthy of attention.

His name is Wheeler McKendree "Mack" Turner, and he is now only 32 years old. Many of my senior colleagues may remember his father, the late Maj. Francis Turner, who served as assistant to my able predecessor in this seat, the Honorable M. G. Burnside.

Mack, like the young Edison, found academic studies too regimented and confining for his imaginative mind. He did well in school, but preferred to think, tinker, and experiment in his own way. He completed less than 2 years at Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va., before his first invention—a small and highly efficient television antenna—was placed on the market.

Mack left school to work on the promotion and manufacture of the antenna. The small antenna did not prove a commercial success, however—because, as Mack tells it, people regarded a big, unwieldly television antenna on their roofs as a status symbol in those early days of TV—and the business failed, leaving Mack without an income and in debt.

Mack, then living in Milton, W. Va., in my district, decided at that time to move into the mushrooming aircraft and missile industry.

With his wife and child, he loaded all his belongings into an old car and headed west to an uncertain future, not really much unlike the pioneers who trekked westward in frontier days, determined to carve a better life for themselves.

In Texas, he applied for a job at an aircraft plant, and despite the lack of an engineering degree, insisted he be allowed to take engineers' qualification and aptitude tests. He scored so high that he was hired as an engineer.

He stayed on here for a time, learning and absorbing all he could about the intricate communications and electronic systems then being built for supersonic aircraft. But the rigidity of corporation life did not appeal to him, so he transferred to California at a time when the field of missilery was just opening up in earnest.

At a California aircraft plant, Mack began studying the science of telemetry, and recognized the vast benefit to our Nation's strength which could be reaped if accurate, swift systems of communication between earth and a missile in flight could be developed.

After a few years of study, theorizing, testing, and plenty of good hard work in his own garage, Mack unveiled a telemetry system which cut to a tenth the former time required to receive, decode, and assess the signals emitted by a missile.

This was a great contribution to the development of communications in the infant missile industry, and Mack won high praise and reward for his invention.

His profit from this "decommutator" system enabled him at last to throw himself headlong into his favorite subject—full-time research in communications.

With the support and encouragement of a small electronics firm in Santa Barbara, Mack began a program of research which already has meant a great deal to our country's defense effort.

Just recently, he contracted to furnish some of his devices for the most thrilling and promising American space experiment in process today—Project Mercury, which one day will put the first American into space.

In addition, he is near to perfecting a modulating system which will clear away static and any form of interference in radio communications and bring in a human voice loud and clear. This device holds tremendous potential for our air age, for it has widespread application for both civilian and military aircraft. He also is hard at work on further telemetry refinements.

Mack in the meantime has organized and become president of his own firm, Astrometrics, Inc., of Santa Barbara. I expect one day we shall hear even more from this small firm, for its founder is determined to bring about more advancements to make our country more prosperous and strong.

As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, Mr. Speaker, I can attest that America needs all the Mack Turners it can find. In the deadly serious race for missile supremacy and the conquest of space, young men with his devotion and energy are at a premium, and they ought to be encouraged wherever possible to experiment and dream in an atmosphere of freedom and lack of pressure.

As a West Virginian, I am proud of this man's success and achievements—

although I am sorry that since West Virginia is ignored and bypassed by the Defense Department in the allocation of contracts and installations, he could not make his mark in his home State. But I am glad to see this young man doing so much to prove the West Virginians still are characterized by perserverance, independence of action and high ingenuity.

Young men like Mack Turner prove the American dream, the American spirit of adventure are not dead.

Carl Dittmar Still Active at 82 Years of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of Carl Dittmar is that of an old man with a young mind whose life has been rich in varied activities. Much of these activities stem from his lifelong admiration for the teachings of William Jennings Bryan and Henry "Single Tax" George.

After graduating from Stanford University in the 1890's, Dittmar became a correspondent in Sacramento for the San Francisco Chronicle and also reported for the Sacramento Bee. In his late twenties, he became publisher of two legal newspapers, now defunct, in Shasta County, Calif.

Now 82, Dittmar is still active in politics and vigorously defends his position with respect to social credit on any and all occasions.

Following is an article by Carl Dittmar that appeared in the Californian for April 1960:

SOCIAL CREDIT OR CHAOS
(By Carl F. Dittmar)

A knowledge of social credit presupposes some knowledge of bank credit, yet bank credit itself is so new a subject as to have been designated as "Banking Power" in the annual report of the Controller of the Currency as late as 1926. Bankers themselves had not begun to recognize its significance until about the turn of the century.

However, the subject had been boldly set forth at the founding session of the California Bankers' Association in 1890 in Los Angeles when J. P. Widney, president of the University Bank of Los Angeles, warned that the time had come for bankers to give serious consideration to an ominous trend in banking: the substitution of bank credit for money.

What was greatly disturbing to Widney was the fact that whereas the deposit liability of the banks of the Nation had reached the staggering sum of $5 billion, this bookkeeping balance owed to the depositors by the banks was offset by a gold coverage of a scant $100 million, or about 2 percent. (Under the gold standard the depositors could demand payment in gold.) To the assembled bankers he merely pointed out their joint banking insolvency, but his pleas went unheeded. The bankers chose to ignore the warning and they took pains to prevent Widney's scholarly presentation from appearing in the official record of their proceedings.

Widney retired from the banking business. He voluntarily liquidated his bank, thereby escaping the terrific mortality toll that overtook the banks in the depression of the nineties.

It was during those depression years that a young lawyer in Lincoln, Nebr., came up with a solution—Government guarantee of bank deposits. His argument was presented in a thought-provoking little booklet published in 1895 under the title of "Check-Book Money." This pamphlet came to the attention of President McKinley, who appointed the young lawyer controller of the Treasury. In 1924 this man was elected vice president of the United States on the Coolidge ticket, for he was no other than Charles G. (Hell 'n Maria) Dawes.

Another young banker of that period who faced up to the subject of bank credit was Frank A. Vanderlip, who in time was to become president of the powerful National City (Standard Oil) Bank of New York City. Coming up from the ranks of newspaper reporting in Chicago, he went on to author the classic observation that "the American people are a Nation of economic illiterates." Addressing Harvard University students in 1911, he declared that bankers no longer fit the definition of money lenders, but that they had become the suppliers of credit and the creators of the very credit that they supply. A banker accepts the collateral brought to him by a borrower; and the borrower merely exchanges his personal (and less readily negotiable) credit for the banker's highly negotiable bank credit.

It is by this simple process that the banks of today have provided themselves with the grand total of $200 billion in deposits. These so-called deposits are our primary medium of exchange, for bank credit is our only lawful money. It is so noted on the face of every Federal Reserve note. Thus, even a Federal Reserve note itself becomes a mere deposit slip of token currency, although full legal tender.

The critical world situation of the moment makes it imperative that the people of our democracy come to a greater understanding of the subject of money and banking. The times are too perilous for anything less than brutal frankness.

Social credit has made more progress in Canada than in any other country. The Canadian Social Credit Party's platform calls for a Federal old age pension of $100 per month per person. Why is social credit such a lively issue in Canada and yet so dead in the United States?

The answer goes back to the depression of the 1930's. At that time the United States took two steps to rehabilitate and stabilize banking: The abolition of the gold standard and the guarantee of bank deposits. Canada went much further. The country's central banking system was nationalized, which would be analogous to our Government's taking over the Federal Reserve System.

The nationalization of the Bank of Canada provided the threshold for social credit, which made its first appearance in 1943 in the form of the family allowance program. Under this program Canada's children, from birth to the compulsory education age ceiling of 16, are endowed with a Federal monthly income of $5 to $8 per month, according to age. There is no means test. All children are included. The program is a virtual school subsidy.

The second Canada-wide application of social credit came in 1951 in the form of a Federal old age pension of $40 per month for everyone reaching 70—again, free from any means test. All citizens with 20 years' residence are eligible. Later, parliament upped the amount to $55 plus an additional amount to be matched dollar for dollar with the individual provinces. There is no property qualification. There is no income restriction. The beneficiary may continue to work, earn money and still receive the pension.

Six nations are now declaring dividends to their citizens. The two nations that have ventured the farthest and are making the largest distribution per capita are Canada and Germany. And their currencies are the ones that are most sought in the money exchanges of the free world.

It is in the field of social credit that communism has thus far been winning the battles of the cold war. For it lies in the power the Communists exert by the ownership of their central banks. A Russian soldier, like an American soldier, is paid in a government bank check cashable at any bank. But the Russian bank check is written against a reservoir of social credit, whereas the American bank check is written against bank credit created and controlled by a privately owned central banking system. This war of bank credit can never be won until the U.S. Government takes over ownership and operation of the central banking system, or the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

The economies of the free world are geared to the American dollar, and it would be a sad day for freedom if the neutral nations should turn toward the ruble as a more stable measure of value. What the situation demands is a stable dollar. Admittedly, a stable dollar does require a balanced budget, but a balanced budget does not require a policy of tight money. To the contrary, the real requirement is easy money.

Better drench the economy with purchasing power (social credit), at the same time establishing a balanced budget by taxing out of circulation exactly the amount that has been poured in. For human beings, too, must have money to balance their budgets.

Puerto Rican Democrats Move Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of April 6, page A3065, under the title "Democrats or Campocrats in Puerto Rico?" I discussed the current struggle between two factions in Democratic ranks in Puerto Rico and the real cause behind that rift. I stated that certain powerful elements are evidently not anxious to have a growing and active Democratic Party on the island which advocates strong ties with the Democratic Party on the mainland.

I regret that Governor Muñoz-Marín and the leaders of his Popular Democratic Party are not aware of the mood of the rank and file of the Puerto Rican people who desire to associate themselves with the Democratic Party of the mainland and with the idea of statehood. The fact of the matter is that when the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico, headed by my good friend Jose A. Benitez, met in a convention on April 11 at San Juan, no less than 1,125 delegates attended and endorsed a statehood plank in their platform.

Perhaps the most interesting development was that the day after the convention, Mr. Enrique Campos del Toro, president of the dissident group known

as Campocrats, resigned as leader of the group with the statement that he desires to "thus put an end to a disagreeable incident in my life." In this way, he refused to work with this dummy group which claims to be the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico.

In my statement of April 6, I predicted that the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico, under the able leadership of Mr. Benitez, will grow up as a strong and influential party in the interests of the people. I now wish to add to that conviction:

I strongly believe that the Popular Democratic Party, which is not the party of the people, will decline in influence and ultimately also in power. The people are tired of the men associated with this group.

Likewise, the Independence Party, which is advocating independence for Puerto Rico and a complete breakaway from the United States, is losing support rapidly and will eventually disappear from the scene or become a most ineffective group.

There will then remain two major groups in Puerto Rico, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, both advocating statehood and both maintaining ties with the two major political parties on the mainland. Such must be the logical sequence of events, and it will only emphasize Puerto Rican ripeness for statehood.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert into the RECORD two news items from the San Juan Star of April 11 and 12, entitled "Benicrats Endorse Plank on Statehood" and "Campos Quits as President of Campocrat Dem Faction," which describe some of the events mentioned above.

[From the San Juan Star, Apr. 11, 1960]

BENICRATS ENDORSE PLANK ON STATEHOOD

(By A. W. Maldonado)

By official count, 1,125 delegates to a Democratic (Benicratic) convention yesterday endorsed a resolution to enter the local elections on a statehood plank.

Benicrat leader Jose A. Benitez also told the assemblage—which met under a bright and burning morning sun at Cobian's Drive-In Theater on the Rio Piedras-Caguas Highway—that the National Democratic Party will be the only party in the United States with statehood for Puerto Rico in its platform.

He predicted only the National Democratic could bring Puerto Rico statehood.

"If NIXON becomes President," Benitez said, "forget about statehood." He characterized NIXON as being great friends with Governor Muñoz, who is, Benitez said, the greatest enemy of statehood.

The Benicrats also expelled from their ranks the already dissident members who joined in the formation of another Democratic Party faction, the "Campocrats," under the leadership of banker Enrique Campos del Toro. The assemblage yesterday described the meeting in which the Campocrats were formed as clandestine, unauthorized, null and void. The Campocrats faction is composed largely of members of Governor Munoz' Popular Democratic Party.

The Benicrats said yesterday that the Benicrats who became Campocrats were betraying their ideals.

Dr. Carlos E. Chardon, Benicrat candidate for Governor, delivered a speech attacking Governor Muñoz and his party for attempting to stay perpetually in power.

"Nothing is more dangerous than allowing an individual to stay in power for a long time," Chardon said.

"It can be said that there have been many hoaxes—but the greatest of these is the so-called commonwealth status which has been an instrument to perpetuate a government much longer than should be allowed in a democracy."

Another resolution was passed repudiating the censure or protest of President Eisenhower by Governor Muñoz and the legislature for alleged interference in local politics.

A discussion arose when a resolution calling for statehood as the principle objective of the Democratic Party was presented. The resolution originally read statehood "when justified by the economic conditions," but that phrase was eliminated when a delegate protested that "statehood when economic conditions permit" is the policy stated by Governor Muñoz which is interpreted by many as meaning "statehood never." At the beginning of the convention cables were read from former President Harry S Truman, Senator John Kennedy, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator George Smathers, and Senator Stuart Symington, sending regrets that they could not attend the convention.

[From the San Juan Star, Apr. 12, 1960]

CAMPOS QUITS AS PRESIDENT OF CAMPOCRAT DEMOCRATIC FACTION

Enrique Campos del Toro resigned yesterday as president of the Campocrats, the local Democratic Party faction formed recently to combat the Benicrats, led by statehood advocate Jose A. Benitez.

"I believe I should resign and thus put an end to a disagreeable incident in my life," Campos del Toro said in a statement.

Campos del Toro, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association, reaffirmed his support of Commonwealth status, the main flank of the offshoot Democratic committee, but repeated that he thinks there should be room for discussion of statehood within the Popular Democratic Party.

It was members of that party who were behind the formation of the new group at an assembly March 27.

MANY BELIEVE IN STATEHOOD

"Following the assembly, a friend of mine, Harold Lidin, a reporter for the San Juan Star, visited me and I told him, and I now repeat it, that there are many Popularies who believe in Statehood and [they] have a legitimate right to discuss and advocate their ideas within the Popular Party," Campos del Toro said.

It was this stand that led to Campos del Toro's being criticized on the floor of the House of Representatives by Representative Jorge Font Saldaña, a Popular, as "irresponsible, imprudent, and inconsistent."

In announcing his resignation, Campos del Toro, said "My criteria on the right of free discussion of ideas is invariable and this, having been the motive for expressions of sour and vexatious controversies which have reached the floor of the house of representatives, where I was made the object of a personal attack, I believe I should resign."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

3490

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate committee reported Treasury-Post Office appropriations.
House cleared civil rights bill for the President and passed the Mutual Security Program authorization bill.
See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7855–7874

Bills Introduced: Six bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3400–3405. Pages 7858–7859

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 10569, fiscal 1961 appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the U.S. Tax Court, with amendments (S. Rept. 1282);

H. Con. Res. 582, expressing congressional approval of disposal of 470,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile (S. Rept. 1283);

S. 3019, providing for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, with amendments (S. Rept. 1284); and

S. 1781, to establish cooperative research and training programs for fish and wildlife resources, with amendments (S. Rept. 1285). Page 7858

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 7855

D.C. Motor Safety: Senate continued on S. 2131, to amend in several respects the D.C. Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act. Page 7874

Nepalese King: Acting majority leader announced that on Thursday, April 28, there will be a joint meeting of Congress in the Hall of the House to hear an address by the King of Nepal. Page 7855

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Courtland D. Perkins, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Maj. Gen. William A. Carter to be Governor of the Canal Zone; and numerous nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Pages 7889–7890

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:23 p.m. until noon Monday, April 25, when its unfinished business will be S. 2131, D.C. Motor Safety Act amendments. Senate will attend a joint meeting with House in the Hall of the House to hear an address by President De Gaulle, of France. Page 7889

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

WHEAT PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee concluded its hearings on proposed wheat programs after hearing testimony from Herschel D. Newsom, master, and Joseph Parker, both of the National Grange; John A. Baker, National Farmers Union; Anthony C. Owens, of Minneapolis, and Charles B. Knappen, Jr., of Augusta, Mich., both of the National Soft Wheat Millers Association; Claude Bell, Rawlins County Wheat Producers, McDonald, Kans.; John G. Kite, Cheyenne County Wheat Producers, St. Francis, Kans.; and Russell Duncan, of Fargo, N. Dak.

Committee will begin executive consideration of this matter on Tuesday, April 26.

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Continuing its hearings on fiscal 1961 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, subcommittee received testimony from Senators Allott and Carroll; and the following Agriculture Department officials in behalf of funds for their respective departments: Assistant Secretary Clarence L. Miller, and Max Myers, Administrator, Foreign Agriculture Service; Alex C. Caldwell, Deputy Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority; and Assistant Secretary Marvin L. McLain, and Clarence D. Palmby, Acting Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, and Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, who was accompanied by his associates.

In addition to those listed as having testified on this matter on Wednesday, April 20, was Senator O'Mahoney.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—TREASURY-POST OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 10569, fiscal 1961 appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the U.S. Tax Court. As approved, the bill would provide $4,877,014,000, an increase of $81,600,000 over the House-passed total of $4,795,414,000.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported H. Con. Res. 582, expressing congressional approval of disposal of 470,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile; and the nominations of Courtland D. Perkins,

Appendix

Movement of Household Goods Owned by Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at meetings sponsored by the Department of Defense on April 4 and April 5, issues relating to the distribution of business to movers of household goods were discussed and debated. The focal point of the discussions was a new proposed directive, prepared through the cooperative efforts of the moving industry and the Department of Defense.

One of the statements made during the meetings was prepared and delivered by Mr. Russell E. Garrett, chairman of the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic. In the course of the statement to which I refer, Mr. Garrett refers to the democratic process "as a technique for exchanging views in the market-place of ideas," and to education as "a continuing dialog." His remarks were made in this spirit.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement, dated April 4, by Mr. Russell E. Garrett, chairman of the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY RUSSELL E. GARRETT, CHAIRMAN OF THE MOVERS COMMITTEE FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

My name is Russell E. Garrett. I am an officer of the John F. Ivory Storage Co. of Detroit, Mich., and I presently act as chairman of the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic.

Of all of the industry activities in which I have been engaged, I regard my participation, as a member of the Ad Hoc Industry Advisory Committee of the DOD at the most important. I must acknowledge that this has been a fruitful as well as stimulating experience. I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation to Dr. Gayton E. Germane, Director for Transportation Policy, Department of Defense, General Morris, Executive Director of the Military Traffic Management Agency, and to their colleagues who have guided our deliberations.

I should like to discuss the proposed directive briefly and to state first, the areas of agreement; second, to describe the matters on which we tentatively reserve judgment; and third, to point up issues which are still to be resolved.

It is no secret that a vast, if not preponderant, segment of the household goods industry, opposed Directive 4500.26. It is equally obvious that an overwhelming majority of the industry supported and urged retention of DOD 4500.13.

But we are realists. We recognize that in a government of laws, regulations, like people, are not perfect. A progressive governmental policy is viable; it must and does respond to the lessons of experience and to the needs of the people whom the Government must protect and serve.

Someone has said that education is a continuing dialogue and I like to think of the democratic process as a technique for exchanging views in the marketplace of ideas.

There is, as you know, a Gresham's law in economics which says, in substance, that bad currency drives good currency out of the market. In a democracy, fortunately, the movement is reversed. If Gresham's law is applied to political science, one must say that good ideas drive poor ideas out of the marketplace. And this is what has happened in our discussions about the business of transporting household goods for military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense.

I must admit that we did not attain all we hope for. I concede that we have reconciled opinions and views which we once believed were incapable of compromise. Nevertheless, guided by a sense of responsibility to the Government, a conviction about the impartiality of the Government officers and a recognition that we must live and work together, we were determined to reach a point of mutual adjustment.

I hasten to add that we were not in conflict on all points. Our committee, representatives of the Big Four, the forwarders, the Movers Conference of America, and the Government were equally dedicated to the view that movers must provide high quality of service for defense personnel and their dependents. We were as one in our belief that the Government is entitled to full value for the dollars it pays for the services we provide. No one argued, nor could it be argued that irresponsible movers were entitled to share the benefits of Government business without assuming the grave responsibilities which are inherent in every relationship between the Government and private business.

We had our sharp differences, of course, btu these reflected merely disagreement over the method of achieving a commonly approved goal.

For reasons which we expounded at length at other times, we opposed any attempt to subvert the principle of equitable rotation of Government traffic. We believed that Directive 4500.26 was fraught with grave danger, not alone to the small independent movers, but to the Government itself. It was on this basis that we attempted to persuade representatives of the Government as well as that limited number of movers who held a contrary view that any program which looked toward the elimination of the rotation system would be unrealistic and inequitable. On this basic concept, I think good sense prevailed.

A directive has now been formulated which in its basic philosophy preserves the principle of equitable rotation without sacrificing the primary objective of high quality of service. To be sure, it does not give us exactly what we wanted. But we are convinced that our industry can live with the provisions of the directive provided the directive is carefully implemented. There are, however, some qualifications and reservations and I shall try to outline the reasons which prompt them.

Let me indicate first what we feel are unimpeachable provisions of the directive. First, we approve the stated objective of the directive, namely, to assure high quality of service to military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. We agree that they are entitled to transportation of their household goods at the lowest overall cost to the Government.

Second, we approve so much of the directive which limits consideration of comparative costs to a comparison between different modes of transportation.

Third, we approve the specification of criteria for quality of service, even though we should like to know more about what the term "other relevant information" means. But we assume that this phrase will be construed reasonably so as to be related to the specific standards set forth in the directive.

Fourth, we approve the nonuse of carriers who have failed to meet reasonable standards of performance or who have committed acts commonly regarded as unethical, provided that they be given a reasonably opportunity to meet and refute the charges or correct any deficiencies.

Fifth, we approve the basis on which storage in transit will be used.

Sixth, we approve so much of the provisions relating to implementation as sets forth the method of assuring compliance with the regulation, the negotiation for services, the use of service tenders and the processing thereof, and the appointment of a single manager for traffic management on the basis outlined in the directive.

This brings me to the second category: provisions to which we do not accord absolute and unqualified approval. I refer first to the provision which empowers the single manager for traffic management to implement the directive by prescribing various standards or procedures. Of course, the directive prescribes that the manager will consult with industry representatives, among others: we would suggest, however, that as a matter of good administrative practice, all standards or procedures should be formualted in writing, circulated among interested parties and that the latter be given a reasonable opportunity to submit their views in writing. Ex parte representations, private conferences, and meetings should be absolutely banned. Recent publicity concerning ex parte negotiations and alleged efforts to influence governmental action should be sufficient to alert every agency and private business to the dangers which informal procedures create. Honest men should have no objection to a public statement of their views and an opportunity on the part of others to critically evaluate, and comment upon them.

I do not suggest a debating society or resort to judicial procedures. The manager for traffic management should be free to act on the basis of the information supplied to him. Once a regulation or rule is adopted, efforts to secure a change should be restricted to open and public persuasion rather than pressure tactics, either official or unofficial.

Small business is best protected when ideas are freely exchanged and the opportunities for pressure are minimized if not wholly eliminated.

Second. Another matter on which we do not announce unqualified approval is the provision relating to evidence of satisfactory transportation equipment and financial responsibility and reliability. We think that this should be spelled out more fully in the directive or, at the very least, by an implementing regulation circulated in the manner to which I have previously referred. In no event should these standards be violative of the spirit and basic purpose of the directive.

Third. The reference in the directive to "lowest overall cost" should be clarified so as to make certain that carriers will not be faced with the prospect of unlimited common law liability as a condition for qualifying. It is a matter of which one must take judicial notice that household goods transportation produces claims almost as inevitably as the rise and setting of the sun A marred and scratched table which has been a hidden eyesore in the dark corner of one's home somehow becomes an heirloom and the occasion for strident complaint by the householder when the table is exposed to the light of sun in the new home.

In the civilian field, many movers will tell you that customers sometimes seek to recover the cost of transportation through reimbursement for claims. In some cases, this art has been refined so that the householder recovers a profit—or at least tries to. A few military and civilian personnel of the DOD sometimes lose their special and unique character when the transportation of household goods is involved and act like certain other householders mentioned above. Claims as factor of cost should be defined by implementing regulations carefully planned by the Government with the aid of industry and providing a reasonable opportunity to movers who are charged with claims to adjust and review them. All claims would be filed with the mover and the Government concurrently. No claim for loss and damage should be settled until investigation has been completed.

Finally, we do not unqualifiedly approve the provision which authorized the veto of a carrier or the sanction or preference. Of course, if the prior unsatisfactory service is specified in writing such carrier should not be considered for that particular service only—and I add this proviso—only when an impartial review of the complaint satisfies the transportation officer that the complaint was justified and that the service was in fact unsatisfactory, measured against commonly accepted standards of satisfactory service in the household goods transportation field. Frankly, we do not want to see military personnel, influenced by aggressive advertising and snide reference to fly-by-night carriers so that an inconsequential complaint is magnified into a Federal case and is employed as a basis for rejecting a carrier.

In this connection, we do not oppose the principle of preference so long as it does not violate the basic policy of rotation. With these comments I am authorized to say that our committee accepts the provisions of the proposed directive which I have just discussed.

Now, this leads me to the last category, namely, the provisions of the directive with respect to which our approval is studiously qualified. I refer specifically to the bonus provision in the new directive. In essence, the directive provides for the offer of additional nonrotation shipments to lowest cost carriers who have given exceptionally high quality service. This provision is a highly complex one. For one thing, it could, in practical effect, defeat the whole concept of rotation. If a large volume of additional shipments are offered to lowest cost carriers who allegedly provide outstanding service, what may be left may not be worth handling. There is a theory that when there is one loaf of bread it must be divided among all persons at the table. But if a large part of the loaf has been devoured, the number of persons at the table is exceedingly large, everyone receives a slice but the slice is so thin that everyone starves to death. This could conceivably happen in this field. We suggest, therefore, a fixed maximum bonus percentage be established in the directive itself and that additional nonrotation business, if any, be offered only on a fixed periodic basis, and shall be noncumulative. In other words, if under the directive, additional nonrotation business is limited to a maximum of 10 percent of the traffic awarded to a carrier during the specified period and the favored carrier, in any one month, actually receives 7 percent, he would not carry over a credit of 3 percent in the succeeding month. I urge that this principle be written into the directive.

The standards for determining "exceptionally high quality of service," should be the subject matter of implementing regulations which are specific, concrete, and easily understood. Like other implementing regulations, they should be circulated and the views of the industry considered before they become effective.

Let me suggest, finally, in this connection, the standards for eligibility should not be fixed on such a basis that only a limited number of movers can qualify, nor should the standards be so unrealistic that only a handful can meet them. In short, the standard for service should comport with the experience of the industry. Little movers operating in elegant vans driven by chauffeurs in casual outfits rather than attractive uniforms and who do not provide brochures, pamphlets, written instructions, and glamour provide, in many instances, the best service that householders can receive anywhere. Each of us in the industry have received accolades and brickbats. A poor job can be performed by a large company just as easily as it is by a small company. Hence, whatever standards are employed to measure "outstanding quality of service" should be attainable by all movers. This is only another way of saying that it must be practical and realistic. The standards must be clearly designed so that the subjective reactions of transportation officers will be minimized if not entirely eliminated.

I have tried to summarize briefly the views of all of the people whom we represent. I cannot say to you that there is unanimity of approval. I cannot say that there is unanimity of disapproval. We are a democratic group and we encourage divergent views and differences of opinions. What I tried to do is reconcile these views and to say to you, in a word, that we believe you have made a genuine contribution to stability and practical understanding in this field and that your directive reflects a sincere and devoted effort to meet the requirements of the members of our industry without sacrificing the rights of the personnel of the Department of Defense. If some of the suggestions we make are accepted, we should be very pleased. If you reject them, we will proceed with the directive as formulated, give you our fullest cooperation and hope that you will constantly review the operations of the directive and that you will have an open mind and an open heart concerning changes and that we can persuade you that the changes we propose from time to time will serve the best interests of all persons who are concerned with this problem.

On one ground we are all agreed: we all agree that you have done an earnest and selfless job and that you have tried mightily to accommodate all points of view, that you have sympathetically considered our opinions; that your directive is the product of careful thought and analysis. Thank you.

U.S.S. "Patrick Henry" Adds Teeth to Atomic Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 9, David J. Davin covered the commissioning ceremonies of the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry*, our newest Polaris submarine, for his paper, the Willimantic (Conn.) Daily Chronicle.

Mr. Davin's story includes a wealth of interesting detail about the operation of a Polaris submarine. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues with the thought that we should all become familiar with this single most effective deterrent instrument available to the free world.

Mr. Davin's story, which appeared in the Chronicle of April 11, follows:

[From the Willimantic (Conn.) Daily Chronicle, Apr. 11, 1960

U.S.S. "PATRICK HENRY" ADDS TEETH TO ATOMIC NAVY

(By David J. Davin)

With the words, "Mr. Grojean, set the watch," Saturday at 1:20 p.m., the U.S. Navy received the Nation's second nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarine, the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry*, SSB (N) 599.

Cmdr. Harold E. Shear, the *Patrick Henry's* new commanding officer, spoke these words to Lt. Cmdr. Charles D. Grojean, executive officer of the "blue" crew of the new submarine, during commissioning ceremonies at General Dynamics Corp.'s electric boat division, Groton. The words meant for Lieutenant Commander Grojean to station the sailors on duty. And from crew right through to the high stabilizing fin at the after tip, the sleek, new ship is one of the U.S. best answers to some of the questions why we are not in a third world war.

The *Patrick Henry*, named after the colonial man who helped draft the Declaration of Independence, is a unique, awesome, deadly, and strange ship. First, she has two crews—the "blue" and the "gold." Each crew serves under the same skipper Commander Shear, but each has its own 10 officers and 90 enlisted men.

NINE POLARIS SUBS

And the name is somewhat unique. The Navy used to name its submarines after some form of marine life, usually fish, like the dolphin, bluefin, shark. Now the new Navy has names like the *Patrick Henry*, the *George Washington* (first nuclear sub capable of firing the Polaris), the *Theodore Roosevelt*, and the *Thomas A. Edison*, to name but a few. In all, the Navy has authorized nine nuclear Polaris-firing submarines. To date, she has two in commission—the *George Washington* and the *Patrick Henry*.

But the name and dual crew characteristics are the least things that make the *Patrick Henry* unique.

She has three ships inertial navigation systems (SINS).

An early form of the SINS took the U.S.S. *Nautilus* under the North Pole, enabling the world's first nuclear sub to know her position, within very short distances at all times. The SINS aboard the *Patrick Henry* are even more accurate, so that she will always know her exact location.

And the fire control system, the underwater stabilization system, air manufacturing facilities, ship control systems, and the systems maintaining the Polaris itself, plus the ship's conventional torpedo facilities make it unbelievable to the point of awesomeness.

The fire control system, containing over 15,000 transistors, will provide continuous, accurate information to the missile guidance system, despite sea conditions and ship motions.

One huge machine makes oxygen by the electrolysis of water. Another "scrubs" carbon dioxide from the air inside the ship and yet another burns off harmful carbon monoxide to make air reusable. The *Patrick Henry* also makes its own water, which one officer said was always more than enough.

Unlike the first submarine, the U.S.S. *Holland*, delivered by the Electric Boat Co. to the Navy exactly 60 years ago today, the *Patrick Henry* has a control room equipped with two "joy sticks," almost like an airplane. And a gyrostabilizer will hold the ship level in rough seas, virtually eliminating the need for a *Patrick Henry* crew member to hold his plate with one hand to just keep it on the table.

ONCE CALLED BOAT

These are just four of the luxuries the crew of the *Holland* went without. In the old days of submarining, as when the *Holland* was commissioned, the ship (called a boat then) was limited as to the time it could stay submerged. *Holland* had a 10-hour limit, using air trapped in the hull. The *Patrick Henry* can stay under almost indefinitely.

Besides its business systems, the *Patrick Henry* has some pleasure systems aboard. There is a television set in the crew's compartment, along with a nickel jukebox system and stereo tape hi-fi player piped throughout the ship. And there is another hi-fi system located in the officers' wardroom in a rich, soft brown wood cabinet. This, too, plays throughout the ship.

The galley, all stainless steel and electric would make any woman drool. Although designed only to serve the crew of 100, during the final stage of fitting out it was feeding over 200 officers and men. And not a sailor in sight on Saturday looked like he had been away from "mom's" cooking for even a minute.

The old *Holland* carried a crew of seven. The *Patrick Henry* with 100, is not only much bigger but the dual crew arrangement will enable her to stay at sea almost constantly. One crew will always be on the beach, training, or on leave.

And the *Patrick Henry* is considerably larger than the old *Holland*. She is 380 feet long and displaces 5,600 tons. The old *Holland* was only 54 feet long.

All persons who serve or operate around the *Patrick Henry*, or any nuclear submarine, wear film badges while on board. These badges detect any radiation and technicians develop these plates each week. Saturday, prior to commissioning and the beginning of shakedown, ship's officers conducted the press through the sub. All who boarded wore one of these little film badges.

While going aboard, the absence of electric lines, fresh water lines, steam lines, and all the rest of the paraphernalia usually seen running from the dock to a tied-up ship, were noticeably absent. This was because the nuclear reactor was manufacturing the sub's electricity, water, a possible 10,000 gallons per day, heat and air. However, upon departing the ship, Lt. John C. Young, electrical division officer of the "blue" crew and guide for the press group checked the amount of radiation assimilated during our 45-minute tour. He used a small, pencil-like tube he had in his shirt pocket. He reported no one had received radiation while on board.

He took the group as close to the reactor compartment as security regulations permit and said the whole reactor is shielded in lead, making danger almost nil. And should any emergency arise, the whole reactor can be secured and operated from a special manual control compartment.

The *Patrick Henry* is the 11th nuclear sub to go into commission for the United States. However, only it and the *George Washington* are equipped to fire the Polaris. Another sub under construction at Electric Boat, the *Thomas A. Edison* (its keel was laid February 15, 1960), will be the first submarine to be outfitted right from the keel up to fire Polaris. Both the *George Washington* and the *Patrick Henry* were redesigned while under construction to fire the missile.

"TRITON" BIGGEST

To date, the Government has authorized 37 nuclear submarines; 11 have been delivered. Only one, the U.S.S. *Halibut*, is designed to fire guided missiles. (The Polaris is a ballistic missile, controlled from within) The U.S.S. *Triton*, to date, is the biggest. She is 447 feet long, 37 feet in draft, and displaces 5,900 tons. However, *Triton* is a radar picket submarine. The *Thomas A. Edison*, and her sister ships, when completed, displace more than *Triton*—6,900 tons each.

During Saturday's commissioning ceremonies, Rear Adm. L. R. Daspit, commander of the Atlantic Submarine Force, summed up the importance of the nuclear submarine. Paraphrasing Oliver Cromwell, he said, "In today's world, it is necessary to trust in God but keep your deterrent mobile." And mobile is what the atomic-powered sub is.

Main speaker of the ceremonies, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said "A Polaris fleet will be almost immune to surprise attack. Its units will be dispersed, submerged, and moving, over millions of square miles of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic Oceans. Imagine the difficulty of trying to find and destroy such a deterrent. No wonder it has ben compared in difficulty with trying to find a black cat somewhere on a vast and empty plain on a moonless night."

The words "mobility" and "self-sustaining" are almost synonymous with the *Patrick Henry*.

SHERWOOD FOREST

Patrick Henry's real teeth are her 16 Polaris, sold fuel, intermediate range ballistic missiles. The missile, named after the North Star, has a range of 1,200 miles. Each missile, when abroad the ship, will rest in its own "launching pad," a tube about 7 feet in diameter, vertically mounted aft of the sub's sail (once called "conning tower") and extending from the weather deck all the way to the bottom level, 32 feet down. Inside, these tubes are painted light green, and referred to as "Sherwood Forest."

The Polaris tubes on the ship are in two rows of eight each. Each tube has access doors to permit manual servicing of the "bird." However, an electronic brain will automatically maintain the missiles in operational readiness. Each missile and its various subsystems will receive regular checks by a diagnostic computer. If the computer finds a trouble spot, it will trigger an alarm alerting the Navy missile specialists on board.

Each separate ship system such as the SINS, feeds information to the fire-control system. And this system keeps the missile aimed on target. At the end of a countdown, a charge of compressed air will propel the missile out of the tube (if the sub is submerged) through the water, into the atmosphere. Once in the air, the rocket engines take over to drive it and its nuclear warhead to the target. In all, if all 16 missiles were launched, their combined firepower would be more than all the bombs dropped in the Second World War.

This is the newest in America's arsenal of defense, part of her nuclear-powered Navy, the Navy Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh Burke calls "This wonderful Navy of ours."

Interest Rate Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Harold B. Dorsey, which was published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Liberals' Stand Fattens Banks, Hurts Housing Credit."

The article has to do with the interest rate ceiling issue. Mr. Dorsey makes some very pointed remarks in support of the Treasury's position that the ceiling should be lifted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1960]

ECONOMIC VIEW—LIBERALS' STAND FATTENS BANKS, HURTS HOUSING CREDIT

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

This article has been inspired by a statement of Seymour E. Harris published last Wednesday on the editorial page of this newspaper. The opinions expressed by Professor Harris were intended to support the "Congressmen who are not disposed to yield to the President's request for a removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government securities."

Professor Harris is littauer professor of political economy at Harvard University. His comments last week serve a useful purpose insofar as they demonstrate how badly the discussion about the interest rate ceiling has become distorted by political considerations.

Harris chooses to relate the economic growth rate of the 5 years preceding the Eisenhower administration (1947–52)—when, as all economists know, business activity was deriving the maximum stimulation from the pentup demands of the war—with the 7 years during which the present administration has been in office (1952–59)—when, as all economists know, the pent-up demands were losing their stimulating effects. He implies that the slower rate of growth in the latter period was due to tight credit, which in turn implies that credit policies retarded borrowing and spending.

In fact, however, the annual rate of expansion of total public and private debt in the latest 7 years averaged $38.9 billion, which is 41 percent greater than the $27.6 billion annual rate of debt expansion in the preceding 5 years. His implications, therefore, are completely without factual support. And since he has selected politically significant periods for this particular comment, one must conclude that he is putting more weight on political consideration than upon the readily available facts of the matter.

The debt expansion of almost incomprehensible proportions throughout the postwar period—and particularly in the past 7 years—must necessarily have been a factor in any explanation of rising interest rates. Just

like any other commodity, a sharp increase in demand tends to increase the price of that commodity, in this instance the interest rate.

Professor Harris asks: "Why not exploit the 4–5 year market * * * [for the Treasury's credit needs]?

It so happens that the Treasury Department has issued nearly $14.5 billion of new securities in the 4–5-year market since last June. In fact, it was forced by the 4¼-percent ceiling to impose its demand on the short-term and intermediate-term credit markets to such an extent that thousands of small borrowers have had to pay the highest interest rate for their credit needs in over a quarter of a century. This penalty imposed on legitimate private borrowers presented a beautiful melon to the commercial banks which recorded the highest earnings on record in the final quarter of last year and the first quarter of this year.

As might have been expected, the high short-term and intermediate-term interest rates, that were caused in large part by the impingement of the Treasury on these credit markets, attracted savers and encouraged them to pull their funds out of institutions that usually provide credit for the mortgage market. Associations representing the residential construction industry have publicly recognized the resulting reduction in the availability of mortgage credit and the consequent damage that has been imposed on building activity. They are recommending that the 4¼-percent ceiling should be removed.

The Harris article also makes it quite clear that those who are opposing a simple piece of legislation to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds look upon this occasion as an opportunity to impose their own ideas about credit policy on the Federal Reserve. Unless one is uncharitable enough to think that they are trying to take advantage of the situation to impose a minority view upon the majority, then it is difficult to see why they are trying to tie in credit controls with Treasury financing techniques. In the highly respected Douglas report of 1950, Senator DOUGLAS did a magnificent job of proving that Treasury financing must be divorced from national credit policymaking.

Even from a political viewpoint, it is difficult to see what Professor Harris and the liberal group in Congress hope to accomplish for themselves in opposing the legislation that would remove the 4¼-percent ceiling. The experience of the past 9 months has demonstrated very clearly that their attitude has been responsible, to a considerable degree, for the fact that thousands of small borrowers have had to pay unnecessarily high interest rates for their normal credit needs to the benefit of the commercial banks which have been recording the highest earnings on record, and that the residential construction industry and its thousands of workers have been hurt.

It would be my observation that all of these people who are getting hurt are becoming increasingly aware of the group in Congress that is responsible for the unnecessary pain. And it is quite possible that tight credit will once again be imposing the pain in its most acute form next November.

New Pentagon Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is underway at the Pentagon an attempt to give the Defense Department's publicity expert, Assistant Secretary of Defense Murray Snyder, the powers of an advertising czar. I believe the Congress and the public should be aware of the plan. If put into effect, I fear it would do a great deal to prevent intelligent discussion of defense policies which may mean life or death to the United States.

Assistant Secretary Snyder has asked the Army, Navy, and Air Force to comment on a new Defense Department information directive which would give Mr. Snyder the power to censor "controversial' advertising, speeches, or press releases by manufacturers. After the services comment, Secretary of Defense Gates will be asked to put the new order into effect.

Mr. Snyder's new directive consolidates two 1952 directives which set up rules manufacturers must follow to get Defense Department approval for the release of information. No one objects to rules prohibiting the release of military secrets by companies which manufacture defense products. The new directive contains the same rules on military security as did the old directives, but Mr. Snyder's plan goes much further.

The directive which Mr. Snyder is asking the Army, Navy, and Air Force to approve states that defense contractors, in their advertising, speeches, or press releases, cannot make inappropriate claims for the qualities of their products. The Snyder directive states, in section VIII, that manufacturers who make defense material cannot release inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading material. And would the Federal Trade Commission determine whether an advertisement was incomplete? No, this power would be given to Mr. Snyder, who would also decide whether any claims made in advertisements by defense manufacturers were inappropriate.

Mr. Snyder's new directive gives him even more power as an advertising czar. It would prevent a defense contractor from releasing information which could reasonably be interpreted as intended to influence the adoption, revision, or cancellation of plans, programs, or policies of the Government, including legislation. Mr. Snyder, under his new directive, would be the one to decide whether a manufacturer's advertisement could be interpreted to influence legislation.

The Defense Department is spending billions of dollars on the Nation's defense program, but those officials who are spending the tax funds do not want to take into their confidence the American public which must pay the taxes. This plan to censor advertisements by defense manufacturers—a valuable source of information for the public—is another attempt to hide controversy behind a mask of conformity. Following is Mr. Snyder's proposed directive:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to set forth guidelines and procedures for the security review and clearance for public release by defense contractors (including subcontractors) of advertising material and other public information concerning products and services purchased by the Department of Defense.

II. CANCELLATIONS

DOD Directive 5230.3, dated January 18, 1952, and DOD Directive 5230.5, dated September 24, 1953, are hereby canceled.

III. POLICY

Persons and firms furnishing products and services to the Department of Defense (including nonprofit organizations and educational institutions), and officers, employees, representatives, and agents of such persons and firms, shall not release, for public dissemination, information regarding products or services except as authorized in this directive or approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

IV. DELEGATION OF APPROVAL AUTHORITY

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) is hereby named as designee of the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of approving or disapproving requests for clearance of information coming within the scope of this directive, this clearance to be exercised through the Office of Security Review. In appropriate cases decisions shall be made in coordination with the General Counsel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

V. AUTHORIZED ISSUANCES

A. Contractors shall be authorized to release to the public, without advance approval, the following information pertaining to unclassified or classified contracts for products and services purchased by or furnished to the Department of Defense:

1. Statements that a contract has been awarded.

2. The type of product or services involved, in general terms (such as aircraft of standard types, tanks, trucks, ammunition, clothing, construction; or study of a new electronics system or a high altitude research study, etc.), provided the designation of the product or services is not itself classified.

3. With respect to unclassified contracts only, releases may include the name of the Department of Defense contracting office, a brief description of the product or service involved, the quantity of products to be furnished, and the dollar amount.

4. Help-wanted and recruiting information, which does not divulge classified material.

5. A general statement of the kinds and numbers of additional employees which will be required by the facility involved.

6. Announcement of subcontracting opportunities for unclassified subcontracts, providing no classified material is made public concerning the prime contract or higher tier subcontracts.

7. With respect to research and development work performed by nonprofit organizations and educational institutions, unclassified information of public or professional interest pertinent to accomplishments under a contract, provided the release of such information is not limited by terms of the contract. The release of unclassified information derived from research and development contracts is encouraged, as the dissemination of such information will accrue to the general benefit of the United States.

8. The specific information, in the specific format previously approved pursuant to VII below.

B. In order that manufacturers holding classified Department of Defense contracts may make state of business reports to stockholders, stock exchanges, etc., the total companywide dollar value of backlog may be released provided:

1. That only the Department of Defense total is used and not broken down by individual military service or item.

2. That the release does not reveal the quantity or volume of individual orders.

3. That the report is not made for period of less than 3 months.

C. In case of doubt as to the releasibility of information pursuant to this paragraph, contractors should follow the procedures of VII below.

VI. ISSUANCES REQUIRING PRIOR APPROVAL

Contractors shall not be authorized to release information other than that set forth in V above without prior approval of the Office of Security Review, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). Paragraph VIII below sets forth those types of releases which will not be approved, and therefore should neither be released nor submitted for approval. Examples of information which may not be released without such approval are:

1. Production schedules, future planning on production schedules, or rates of delivery.
2. Information on sources of supply, quantities and qualities of strategic or critical supplies and movements, assembly or storage of supplies or material.
3. Information on sabotage attempts or plant security measures.
4. Information and research and/or development projects, except as provided in V, A. 7, above.
5. Information on any missiles, nuclear devices or weapons; "BW–CW" agents, materials or weapons; and other new weapons or weapon systems.
6. Information, including any photograph, sketch or plan concerning first models of weapons or equipment, outstanding production achievements, or performance of weapons or equipment.
7. Information on material for shipment to allied governments under MDAP, NATO, etc.
8. Movement of military aircraft or naval vessels. (This restriction is applicable to all cases, including those where actual movement order is unclassified.)

VII. APPROVAL PROCEDURES

A. Persons and firms (including nonprofit organizations and educational institutions) desiring approval to release information other than of the type set forth in V above, shall forward requests for approval in writing to Office of Security Review, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C.

The military departments are authorized to provide in contracts that requests for approval shall be submitted through designated departmental officials or offices. Subcontractors shall forward requests through prime contractors, who shall be responsible for initial screening of submitted material.

B. The information proposed for release shall be attached to the request, precisely in the format and substance desired to be released, including any photographs, sketches, plans, blueprints, models (if practicable), charts, etc., or other art work which are proposed for release.

C. Approvals are restricted to the specific release submitted for approval. Any change whatsoever in format, art work, or substance requires a new approval.

VIII. ISSUANCES WHICH SHALL NOT BE APPROVED

Proposed releases containing the following types of information shall not be approved.

1. Inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading material (e.g., inappropriate claims of operational availability or operational capability of products under research or development or furnished to the Department of Defense).

2. Appraisal of the military effectiveness or ineffectiveness of weapons and weapon systems of the United States or other countries, or discussion of the economic impact of award or cancellation of specific defense contracts, or continuance or discontinuance of specific procurement programs or the military strategy and tactics upon which such programs are based, where, in either case because of timing, content, magnitude, or a combination of any of these elements, release of information could reasonably be interpreted as intended to influence the adoption, revision or cancellation of plans, programs or policies of the Government, including legislation.

3. Discussion of the relative merits of conflicting military strategies and tactics, which may affect the purchase or development of products or services by or for the Defense Department.

4. Classified information, or information pertaining to research, methods, or end products that develop a security classification in an otherwise unclassified contract.

5. Statements concerning movements of military aircraft and naval vessels, unless screened by the responsible commander.

6. Statements concerning qualification, acceptance or approval of products or services furnished to the Department of Defense; that a contractor is the sole supplier of a product or services, or, the percentage of prime contractor's requirements provided by a subcontractor, in terms of quantity or dollar value.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION

A. The following contract clause shall be inserted in all contracts involving research, development, and experimental work, classified contracts, and all other contracts for more than $100,000:

"The contractor shall not release for public dissemination information regarding products or services purchased by the Department of Defense except as authorized or approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee. Procedures for securing approval shall be as set forth in appendix F, Armed Services Procurement Regulation, entitled "Manual for Release of Information by Contractors," issued [date], as said manual may from time to time be amended, which is hereby incorporated by reference with the same force and effect as though fully set forth. The substance of this clause shall be inserted in all subcontracts involving research, development, and experimental work, classified subcontracts, and all other subcontracts for more than $100,000. Authorization or approval for release under this clause shall not be construed to authorize or approve payment for the cost of releasing information."

B. The substance of this directive shall be published in a "Manual for Release of Information by Contractors," and inserted as an appendix to the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

C. Violations of this directive shall be brought to the immediate attention of the Office of Security Review and, as required, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) will consult with the General Counsel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) concerning appropriate action.

X. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective upon receipt.

Yarborough Urges Padre Island Seashore Park Approval by Congress This Session

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us who have been working to establish a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island—America's longest and southernmost natural beach—were encouraged with Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton's recent endorsement of the project, with an 88-mile-long park recreation area.

Secretary Seaton has urged the appropriation of $25 million for acquisition of land for three great seashore recreation parks—Padre Island, Cape Cod, and the Oregon Dunes.

The sands of time and space are running out for America—so far as preserving our national heritage of open beaches is concerned. From the rock-ribbed coast of Maine to the sun-drenched sands of the south tip of Padre Island is a distance of 3,700 miles but only 265 miles of that vast coastline is being permanently preserved for public use in State or national park areas.

A quarter of a century ago, the National Park Service surveyed America's shorelines and at that time recommended that Padre Island be acquired as a national park site. It that recommendation had been carried out, the people would have secured possession of this matchless beach for less than half the price it will cost today. If the Congress fails to act this year, the price on this land will climb higher and much of the choice beach will be permanently lost to public use through private development. I urge action this session, having introduced S. 4 last year to create Padre Island as a national recreation area. Since Secretary Seaton's endorsement of Padre Island two of Texas' finest and most influential daily newspapers—the Houston Post and the Corpus Christi Caller—have published editorials commending his action. I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD: From the Houston Post of April 19, 1960, the editorial "Request by Interior Secretary Boosts Padre Island Park Hopes"; and, from the Corpus Christi Caller, of April 20, 1960, "One More Hurdle Cleared by Padre Park Proposal."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 19, 1960]

REQUESTS BY INTERIOR SECRETARY BOOSTS PADRE ISLAND PARK HOPES

Padre Island is a step nearer preservation for public recreation as a result of a request by the Interior Department that Congress include it, along with Cape Cod in Massachusetts and the Oregon Dunes, in the national park system.

A year ago the Department recommended general legislation on seashore areas, but named no specific areas. It suggested a $15 million limit on the amount to be spent for acquisition and other items.

In the new request, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton increased the limit to $25 million. In a letter to the Senate Interior Committee, Seaton said the Department feels that investigations and hearings with respect to Padre Island, Cape Cod, and the Oregon Dunes "have proceeded to the point where arrangements reasonably satisfactory to most of the interested persons can be agreed upon."

He added that the congressional hearings on the three projects "have clearly demonstrated their national significance and the

feasibility of acquiring and protecting them for public inspiration and enjoyment."

It is to be hoped that Congress will act favorably and promptly on the request. In rapidly growing America the need for outdoor public recreational space is becoming serious. At this time only 240 miles of seashore of the Nation's 3,700-mile shoreline is publicly owned. Padre Island, which stretches along the Texas coast from Corpus Christi to Brownsville, would add 90-odd miles to the total.

There has been some development at the southern and northern ends of the island, but most of it is still an area of sand and sparse vegetation which impresses with its beauty virtually all who visit it.

Padre Island can be bought now at a relatively low cost. The cost is not going to decline. It probably will increase if there is much delay in acquiring it. The sooner Congress acts to preserve this natural wonderland for all of the people, the better it will be for ourselves and for posterity.

[From Corpus Christi Caller, Apr. 20, 1960]

ONE MORE HURDLE CLEARED BY PADRE PARK PROPOSAL

Another welcome step forward in the move to create a national seashore area on Padre Island came last week when Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton specifically endorsed the island plan. He recommended to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that a maximum of $25 million be set aside to acquire seashore areas at Cape Cod, Padre Island and Oregon Dunes.

Just 1 year ago Seaton recommended to Congress that not more than $15 million be appropriated to acquire seashore areas, without specifically mentioning the areas recommended. At the time the Indiana The new recommendation from Seaton fol- Dune was one of the sites being considered. lowed a letter sent him last September, signed by Senators LYNDON B. JOHNSON and RALPH YARBOROUGH and Representatives JOHN YOUNG and JOE KILGORE, asking for a specific recommendation for Padre Island.

Secretary Seaton did not, of course, undertake to determine what part of Padre Island should be dedicated as a national seashore area. It is a question that should be referred, when enabling legislation is approved, to the National Parks Service and its advisory committees. The question of area and of location is scarcely one that can be settled satisfactorily in a legislative forum. An enabling act sketched in broad outlines is sufficient.

Milwaukee Brewery Workers Union Supports Reduction of Certain Excise Tax Rates

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution submitted by Brewery Workers Local Union No. 9 of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the automatic reduction of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, gasoline, diesel fuel, cigarettes, and motor-vehicle chassis first imposed during the wartime emergencies of recent memory.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE U.S. CONGRESS TO ALLOW THE AUTOMATIC RATE REDUCTION ON CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATES

Whereas Federal excise taxes were substantially increased to the war tax rate on many manufactured items by the Revenue Act of 1943, 1945, and 1947; and

Whereas these rates were even further increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 for the purpose of a temporary Korean wartime emergency; and

Whereas all excise rates were reduced to prewar tax rates by the Excise Reduction Act of 1954, with the exception of alcoholic beverages, gasoline, diesel fuel, cigarettes, and motor-vehicle chassis, which products continued to be taxed at the highest rate, but were scheduled for automatic reduction on March 31, 1955; and

Whereas the Revenue Acts of 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 continued to postpone the automatic reduction on these items; and

Whereas the Revenue Act of 1959 once more postponed the rate reduction date on these selected items from July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1960; and

Whereas the wartime emergency which occasioned the imposition of the additional excise on these selected items now no longer exists; and

Whereas war tax rates are so high as to substantially reduce sales in a peacetime market; and

Whereas the excessive taxation of these selected products has restricted wages and job opportunities for organized labor in the particular industries manufacturing these goods and has prevented business expansion in these businesses because they could not keep pace with less highly taxed items: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Brewery Workers Local Union No. 9, 2189 North 48th Street, Milwauke, Wis., representing 6,000 workers and members, hereby goes on record as favoring the reduction of these oppressive excises and respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to permit these war tax rates to expire on the scheduled date of June 30, 1960.

Adopted at meeting on April 17, 1960.

JOHN W. SCHMITT,
Recording Secretary, Brewery Workers Local Union No. 9.

"The Shield of Freedom," Is Theme of an Address at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post Home Dedication, Hinton, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Summers County Post No. 4500 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States dedicated its new post home at Hinton, W. Va., in ceremonies held April 23 to 24, 1960. It was my privilege to have been the speaker at the dedication service on this past Sunday.

This post was chartered on October 20, 1945, with 108 charter members. It has grown to over 335 members. The home is a beautiful building with the most modern facilities.

A reception at the home of my friend, Van A. Trail, was held Saturday afternoon for a distinguished American, who is well known to Members of the Congress, Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative and rehabilitation services for veterans of the United States. Mr. Ketchum later delivered the address for the dedication banquet in ceremonies for which Past West Virginia Department Commander Richard G. Homan was the toastmaster.

Also present and participating in the program for the significant dedication banquet and services were David J. Lowery, of Weirton, present West Virginia department commander of the V.F.W. of the United States; Mayor Harold B. Eagle, of Hinton; Post Commander John W. Gilbert; Quartermaster Ovid L. Graham, Jr.; Ladies Auxiliary President Betty Graham; Post Building Committee Chairman Jack E. Lawrence, and the Hinton municipal band. The Reverend S. M. McMurray, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Hinton, gave the invocation.

For the dedication service address, I chose to speak on the subject, "The Shield of Freedom," and of our responsibilities as free citizens to maintain it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my speech on April 24, 1960, at the dedication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 4500 home at Hinton, W. Va.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIELD OF FREEDOM

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 4500, in dedication of their building, Hinton, W. Va., April 24, 1960)

Commander Gilbert, Mrs. Graham, of the ladies auxiliary, and officers and members of Summers County Post No. 4500 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is a privilege to address the membership of such a distinguished post as yours, and the citizens of this community.

Your dedication as individuals and as a group to the ideals of our society is attested to by your record of three consecutive awards as post of the year by your outstanding service in the sponsorship of Boy Scout Troop 115 and Explorer Post 115, in the sponsoring of the Red Cross bloodmobile program, and by your participation in many other charitable and civic efforts.

Your actions have testified to your commitments as men. We now gather for the purpose of dedicating your post home, and for this also we must ask the question as to what larger purpose this structure is dedicated, even as our lives are dedicated.

As a veteran of one or more of our Nation's wars, each of you has given some portion of his life—and some of you have given of your blood and flesh as well—in defense of freedom. Therefore, this afternoon I wish to speak of "the shield of freedom" and of our responsibilities as freemen to maintain it.

As Dr. Karl Menninger said of the virtue of humility which disappears when one lays claim to it, freedom tends to disappear when it is confused with license.

The absolute and unabridged right to do as one pleases and to pursue personal pleasure and profit do not in themselves repre-

sent the liberty of men and women in a free society. For freedom imposes its own obligations upon the citizen. The first of these is to understand the nature of freedom itself, the second to understand the nature of its opponent and the requirements of its defense. It is to the second question that I will direct my remarks.

However, let us first define the face of the evil which currently poses a serious threat to our freedom.

One hundred years ago communism was a theory of history and economics coveted by a handful of men in Europe and England. Some 40 years ago, at the time of the Bolshevik revolution, communism commanded a small but militant force of some 80,000 followers. Today, it claims a total world membership of more than 33 million, with active party units located in 83 nations, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

In addition, while the Soviet Union holds forth the olive branch of peaceful coexistence, international communism, aided by followers working within, has subjugated 17 countries with a population of over 900 million people, or about one-third of those on the planet. While Khrushchev extends the hope of lessening world tensions, his Chinese partners are engaged in shipping contraband arms to north Africa, fomenting disturbances among their neighbors, and threatening the peace of southeast Asia.

Against this malevolent force stand the United States and a coalition of those nations which would preserve and extend the ideals of human freedom and dignity. And since the forces that oppose us respect only power—and the show of power—America must maintain her strength, militarily, economically, politically and morally. This means we can no longer afford the luxury of giving only part-time attention to full-time problems, for the problem of combating Soviet and Chinese imperialism is indeed a full-time assignment which deserves the full application of all our resources. Today, however, let us devote attention largely to the question of our military resources.

Within the present century we have been involved in two major wars and one localized but extremely costly conflict. In each instance our military policy was one of "punishing" an aggressor nation which had disturbed the peace. And in each instance we acted as though all we needed to do was punish the aggressor and peace would be restored, leaving us free to follow our own carefree pursuits. But we have learned through harsh and bitter experience that the uneasy condition of peace is not so easily restored.

It would seem, therefore, that we must reexamine the military policies that have guided our conduct in the wars of this century. We must recognize that the United States has interests that endure beyond the mere punishment of the aggressor nations—interests that involve the basic values and assumptions of Western civilization itself. And these interests—these values—can be maintained only so long as the United States is capable, in alliance with the other free nations of the world, of bringing a countervailing power to bear on the Soviet Union and Communist China, whenever and wherever their imperialistic designs lead them to encroach upon free nations. Such power cannot be provided by an unwise and unrealistic attitude toward our national budget.

Though we all devoutly pray that the proposed series of summit conferences will eventually lead to a world in which all men may live in honor and peace with one another, that time does not seem near at hand.

And until that new day does arrive the United States must maintain sufficient strength—now and in the foreseeable future—to deter the hunger for conquest among the Soviet and Chinese leaders. This cannot be done if we are to be preoccupied solely with a balanced budget. For—as I have said elsewhere—a balanced budget in financial terms may well bring about a deficit budget in larger and more human terms.

For example, a year ago last March, in a memorandum setting forth their views on the budget, the Chiefs of each of the armed services expressed doubt about its adequacy. Typical of their comments was the statement of the then Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, when he reported, "The reservations which I had in mind pertain specifically to four major Army programs. These are (1) Army modernization, (2) the antimissile missile program, (3) the personnel strength of the Active Army and Reserve forces, and (4) the Army surface-to-air missile program." The Chiefs of each of the other services expressed similar concern about the adequacy of the allotment for his own branch.

There is a growing criticism from experts in the field of science, from our military authorities, from economists and leading business executives, and from leaders in Congress, of our inadequate defense level. While it is true, as the President avers, that the present deterrence of mutual terror prevails, what of 3 or 4 years from today? There are those who maintain that Russia—at the present rate of development—will have a 3-to-1 superiority over us in intercontinental ballistic missiles. By thus deliberately conceding a missile superiority to the Kremlin, we are gambling with the future and gravely limiting the range of our present diplomacy.

There are those in authority who proclaim that we have sufficient strength to devastate the country of any aggressor. That may well be true. But our primary strategy must be the deterring of a strategic attack, not the "winning" of a strategic war.

While it is undeniable that for security reasons many policy and strategic decisions must remain secret, there are certain areas of determination that bear upon the question of national survival and which are rightly matters for public scrutiny. Among the vital matters concerning which policy and strategic decisions must be made, and about which the American citizens are entitled to adequate information and assurances, are these:

The question of relying almost exclusively on nuclear deterrent forces, the matter of a balanced defensive arsenal, the almost complete neglect of realistic civil defense measures which would make our deterrent intent more believable, and, finally, the power of the Bureau of the Budget over defense decisions.

These questions are not answered merely by imputing a partisan and political bias to all who question the wisdom of our current defense policies.

Military history is studded with instances of professional military men having failed to grasp the significance of new elements of strategic or tactical value. There have been, for example, such occasions as the rejection of the tank by French Army generals before World War I, the rejection by our own Army of the thesis of airpower propounded by Gen. Billy Mitchell in the 1920's, and the resistance of our battleship admirals to the development of aircraft carriers before World War II. These are but a few of the incidents which provide illustrations that a lifetime in the military service is no guarantee of infallibility.

One might further add that some of the most penetrating criticisms of present defense policies have originated from men who have also devoted their lives to our national defense and who have been much more closely associated and intimately involved with it during the past 10 years than has the President. One of the most notable is retired Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who recently stated before a joint hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Aeronautical and Space Science Committee that, "The trend of relative military strength is against us. Our manned bomber force is a dwindling military asset. Our long-range missile force is limited in size, uncertain in reliability, and immobile upon exposed bases. We have no antimissile defense in being or in sight. There is no effective fallout protection for our civil population."

Another authoritative critic within his own field is Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr., former vice president of Convair, the major manufacturer of the Atlas intercontinental missile, who resigned his $60,000 a year job with Convair in order, as he stated, "to unclutter my opinions with charges of bias."

Among other statements Mr. Lanphier made before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics was his declaration that the United States is now "engaged, in fact, in the only military phase of World War III we have a chance to win—the deterrent phase—and we are losing it." He then added, "We are losing, for, among other reasons: lack of a sufficient and timely intercontinental ballistic missile program; lack of defense against a submarine attack; lack of a weapons program and policy to deter limited aggression; lack of a sufficient and timely space program, and, above all, lack of recognition that we are and have been for a long time actually engaged in World War III."

Our position in certain vital areas of tactical strength appears no stronger than in those strategic matters I have just cited. For example, as recently as this week—on April 20—Army and Air Force chiefs reported to Congress that the recent war games in the Caribbean revealed that the Nation's military airlift is inadequate and outmoded.

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, chief of the Continental Army Command, and Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, head of the Military Air Transport Service, jointly submitted a formal critique of last month's exercise Big Slam-Puerto Pine—the first major test of the Air Force's ability to rush Army combat forces to an oversea trouble spot. Their report to the House Armed Services Subcommittee included the following statement:

"The limitations of the majority of the present MATS aircraft seriously limit the size of U.S. Forces which can be deployed to distant oversea destinations in acceptable periods of time."

General Tunner further declared that 90 percent of the Military Air Transport Service is obsolescent and "the need for modernization is immediate and critical." Despite such testimony from the men who are best qualified to know, the administration has requested only $50 million in the current budget for the development of new military transport aircraft which might be ready in 3 to 5 years.

One is thus impelled to question what the United States would or could do in the event of another Korea, or even a Lebanon, in which we would be confronted by enemy combat forces.

Finally, almost 2½ years ago, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services issued its report after taking 7,000 pages of testimony. In this report the subcommittee made 17 specific recommendations covering the entire range of our defense system. These recommendations were unanimously approved, not only by the subcommittee, but by every member of the committee itself and endorsed on the basis of testimony from the leading experts throughout the country.

Yet, even at this late date, not enough has been done to implement these recommendations. The excuse has been that we cannot afford them. I say—the leaders of Congress say—and I believe the American people will say that we cannot afford not to have them.

If we cannot afford them under our present system of priorities, then we had better reappraise our standards of priority.

Currently, we are spending 10 percent of our national income on national security. In a recent book by Bernard Brodie, a military historian with the Rand Corp., entitled "Strategy in the Missile Age," it is persuasively argued that we can readily afford to spend 15 percent, and that this sum would perform miracles for the forces, and would also provide a minimum program of fallout shelters surrounding our cities.

As the richest nation in the world, we can afford and we must provide the preservation of those values which alone make our material wealth meaningful. But, in order to achieve such a defensive system, we must have some guiding principles of action other than mere budgetary ones. In closing, I suggest these basic principles:

1. Since we have determined against our fighting a preventive war, we must devote a greater military effort into cutting down drastically the advantage an enemy might derive from a surprise attack. This will call for (a) the reduction of the vulnerability of our own retaliation system; (b) the improvement of our detections systems to reduce the possibility of false alarm; and (c) the reduction of the vulnerability of our present and future defensive systems.

2. Secondly we must provide more substantial conventionally armed forces and the necessary transport for limited war. As Historian Brodie remarked, "There will be time enough to readjust to what is permissible in limited war when incentives to strategic attack have been markedly reduced."

3. Finally, we must begin to take seriously the proposition that the danger of total war is a real and finite one, and that provision must, therefore, be made for the saving of life on a vast scale.

While present world tensions exist, we may not flee, no matter how appalling the vision of nuclear war, from facing the realities of our times. To do less is to lose faith with and to violate the trust of those of your comrades who gave their lives for human dignity and individual freedom.

The Groton Boys in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, since the insertion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 7, 1960, about the visit of the boys from Groton School to the Capital in which I included various letters I had received from these young men, I have now received additional letters and I am happy to have them printed in the RECORD to complete the story.

One of these letters is from the headmaster of Groton School, Rev. John Crocker; another is from the master who teachers American Government and was with the boys in Washington, Richard Congleton, Jr., telling of the boys' reactions to the trip. I have also included a letter from one of the parents of the boys, Mrs. Charles Devens, expressing her appreciation. The response to the efforts that everyone made to make this trip a success is most gratifying and it is apparent that good has been accomplished.

The letters follow:

APRIL 8, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: A trip such as you gave the Groton boys during their vacation in March deserves recognition by and thanks from the parents also and this is to tell you what fun Bobby Devens, David's classmate and good friend, had as your guest. We were most interested in the itinerary and various booklets he brought back and the two pictures are on display in the Devens' living room. This family is particularly fortunate; for Charlie, who was in Kenny's class at Groton, had the same fine trip in June of his sixth form year—1955.

David and Bobby are a formidable doubles team in fives and have won the tournament together in the past—I don't know about this year's results.

I hope we will have an opportunity to see you soon; perhaps at the reunion; anyway at the prize day exercises in June of 1961.

Charlie joins me in sending you our thanks.

Sincerely,

EDITH W. DEVENS
Mrs. Charles Devens.

P.S.—Please don't think of acknowledging this, as you are much too busy and we are off this afternoon to meet our daughter in Lisbon for a trip to Spain.

APRIL 13, 1960.

DEAR JIM: I must apologize for my delay in writing to thank you for the wonderful time that you gave that big crowd of Groton boys and two masters who went to Washington under your auspices, during the Easter vacation. They all came back full of enthusiasm and I do want you to know that I think all your labors have obviously borne fruit in terms of stimulating both their knowledge about our Government and interest in its problems and, I hope, in the desire to serve it if the chance comes to them.

You were wonderfully generous in giving them two big banquets and enabling them to hear JOE MARTIN, two members of the Cabinet, and a number of others.

The news that you are running again is simply grand. You really are wonderful and we take our hats off to you.

Mary joins me in sending you our affectionate regards and believe me, we are grateful for all you have done and are doing for G.S.

Sincerely yours,

JACK
Rev. John Crocker.

P.S.—Since dictating this, yours of April 11 has arrived with the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The boys are thrilled to be in print in such a place.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I would like to report to you the boys' reaction to the trip. As a Government teacher, my most difficult task is to try and help the student visualize the Government in operation, and the trip certainly accomplished this. I have had boys in class quote yourself, Secretary Anderson, Secretary Flemming, Mr. Judd, Speaker Rayburn, and others. Many of the boys have developed real interest for the first time, mainly because they had an opoprtunity to see things firsthand.

Other boys have begun reading about politics and policies for the first time, not as an assignment but because they have found new interests. Therefore, you are to be complimented and thanked for making this opportunity possible. I believe such a trip should be part of every Groton boy's education.

The pictures arrived and the boys asked me to thank you again for them.

My wife and I were glad we had an opportunity to see you before we left Washington.

Thanks again from myself, Mr. Rimmer, and especially 40 boys who learned so much in so short a time.

My personal regards,

RICHARD CONGLETON, Jr.

APRIL 12, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: It is with my tail between my legs that I write this letter—a perfect example of schoolboy thoughtlessness and lateness—but it is also written with a lingering sense of gratitude and warmth for you and your compatriots in Washington.

Never did I expect so much attention would be paid by so many important men—and so many great ones—to a mere group of students. However, the fact that we did receive so much of your time and the time of others has killed a very bad, former impression I once had of politicians: that they are interested only in vote getting.

Politicians are humans, thank God, and wisely chosen ones if they are all like the ones we met (and that includes Republicans, too—I am a Democrat).

I appreciated the National Gallery (and your "nudes") and Mr. Flemming, Mr. Judd, and Mr. Rayburn greatly, but I shan't say anything was better than anything else; it was all an education, and all a lifetime experience.

Thnk you, sir, for your warmth and generosity, your spirit and love for our great country, your time and your interest, and I beg your forgiveness for the lateness of this letter. It is not due to a lack of appreciation.

Affectionately yours,

PAYSON RAND.

APRIL 7, 1960.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Please forgive me sir for not having written you sooner. Immediately after leaving Washington, I went to Chapel Hill, N.C., to see the university, and to stay with a friend. I just recently returned home, only to find difficulties which prevented my writing.

I have been very anxious to write and tell you how much I enjoyed the trip, and to thank you for the trouble which you went to in order that the trip be so successful. Although I enjoyed the whole trip immensely, I think it might interest you to know what I particularly enjoyed, and that was the lunch you treated us to at the House Dining Room. Aside from the food which was also very good, I enjoyed the speech by Mr. RAYBURN and especially the talk Mr. JUDD gave us on our foreign policy. It was very enlightening and I only wish that time had permitted him to speak the additional 2 hours you said he could do with ease.

I arrived home just the other day to find the prints you so kindly had made up of our lunch and dinner and I wish to thank you for them, also.

Thanks again for making my trip to Washington a memorable one.

Sincerely,

THOS. HAMILTON, Jr.

THURSDAY.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you so much for the very enjoyable and extremely informative trip around Washington. It was wonderful to be able to actually meet and talk to the men who are helping to run things down there. I also thought the National Gallery of Art and the Smithsonian Institution were especially interesting. All in all the trip was the highpoint of my vacation. Thanks again and thank you for the pictures.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. RICHARDS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AUCHINCLOSS: I really apologize for not writing sooner, but I really want to express my gratitude for the wonderful trip you gave me as a member of the Groton group this spring. It was an experience I shall never forget and also a most entertaining and fascinating one. To see the Government from the inside so to speak is indeed a rare treat and one which very few are lucky enough to experience.

I especially enjoyed meeting you, JOE MARTIN, Speaker RAYBURN, and the vast number of wonderful men working for our Government.

Again I cannot express my thanks enough for a marvelous trip.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. BLACKISTON.

International Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a sponsor of S. 3385 which would promote the foreign relations of the United States by providing for the establishment in Hawaii of a center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate an article in the Christian Science Monitor.

Thomas Nickerson, the writer, is director of the office of publications and information at the University of Hawaii. He writes authoritatively on plans to establish the proposed center in Hawaii and discusses undertakings of the university which make the 50th State the logical locality for the international center.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 12, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE AND STUDY CENTER MAKING HEADWAY IN HAWAII—FOR RACIAL AND EAST-WEST ACCORD

(By Thomas Nickerson)

HONOLULU.—Few newly admitted States have offered the Union so timely a national asset as Hawaii now does in the proposed International Center.

Although having no physical resource—neither oil nor gold nor uranium—Hawaii possesses a rich human resource: The multiracial composition of the State and the consequent potential to perform a sorely needed service to the Nation and mankind—bringing closer relationship between the countries that border the Pacific.

President Eisenhower has stated, "Because of its geographical location and the national origins of many of its people, Hawaii can make a unique contribution to the cause of better understanding between East and West."

ATMOSPHERE OF COOPERATION

The nations of the Far East that are strongly represented in Hawaii's population are Japan, China, Korea, and the Philippines. But it is not ethnic derivation alone that constitutes Hawaii's unique contribution. It is the climate in which her people live—not the physical climate but, far more important yet, the intellectual climate—the atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect in which Hawaii's people work and play constructively together.

Dr. Andrew W. Lind, dean of the University's socioloists, attributes this climate not so much to relaxed physical surroundings as to relaxed personal relationships—to the relative absence of serious racial antagonisms, of economic and political exploitation of the native and immigrant population, of personal frustration. As a result, Hawaii's immigrant peoples have been able to mount steadily what Dr. Lind calls "the occupational ladder."

It is these elements—Hawaii's multiracial composition, her equable racial climate her thorough Americanism, her location midway between East and West—that back such statements as that made by her Governor, William F. Quinn, in a letter to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter. He wrote: "Hawaii is unquestionably the ideal place to locate the International Center. As an educational and training center, the project would show the far-reaching influence we can have in the Asian and Pacific world."

ON BEHALF OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Center is conceived as two entities, each with its supporting services, administered by the University of Hawaii on behalf of the Department of State. An International College would offer academic training to Asian and American students. An International Agency would coordinate the technical training facilities of the State—in agriculture, business, community services, and public administration, education, health, welfare, and safety.

Supporting services would include counseling, translating, tutoring, the administration of conferences, short-term programs, and study groups, and the establishment of an Advanced Studies Institute and an American Studies Institute, and expansion of the present English Language Institute.

The program includes scholarships for selected students from Asia and America, fellowships for distinguished resident and visiting scholars, and facilities for housing, teaching, and feeding students and instructors.

HOUSING FACILITIES

Plans include housing facilities that will provide bedrooms for groups of foreign students centered around common living rooms, faculty apartments, accommodations for transients attending conferences and short courses, classrooms, conference halls, an auditorium seating 700, food services, offices, and recreational facilities. All this is geared to 500 permanent students, 40 visiting scholars, and 60 transients.

An interesting manifestation of the university's preparations for the center was the Afro-Asian student leader seminar, financed by State Department funds, held recently on its campus. Three dozen talented young college men and women from nearly as many countries on three continents assembled to confer for 4 weeks on the place of higher education in society today. The seminar was followed by a 2-week study tour of the mainland.

NOT NEW TO UNIVERSITY

Such conferences are nothing new to the university. It conducted an international conference on race relations in 1954. Over the years it has sponsored three decennial East-West philosophers' conferences—in 1939, in 1949, and 1959. Among those who attended the latest of these were Japan's Suzuki, China's Hu Shih, and India's Radhakrishnan. An Asian conferee remarked that this was the only meeting he had attended in America where Asians had felt free to express themselves frankly and did so. Such has been the success of this series that a fourth conference has been advanced from 1969 to 1964.

For the last 6 years the university has conducted an Asian orientation center for Mundt-Smith and Fulbright grantees headed for graduate study at mainland universities. Hawaii provides an ideal transition from East to West. Asians feel at home here.

The 1959 legislature—the territory's last—demonstrated its deep interest in the center concept by appropriating $534,000 for the first increment of an international house. Moreover, it passed a bill making $95,000 available for an undergraduate Asian studies program and a postgraduate oversea operations program, both of which are now activated. Among other things, they prepare representatives of government and industry for service in the Orient.

These programs will go forward irrespective of the fortunes of the center. They constitute a projection and consolidation of activities on which the university has long concentrated its attention. (Its catalog lists more than 100 courses associated with Asia.) These programs form the sturdy roots on which the brilliantly conceived international center may be grafted.

Representative Clement J. Zablocki Writes With Insight About the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Wisconsin Democratic delegation in the Congress, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Milwaukee, served with distinction in 1959 as U.S. representative to the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations.

The people of his Fourth Congressional District, the people of Wisconsin, and his colleagues in the Congress have long recognized CLEM ZABLOCKI as one of our outstanding, hard-working legislators. As the third-ranking majority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, and as a member with broad legislative interests and experience, CLEM ZABLOCKI is always on the job and always does a commendable job. His work at the United Nations was no exception.

CLEM ZABLOCKI has written an article, "The U.N. and Us," which appears in the May 1960 issue of Eagle magazine. In it he gives us a penetrating inside view of the U.N.—its organization, its inner conflicts, its accomplishments, its goals.

The concluding sentences of CLEM ZABLOCKI's article are, I believe, worth special emphasis because they truly assess this still-youthful international organization upon which the hopes of so many of the world's people depend. Mr. ZABLOCKI writes:

The United Nations is far from perfect—but, by the same token, it has done a better job with the tools at its disposal than most critics will admit. In a world divided by

communism, and experiencing the resurgence of nationalism and an unparalleled drive for independence, the United Nations has tried to transcend political boundaries and to promote the attainment of objectives dear to all men of good will: peace with justice and a better life for those masses who exist in the midst of poverty, disease, and ignorance. Its record needs no apology.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the entire article referred to:

THE U.N. AND US

(By CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, U.S. Representative, Fourth Congressional District, Wisconsin)

When Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon called to ask me to serve as U.S. representative to the 14th session of the United Nations General Assembly, I must admit I greeted the invitation with mixed emotions.

I was looking forward to enjoying the fall with my family in Wisconsin and did not relish spending 3 months in New York after Congress adjourned. At the same time I was honored to have been selected for this special assignment. It would give me an opportunity to learn more about the operations of the United Nations. For this reason I accepted.

On September 15, the day on which the 1st session of the 86th Congress ended after an all-night meeting, I headed for New York and the United Nations, a controversial organization to say the least.

Over the years, I came in contact with some people who looked upon the U.N. with grave suspicion—even with disdain. Others, however, spoke highly about the constructive work of the U.N. and of its specialized agencies.

Between these conflicting opinions some facts spoke for themselves. U.N. membership has continued to grow and the area of its activities has expanded. The aspirations of the newly independent and the underdeveloped nations have centered upon it. In an uncertain and strife-torn world, the U.N. has enjoyed growing prestige and has gained many supporters who see in it the hope of mankind.

Upon arrival in New York I was briefed on the nature of my duties, assigned an office and issued a stack of "position papers," outlining our Government's stand on issues before the United Nations.

My work day started early each morning. I answered mail, studied position papers, reviewed instructions from the State Department and dispatches from U.S. diplomatic posts abroad, worked on drafts of speeches, and conferred with my advisers. Two or three times a week, the entire delegation would meet with Ambassador Lodge to discuss issues being debated in the General Assembly, to review U.S. policy, and to recommend changes.

Meetings of my committee and the plenary session of the General Assembly began at 10:30 a.m. and generally continued until 6 p.m. Occasionally, evening and Saturday sessions were thrown in for good measure.

Organizationwise, the United Nations is composed of six principal organs: the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the General Assembly, the Secretariat, and the International Court of Justice.

The three councils have limited membership (11, 18, and 14, respectively), meet throughout the year, and have primary jurisdiction over their fields. The United States has a permanent representative serving in each council.

The United Nations Secretariat occupies the largest of the three major buildings at U.N. headquarters in New York. Its personnel has been recruited from among the nations of 63 member states. This permanent staff of the United Nations organization works under the direction of the Secretary General, elected by the General Assembly upon the recommendations of the Security Council. The current Secretary General is Dag Hammarskjold of Sweden.

The General Assembly is the only organ in which all 82 member states of the U.N. are represented. Every member state is allowed to have up to five representatives in the General Assembly and as many alternates as desired, but casts only one vote. The U.S. delegation is composed of five delegates and five alternates. Each member acts as an instructed delegate, carrying out policies of the President of the United States without reference to personal convictions.

The General Assembly usually meets once a year, from mid-September to mid-December. It reviews the operations of the three councils, the work of the Secretariat and the International Court, and the activities of the specialized agencies of the U.N. Further, it approves the U.N. budget and allocates its cost among member states. However the General Assembly lacks one important power possessed by other legislatures: it cannot compel compliance with its resolutions. It can only suggest, advise, urge, and call for.

At the beginning of each session, the General Assembly adopts its agenda and assigns the various items to the six regular committees and one special political committee. Each committee deals with a specific field as follows: the first committee, political and security matters; second, economic and financial matters; third, social, humanitarian, and cultural matters; fourth, trusteeship matters; fifth, administrative and budgetary matters; and sixth, legal matters. All 82 member states of the United Nations are represented in each of the seven committees.

After an issue has been decided by a committee, the committee's recommendations, embodied in a draft resolution, are voted upon by the General Assembly convened in a plenary session. Since every member state is represented in each committee, as well as in the plenary, the votes in the plenary tend to follow the vote pattern established in the committee.

I was assigned to represent the United States in the fourth committee, which handled trusteeship matters. I soon discovered the committee was divided into two camps—the so-called colonial powers on the one hand, and the anticolonial forces on the other. In the emotionally charged atmosphere which accompanied the discussion of virtually every issue considered by the committee, there was often complete absence of any middle ground—at least in the eyes of representatives of many of the newly independent nations who fought actively for their point of view and seemed to live by the rule: "If you're not with us, you're agin' us."

The work of the fourth committee sharply affects approximately 100 million people who live in 9 trust territories and 48 non-self-governing territories—most of them in Africa. The committee's agenda and discussions revolve around one of the most distinctive trends of our age: the explosive drive toward independence and economic development in the underdeveloped countries of the world. The protagonists are the impassioned spokesmen for the dependent peoples and for the newly independent nations, craftily supported, for selfish ends, by the Communist bloc. The frequently unwilling antagonists are former colonial powers and their allies.

For its first order of business, the committee faced the complicated task of working out the arrangements and conditions for a plebiscite in the Cameroons under British administration. In effect, the committee's decision would determine the future of the people of the Cameroons—when, and how, and under what conditions they would attain full self-government. For its second item, the committee took up the question of South-West Africa—with its attendant issues of apartheid, repression of the natives by the Government of the Union of South Africa, and the continuing refusal of the Union to acknowledge United Nations supervision and responsibility for the welfare of the people of the territory of South-West Africa. A review of social, education, economic, and even political developments in all the trust territories, and in the non-self-governing territories followed. For its last item, the committee turned to the troublesome, long-standing frontier dispute between Somaliland and Ethiopia.

Most of the work of the fourth committee centered on developments and conditions of Africa. To many of us in the United States, Africa is a distant land of deserts and tropical forests, of big-game hunters, primitive native tribes, violence and terrorism, strange cults, and mystery.

All of these things do exist in Africa—but there is far more to Africa than this. Africa today is experiencing a tremendous transformation—what some observers have called the "freedom explosion." From the coast of Tripoli to Capetown, from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, a single drive seems to permeate the thoughts and actions of the African peoples: the drive for national identity and independence. In this drive, the nationalist forces are rapidly ridding the continent of the trappings of the old colonial systems.

Today Africa is represented in the United Nations by nine independent states. Within the next decade, 25 more may join the ranks of sovereign African nations. This trend, under the "one nation, one vote" rule, promises to give Africa an important voice in the affairs of the United Nations.

Further, it is in Africa that the contest between communism and democracy has reached a decisive stage. Communist effort to fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of the Western European powers poses one of the grave threats to future peace and security. These are the reasons why, to many observers, Africa has become the emerging continent which may play a determining role in the outcome of the struggle between communism and freedom.

It is interesting to note some of the characteristics of the men and women who represent the free nations of Africa and many other newly independent states in the United Nations. A large number have been educated in the colleges and universities of Europe and of America. Most are dedicated, articulate leaders of the nationalistic independence movements in their homelands. They are, by and large, sensitive and proud people, extremely anticolonial. Many can cite the writings of our own Founding Fathers, the philosophy of Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination, and Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter in support of their convictions. Some show strong dedication to the forms of Western democracy—without possibly fully understanding their inner meaning, evolution, and shortcomings. In matters of national independence and economic development, they often tend to rush headlong, without having made sure that the people they represent can walk.

What is of concern to all of us is that, in their compulsion to drive out the influence of Western colonial powers, some of these men and women appear oblivious to the dangers inherent in the new colonialism and imperialism of the Communist system. On the negative side, I must also mention some other contradictions. Struggling in the name of democracy, some adopt methods devised by totalitarian systems. Bitterly resenting what they condemn as the "white man's discrimination," they are not above discriminating

themselves—not only against whites, but also against other indigenous groups. Bristling against intolerance, they are often impatient—even intolerant—of policies and considerations which do not conform to their plans and expectations.

In short, they are neither angels nor demons—but humans, with many of the virtues, and some of the shortcomings, of the average human being.

This fact was pointed up in an amusing incident that occurred in the fourth committee.

Returning to the conference room for an afternoon session, members of the fourth committee were taken aback by an outburst from the delegate from one of the newly independent nations. His chair was missing, and the delegate was outraged. He had been insulted and discriminated against. He and his country had been humiliated, he asserted, and he insisted on a public apology.

It turned out that, while holding a lunch-hour conference in the committee room, a few of the delegates moved some of the chairs around—and failed to return the chair of the complaining delegate to its proper place. Most people would have made no fuss about it. Yet this particular delegate stopped the meeting and insisted on a public apology, feeling that his pride and his country's honor were at stake.

I could not attempt to summarize the multitude of problems considered by the 14th General Assembly. They ranged from the preparation of a declaration on the rights of the child, to the condemnation of Communist violation of human rights in Hungary and Tibet, and the refusal to admit Red China to the U.N.; from the adoption of principles regarding primary education in the wild reaches of Africa, to proposals regarding the establishment of a common market for Latin America, agrarian reform, and far-reaching programs of technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries; from discussions about the improvement of the International School at the U.N. headquarters to the investigation of border violations in Laos, continuation of the U.N. Emergency Force in the Near East, and provision of relief and rehabilitation of refugees.

Unfortunately, many newspapers, in reporting U.N. affairs, tend, to turn a phrase, "to accentuate the negative, and eliminate the positive." Certainly much has been written about the failure of the U.N. to cope with Communist subjugation of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and to establish the reign of peace and justice in the world. By the same token, I wonder to what extent the average newspaper reader is acquainted with the constructive work being done by the U.N.

All too often, the United Nations is blamed for the shortcomings of its individual members. The one-sided critics of the U.N. should realize that any organization is only as good as its members—and that this principle applies especially to such a voluntary organization as the United Nations, composed of sovereign nations, each extremely jealous of its rights and privileges. In essence, these critics expect the impossible. They blame the United Nations for not doing its job—while they insist that the United Nations cannot be given the tools with which to do it. It is like expecting to mow an acre of lawn—after you have locked up the power mower.

The United Nations is far from perfect—but, by the same token, it has done a better job with the tools at its disposal than most critics will admit. In a world divided by communism, and experiencing the resurgence of nationalism and an unparalleled drive for independence, the United Nations has tried to transcend political boundaries and to promote the attainment of objectives dear to all men of good will: peace with justice, and a better life for those masses who exist in the midst of poverty, disease, and ignorance. Its record needs no apology.

Six Mile Creek Watershed Project, Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Seventh National Watershed Congress which met here in Washington earlier this week selected the Six Mile Creek watershed project in Arkansas as the 1960 watershed project of the year.

This project which is located in Logan and Franklin Counties, Ark., was one of the pilot watershed projects. The project has been an outstanding success and has demonstrated the wisdom of this concept of soil and water conservation. It has served as a model and an inspiration to soil conservation groups throughout the Nation.

The Six Mile Creek watershed project was sponsored by the Logan and Franklin County Soil Conservation Districts. The officers and members of those districts, as well as the leaders in many other community organizations in the area, worked long and hard in contributing to the success of this project which culminated in the recent award. I am pleased that the work of these dedicated citizens has been rewarded in this national recognition of their efforts. Time has demonstrated the value of the watershed program. Unfortunately, the program is not receiving the support from the present administration which should be given to it. I hope that the Congress will increase substantially the budget request for the watershed program. For those who may doubt the merits of watershed development I urge that they study the record which has been compiled by this one project in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release issued by the Seventh National Watershed Congress be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTH NATIONAL
WATERSHED CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 18–20, 1960.

ARKANSAS WATERSHED PROJECT WINS NATIONAL AWARD

The "1960 Watershed Project of the Year" award was conferred tonight on the Six-Mile Creek Watershed project in Arkansas' Logan and Franklin Counties at the annual banquet of the Seventh National Watershed Congress.

The award was given to representatives of the magazine and Franklin County Soil Conservation Districts for their "high degree of initiative and decision in advancing the project over a period of 8 years."

Other factors which were cited as influencing the award committee's decision were the "interest and participation of the community's agencies and organizations, both public and private—because the project has demonstrably inspired the imagination and confidence of the people of the watershed and as a result its purposes have progressively expanded to include municipal, industrial, recreational, and agricultural water supplies as well as flood prevention and watershed conservation—because the land treatment throughout the 164,000 acres of the watershed together with 24 reservoirs of the project, have, with eminent success, met the test of torrential rainstorms and either eliminated or minimized flooding because the additional supplies of water and the major reduction in flood hazards throughout the watershed have been directly and substantially responsible for improving the economy and living standards of the entire area; and finally, because the accomplishments in Six-Mile Creek watershed are of such quality and effectiveness that the watershed has become a demonstration and an inspiration to the people of other watersheds in other parts of the Nation."

The "Watershed Project of the Year" award is conferred by the more than 25 national agricultural, business, industrial, conservation and civic organizations (see below) that join in staging the annual National Watershed Congress. The purpose of the public meeting is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on ways of advancing the small watershed development program.

That program relies on local, State and Federal participation to control waterflow and halt soil erosion in upstream tributary areas where more than one-half the annual flood damage occurs. It is administered nationally by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service.

NATIONAL WATERSHED CONGRESS

The National Watershed Congress, which was conceived and fostered by more than 20 of the Nation's leading industrial, agricultural, and conservation organizations, is dedicated to improved natural resources management and use on a watershed basis. The yearly meetings afford an overall review and discussion of watershed programs, problems, and progress. The Congress is not a membership organization; the participating organizations select and direct a steering committee that plans and conducts the annual meetings, which are financed by a nominal registration fee and voluntary contributions. The Congress does not propagandize, adopt resolutions, promote projects, or take any action—it is a forum for the discussion of ways and means of expediting and broadening local watershed programs.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

American Farm Bureau Federation; American Fisheries Society; American Forestry Association; American Nature Association; American Planning and Civic Association; American Pulpwood Association; American Watershed Council; Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Friends of the Land; International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners; Izaak Walton League of America; National Association of County Officials; National Association of Manufacturers; National Association of Soil Conservation Districts; National Audubon Society; National Farmers Union; National Grange; National Parks Association; National Reclamation Association; National Wildlife Federation; Nature Conservancy; Outdoor Writers Association of America; Soil Conservation Society of America; Sport Fishing Institute; Wilderness Society; Wildlife Management Institute; Wildlife Society.

A Medical Plan for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention today to an article which appeared in this morning's Chicago Sun-Times and which so very concisely spells out the problems involved in dealing with the increasing need for legislation to provide hospitalization and surgical care for the aged.

Mr. Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Chicago Sun-Times and author of this article, is one of the most highly respected journalists in this country. It is my belief that he has placed this entire problem in its proper perspective and has made an impressive contribution toward a better understanding of this entire matter.

Mr. Akers' article follows:

A MEDICAL PLAN FOR THE ELDERLY

(By Milburn P. Akers)

WASHINGTON.—The steadily increasing number of persons past 65 has made congressional passage of some plan to help them finance the costs of sickness almost inevitable. In fact, key leaders expect the passage of some such bill at the current session.

The American Medical Association, long the foe of all it construes as socialized medicine has, in this instance, probably brought about its own defeat. For many of the scientific advances which have so dramatically increased man's life span were made by members of the medical profession. As a consequence the number of aged persons now constitute a voting bloc of more than ordinary potential. Additionally there is considerable understanding of the financial problems many of them face, sooner or later, at times of catastrophic illnesses.

The bill which Congress is expected to pass before adjournment (and which President Eisenhower may veto) is looked upon here as merely the first hole in the dike. It will probably be relatively mild; perhaps only a partial contribution in one form or another to the costs of hospitalization. But once such a measure is enacted into law succeeding Congresses will be under pressure, as past ones have been since the first social security measure was adopted, to extend both coverage and benefits.

It will not be the controversial Forand bill that is passed at this time. That measure, in its present form, at least, goes too far for most congressional leaders who, apparently, are not yet willing to cover costs of medical or surgical care.

Most likely, the measure passed at this session will cover only hospitalization and, perhaps, that only in part. Costs for such a program are expected to be met by an increase in the present social security payroll deductions from employees and a matching amount from employers.

There isn't any certainty that President Eisenhower will accept even a mild version of the Forand plan. His administration has had the medical needs of the aged under study but to date hasn't produced a bill or a plan. Even if it does it is unlikely the Democratic majority will look upon it with favor.

Some of the Democratic leaders are not averse to a presidential veto in this instance. In their opinion it is of such stuff that good campaign issues are made.

Few dispute the need for some plan, Government or private, to meet the medical, surgical and hospital needs of the increasing number of senior citizens. Increasing numbers of persons have such insurance protection during their productive years. But most of them are shorn of it upon retirement and remain unprotected during the years when the maladies of old age make it most necessary.

It is this group and its needs which has built up the pressures on Congress; pressures which have finally forced the leak in the dike.

Unless an acceptable, workable, nongovernmental plan is forthcoming shortly—and none is presently on the horizon—the pressures are such that some form of Government insurance is inevitable.

Once the principle is established its extension follows.

Actually, Government is already in the field of medical welfare in a big way. Tax-supported Federal, State and local hospitals already provide total care for many. Free medicines are available to the indigent from many State health departments. Relief funds are used to provide similar care for many of the needy. In one form or the other, these practices have been widespread for years.

Additionally, privately supported hospitals and clinics provide much free service for those unable to pay.

Why then the great demand for the Forand bill or some modification of that proposal?

Vast as is the amount of free medicine and hospitalization available, only special cases or indigents qualify for much of it. The greater bulk of the aged do not come in either category; they merely lack sufficient funds for such extraordinary expenses. These are the persons who want an insurance plan as a matter of right instead of as a matter of charity.

These are the persons whose pressures are putting the Government into the hospitalization insurance business over the opposition of the AMA, which regards such insurance, when governmentally sponsored, as but the first step in ultimate socialized medicine.

That first step is about to be taken.

Problems of the Domestic Fuels Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as all of my distinguished colleagues who are concerned with a sound domestic fuels industry well know, we face a serious problem brought about by the heavy importation of foreign residual oil in recent years, to the serious impairment of American coal markets and posing a threat to the national security.

Only last week the Department of the Interior was forced to increase quotas for the second quarter of this year, although they were already higher than the original base period of 1957, and this action was largely caused by a few large importers failing to meet their responsibilities under the program.

I am glad to say there has been a change in allocation procedures, and quotas will henceforth be granted on a 3-month, instead of a 6-month basis. This, the Department of Interior feels, will make it possible to keep a closer tab on demand and imports, and will help to prevent overselling and the exhaustion of imports early in the quota period, such as has just happened. However, there may be other administrative improvements which can be made in this program, and all of us who are so vitally concerned with the domestic coal economy strongly feel that consideration should be given to them.

There has come to my attention a letter from Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, addressed to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, discussing some of the problems of administration of this program and making several suggestions which I feel are worth serious study. I believe that all of us interested in the domestic fuels of the United States, and in the national security which they guard, will find these comments of interest, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COAL POLICY
CONFERENCE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We would like to offer a few additional comments on the subject of residual oil imports, with particular reference to the recent exchange of letters between Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and the Department of the Interior.

Because the issues involved are important to our national security, these issues should be well understood by the public as well as the parties involved. Also, it seems to us that good public administration, the exercise of good citizenship by several of the large importors of residual oil, including Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and fair play to the small customers, such as hospitals, schools, and sizable apartment houses which depend upon residual oil for their heat, are at stake. The National Coal Policy Conference, as a spokesman for coal producers, the men who mine coal, the railroads who carry it, and others equally interested, would like to be heard via this letter on these issues.

First, all thoughful citizens in Government and out should applaud the statement in the Department's letter of March 29, 1960, where, commenting on the residual oil import control program and the President's proclamation establishing it for national security reasons, stated as follows:

"The major importing companies have a responsibility equal to that of the Government in connection with this as with other national security programs."

Second, what the Department's letter was too polite to say but which an impartial investigation by the Department or appropriate committees of Congress will disclose, is that two or three of the largest residual oil importers, including the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, have faltered in the discharge of their responsibility for maintaining this national security program and are engaged in a deliberate attempt to sabotage it to the point that it either becomes ineffective or is rescinded.

Let me back up this harsh, but accurate, statement with certain of the known facts.

(1) The President of the United States, acting pursuant to section 8 of the Trade

Agreements Extension Act of 1958, issued the proclamation on March 10, 1959, establishing a program for adjusting imports of petroleum and petroleum products, including residual oil. He acted because of the conclusion of the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, with which the President agreed, "that crude oil and principal crude oil derivatives and products are being imported in such quantities and under such circumstances as to threaten the national security." It was provided in section 2(a)(2) that in the area east of the Rocky Mountains:

"The imports of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel shall not exceed the level of imports of that product into those districts during the calendar year 1957."

Subsequently, on December 10, 1959, the order was amended to authorize the Secretary of Interior to make "such adjustments in the maximum levels of such imports as he may determine to be consonant with the objectives of this proclamation."

This basic determination, interweaving, and interconnecting the importation of residual fuel oils with crude oil in the national fuel and energy supply, as it relates to national defense, is the only logical one that can be taken. Imported residual oil increases the dependence of our basic economy on fuel and energy resources outside the United States, unreliable in time of war, in exactly the same fashion that imports of crude oil increase this dependence. Imports of residual oil displace domestic sources of fuel and energy and retard growth and the rate of investment, exploration, and development of those sources in the same manner as do imports of crude oil. Hence, efforts to drive up and force substantial increases in the rates of importation of residual fuel oil so long as the President's proclamation stands as the law of the land can only be viewed as contrary to this national security program.

(2) Despite that fact and the clear indication of the level of imports of residual oil in 1957 as the desirable basis for quotas for import controls of residual oil, several large importers have set about methodically to torpedo this system and make it impossible for it to work. They have done so by following marketing methods and pricing tactics that have resulted and will continue to result in substantially increased sales of residual oil for use in large steam electric generating plants on the eastern seaboard, such as those operated by utility companies, as compared to the level of this use in the year 1957. This practice of increasing sales to these users has been assiduously followed, even though the utility companies are equipped to burn coal or natural gas or both interchangeably with residual oil, thereby exhausting quotas which would otherwise be available to those equipped only to burn residual oil.

The eventual results of this marketing policy and practice being followed by a few of the largest importers, such as Standard Oil of New Jersey, will be either the unlimited or greatly increased importation of residual oil, thereby defeating the national security objective, or shortages for small fuel users, such as hospitals, schools and apartment houses, which, unlike the large steam generating plants in utility service, are not equipped to use any fuel but heavy residual fuel oil.

The plan to sabotage the national security program of residual oil import control is a simple one. A few large importers use up their quotas to sell to the large steam generating plants which can just as easily use coal or gas, without any hardship. If caught short, some may even purchase imported residual oil from other quota users at premium prices to fulfill their commitments to the large utilities. These practices divert additional quantities of the imported oil from the small users who are dependent upon it or may result in general price rises of residual oil for others than the large favored customers. By these practices these few large international oil companies hope to create a crisis or a series of crises which will force the Department of the Interior to repeatedly provide additional allotments in a given allocation period or substantially increase levels of imports for each allocation period.

(3) Thus far this tactic has worked. Applying the standard prescribed in the President's proclamation in the first quarter of controls (April, May, and June 1959), the daily allowables for residual oil imports for fuel use were set at 343,445 barrels per day. By using under-the-table price concessions substantially below list or spot public prices available to all customers, a few of the large importers and marketers of residual oil were able to increase the number of large utility users of residual oil and the quantities used by those who had previously consumed oil in part. This led to increased estimates of demand for imported residual oil for the second half of 1959 and the establishment of an increased quota of 365,000 barrels per day. Apparently the Department hoped that this substantial increase in level would allow for a normal adjusting and seasoning of the controls, permit the building of stocks and provide adequately for the new users of residual oil who choose that fuel and were dependent solely upon it because they could not afford the expense of multiple burning equipment. Any hope that the large importers would allow the situation to become normal and stable was in vain. Even this increased level was dashed by estimates of greatly increased utility utilization during the winter which forced the Department to establish a quota for the first 6 months of 1960 at a maximum of 425,000 barrels per day.

Now it would appear from information available to the public (see Journal of Commerce, Tuesday, March 29, 1960), that the three largest importers (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Texaco Inc., and Hess, Inc.), have used up in the first 2 months of the 6-month period the preponderant fraction of their quota. Jersey Standard had imported all but 30 percent of its allocation with 4 months yet to go in the period; Texaco, Inc., owner of Paragon Oil Co., the second largest importer, had 42.2 percent left and Hess, Inc., the third largest, 38.4 percent yet to bring in, according to the Journal of Commerce article.

We charge that the Standard Oil Co., whose president, M. J. Rathbone, wrote the letter of March 16 crying about an impending supply shortage has deliberately created this shortage by taking the quotas of residual oil that should have gone to the small users who depend upon it solely as their fuel, and sold it in increasing quantities to large steam generating plants on the eastern seaboard which are equipped at a moment's notice to use coal or gas.

If the Government can be "blackjacked" into abandoning or weakening the national security program it has undertaken at the highest level by these kind of tactics, then there can be little hope for public administration of this program in the public interest rather than the interest of a few large international oil companies, who, confronted by a glut of oil in the world market, wish to capitalize and cash in on their somewhat dubious concessions from foreign powers by flooding the American market and destroying or weakening the fiber of the domestic fuel and energy industries.

We recognize, as does the Department's letter of March 29, 1960, that a great many importers other than Standard Oil of New Jersey and the other mentioned, have tried to discharge their responsibilities by continuing to utilize their allotments to service their regular customers and take care of new demands from those who chose to equip themselves to burn oil and oil alone. It is significant that those who import from 100,000 to 500,000 barrels have 73.9 percent of their 6-month allotment available as of March 1; those whose quotas are from 500,000 to 1 million barrels have 57.5 percent of their quotas left as of the same date; those whose quotas are from 1 million to 5 million barrels have 65 percent of their quotas left; while those whose quotas are in excess of 5 million barrels have only 32.5 left. There is no greatly increased or abnormal demand for residual oil except on the part of the few large companies who have created artificially that demand by choosing to dump residual oil into the large steam boiler plants at cut rate prices in order to provide additional outlets, despite the fact, known to them, that the end result would be to sabotage the Government's national security program for residual oil import control.

Actually, all the facts point to the desirability of reducing quotas for the next allotment period to the 1957 level, as originally contemplated in the President's proclamation. Again we urge that the next quota be set for a 3-month period, and be based on the 1957 daily level, seasonally adjusted to allow for the lessened demand during the light burn period of the summer months.

Along with all other citizens inside the Government and out, we are reassured by the statement in your letter of March 29 that you do not intend to avoid your "responsibility under the proclamation, and create a set of conditions under which virtually unlimited quantities of residual can be imported and sold at distress prices."

We know that there are available to you tools and methods of administration that will assure those who are not equipped to utilize other alternative fuels that they will have 100 percent of their requirements for residual oil met from imported supplies whether they are existing users or newcomers to the residual oil market, leaving the impact of any shortage artificially induced by the large international oil companies' use of the tactics described to be borne by the large steam generating plants who are able to utilize coal or natural gas without any hardship.

We direct your Department's attention to the reports of the Federal Power Commission which disclose on a monthly basis the type of fuels burned by the large utility plants, including those on the eastern seaboard which have either recently switched to residual oil or have increased their use of that fuel since either the base year 1957 or, even since the controls have been in effect. An analysis of those figures available at the FPC and the disclosure by the utility plants in question of the sources from whom they purchased the residual oil during the period the oil import control system has been in effect will enable you or an appropriate committee of Congress to identify those sellers of residual oil who have sought to make this program unworkable and induce a series of increases in levels of importation which will undermine or nullify the national program for which you have the important responsibility of administration.

We challenge the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the few large importers who are crying shortage to a full accounting of their stewardship in connection with this oil import program. We submit the facts, when ascertained, will supoprt the charges we have made.

Respectfully submitted.

——— ———, *President.*

University of Illinois Professor Says Price-Cost Pressure Is Changing Farm Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that the farmer is in a serious price-cost squeeze and has been for a considerable time. It is further influencing the tremendous revolution going on in the field of agriculture.

Just the other day Professor of Farm Management W. N. Thompson of the University of Illinois dealt with this problem and I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a newspaper account of his remarks appearing in the Peoria Journal Star under date of April 21.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PROFESSOR SAYS PRICE-COST PRESSURE IS CHANGING FARM PRACTICES

URBANA.—Pressures from lower prices and rising costs are forcing Illinois farmers to adjust their farming operations, according to W. N. Thompson, University of Illinois professor of farm management, who cites these major shifts in Illinois agriculture during recent years:

Farms are getting larger and the number of farms dropped. In 1950 Illinois had 195,000 farms, in 1954 there were 175,000. Now there are fewer than 165,000. Larger farms can operate with low costs per acre. Studies by agricultural economists show that labor, machinery, and building costs average about $10 an acre less on 300-acre than on 150-acre grain farms.

Farmers are specializing their livestock production and expanding the size of each enterprise. Larger operations often have cost advantages. For example, farm records show that farmers averaging 43 litters of hogs a year produced pork for about $2 a hundred pounds less than farmers raising only 11 litters.

Farmers have shifted to grain crops that produce the most feed and highest income per acre. They have boosted corn output through higher yields. Southern Illinois farmers are growing more corn and soybeans. They also have stepped up wheat planting in east-central and southeastern Illinois. Many farmers have dropped low-profit oats from their programs.

Corn has maintained its importance in Corn Belt agriculture. Illinois farmers, planting 10 to 12 percent of the total U.S. crop in recent years, have set new records in the proportion of U.S. corn acreage grown in the State.

Fertilizer use has been the biggest change in farming. Farmers applied eight times as much nitrogen in 1958–59 as they did 10 years ago. Soluble phosphate use is about 2½ times greater. Potash application has tripled.

Beef cattle production has increased, while dairy cow numbers have dropped. Some of this change is due to mechanization of the feeding operation and lower labor required for beef cattle.

Farmers are using more machinery in the field and on the farmstead. They are giving more and more attention to mechanizing livestock chores. Chemicals to control weeds and insects are being used more widely.

Government programs, he says, have not been a major influence in farming adjustments. However, as a result of allotments and price support programs, farmers have stepped up practices that increase yields.

He concludes that farmers also have planted more wheat than they would have if the price support program had not allowed a 15-acre planting for every farmer, corn allotments may have resulted in more soybeans and oat acreage in some years, and that the soil bank conservation reserve program has been significant in a few southern Illinois counties but has had little effect in the State's total farm output.

Looking to the 1960's, Thompson expects farmers to continue to produce large acreages of feed grains and soybeans on the grounds that research and experience have shown them that with a balanced fertility program they can maintain high yields with continuous grain cropping on the better soils. Nitrogen fertilizer use will expand.

Livestock production will move toward more confinement and control of environment. In this way farmers will seek more economical use of their labor, buildings, and equipment and thus free land for grain production.

Farm size will continue to increase along with business volume per farm and per man. Interest in farm corporations will increase as farmers seek to obtain needed capital and make farm ownership transfers easier.

Thompson expects that Government agricultural programs will continue, but the nature of the programs is uncertain. If these programs are to be in the best interests of Illinois farmers, they should encourage adjustments that will permit farm families to use their capital, labor, and management ability more fully, he concludes.

Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the first Arbor Day was proclaimed on April 10, 1872. However, since then it has been observed in Nebraska on April 22 of each year. April 22 is the birthday of the man who conceived the idea of having such a holiday; namely, J. Sterling Morton, at one time U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, and one of Nebraska's outstanding pioneer citizens.

Arbor Day is based on the idea that it is well to set aside one day, each year, for the planting of trees and to focus attention on the realization of what deforestation means to the future development of the United States.

Since the origin of Arbor Day in 1872, the idea of celebrating such a day, each year, has spread to the other States.

A very well written historical account of this holiday appears in the April 1960 issue of the Fraternal Herald. The article was written by Mrs. Heddy Piskac Kohl, a member of the editorial staff of that publication. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARBOR DAY
(By Heddy Piskac Kohl)

Arbor Day is observed in all States either by legislation or by proclamation of State officials. The date varies, depending on the climate, for example, in Alabama Arbor Day is usually proclaimed on the first or second Friday in December. In California it is observed on March 7, which is Luther Burbank's birthday. In Nebraska, Arbor Day is observed on April 22, the birthday of J. Sterling Morton, who persuaded the authorities of his State to proclaim the first Arbor Day on April 10, 1872.

The idea of setting apart one day each year for planting trees came from a man who lived on the treeless plains of Nebraska. J. Sterling Morton, who later became U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, realized what value, beauty, and comfort trees would add to the barren spaces of his State. On that first Arbor Day more than a million trees were planted in Nebraska. Today, Nebraska is often called the Tree Planters' State.

The day has been made into a school festival in many parts of the country, with children planting the trees. Arbor Day serves to develop an appreciation of natural beauty. Often a part of the school program is to assign the care of young trees to individuals, or to organizations like the Boy or Girl Scouts.

Today, Arbor Day is an occasion for impressing upon all people their responsibility to make their yards, neighborhoods, parks, and public grounds more attractive.

In the State of Washington in about 1940, two other educational movements were started which have also spread over most of the country. To educate the public in forest fire prevention, the lumber industries work with local organizations on campaigns called Keep American Green. The second movement, also in keeping with Arbor Day, is the Tree Farm plan to interest farmers and 4-H Club members in planting wood lots.

A national tree-planting program arose from the alarm felt by farsighted public men over the rapid and reckless deforestation of many parts of the country, and a realization of what that deforestation meant to the future welfare and development of the United States. Most civilized governments of the world at different times have looked after their forests to assure a supply of timber.

J. Sterling Morton was an agriculturist and statesman, who came to Nebraska City, Nebr., in 1855. He was editor of the Nebraska City News, was a member of the Territorial legislature, and served as secretary of the Territory of Nebraska. For a time he was the Acting Governor of Nebraska, later served as Secretary of Agriculture under President Cleveland. Morton's home near Nebraska City, Arbor Lodge, is now a State park. The lodge has been preserved as a museum and the grounds, planted with trees from all parts of the world, are visited by thousands of people each year. Arbor Lodge State Park is situated in a fruit-growing region, to visit it during apple blossom time is a memorable experience.

Originally, only about 3 percent of the area of Nebraska was forested. Such trees as did exist were along the streams, where cottonwood, willow, elm, ash, and box elders were common. Pines were found in the northwestern part of the State. Arbor Day, the establishment of the Nebraska National Forest, the planting of shelter belts, and the development of farm woodlots have all served to give impetus to the forestation of Nebraska's plains. The tree-planting program extends to lakes and recreation grounds which are maintained for the use of the public, and to game refuges and fish hatcheries located in various sections of the State. Game preseravtion and tree planting make a natural partnership.

Foreign Trade and the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable NOAH MASON, for 24 years a Member of Congress from Illinois, introduced a bill that should be given top priority by the Congress but it should be noted that this bill will have the opposition of all the "powers that be" including men in high Republican positions. Basically, this bill simply is trying to restore the constitutional authority to the Congress, the people's representatives, instead of giving the authority over tariffs to subservient internationally minded bureaucrats appointed by the President.

When we talk and write of foreign imports we are simply talking about American job loss—every American job in a factory making goods for sale is supposed to support at least three persons' livelihood. The administrators of these export programs like to claim that our American exports support at least 5 million Americans.

But as has often been pointed out by me—I have never been able to find anyone in Government who will tell you how many jobs we lose by reason of our imports. If our imports exceed our exports, it would seem logical to assume there is a job loss to the United States. Recently, a well-informed statistical organization said:

We have already taken a long step toward national suicide through failure to maintain tariff schedules adequate to equalize production costs in the low-wage countries with unavoidable high cost—wages, taxes, and living standards—in effect here. Our industries and the jobs of our people are moving overseas at a constantly accelerating rate.

During the first 9 months of 1959 our imports from Europe increased 43 percent compared with the same period on 1958. Imports from Japan increased still more steeply, or 54 percent. Needless to say, most of these imports compete sharply with our own production.

Another major factor influencing our foreign trade, and one that gives great concern, is found in the President's recently proposed "hard sell" trade program, which, in effect, concedes the perils that confront us, and seeks to give relief through a Federal help in selling program.

The Old World, after World War II, in its recovery not only got our U.S. tax dollars but they also copied our know-how. Europe now has modern plants and equipment, mass production facilities, technological skill, research projects, installment credit and the management methods—all obtained by our foreign aid policies over the past 12 years.

It has been all too apparent that most of the men who have been in a position to formulate foreign as well as domestic policies—all seem to have to have superheated passion for the uplift of foreign peoples and nations. These men seem to have more concern for the welfare of the people and industry of Europe and Asia, including Communist-dominated countries, than for those of the United States. The wants and ambitions of people in foreign lands receive more attention than the great middle class Americans who are struggling with high taxes and trying to live on an inflationed dollar worth 47 cents.

Anytime a Member of Congress speaks out against this prevailing tendency of always putting America last he is immediately stamped as a modern-day illiterate and is a moron from out of the wide open spaces without the benefit of reading the New York Times or Washington Post—or as one intellectual dogooder expressed it—"out in that area of America where they still believe in the doctrine of America first, where Douglas MacArthur is looked upon as a great American, where the people listen to Fulton Lewis, Jr., and where many of these stay-at-home Republican conservatives would like to vote for BARRY GOLDWATER for President.

During the past 7 or 8 years I am sure many persons who have read my newsletters will remember my position and attitude toward our so-called foreign aid and related farm programs. I have been against these programs because as I have tried to point out all we have done is to build up future competition for America—particularly in our own farm areas. Many people have been violently opposed to my position because they always said, "any program is good—that gets rid of our surpluses and helps the needy countries because this builds up friendship for us throughout the world."

That sort of reasoning is deadly unrealistic for the simple reason this policy would not work now—nor at anytime in the future—because you do not buy friendship and you do not buy allies—foreign nations think of their own welfare—just as the United States did up until 12 years ago when we started out to be Santa Claus for all the world. During these years the big manufacturers, big international groups—particularly the international labor bosses—big auto manufacturers and other world-saving groups with American tax dollars all have pointed their fingers of scorn and contempt at any Member of Congress who voted against foreign aid.

But let us make a little closer reappraisal of these world-saving programs with U.S. tax dollars and see what has happened.

Our exports last year, for the first time, were $3 billion less than our imports—the net result—lost $3 billion worth of gold out of Fort Knox to pay foreigners for their goods. We have to pay them in gold; you can't lawfully own gold. You get 47-cent paper dollars.

We have lost our world trade auto market—more automobiles were imported into the United States than sold. World steel markets are being taken away from us throughout the world—our own markets are buying more and more imported steel products. You can go to any hardware or lumber yard in Kansas and buy a roll of barbed wire made in Europe at $2 a roll cheaper than a roll of wire made in Gary, Ind., and the wire is just as good.

The $90 billion we have given away in foreign aid programs brought us stiff competition. We gave them our money, built up their factories, and now they dump their products back in our laps—because of their cheap labor and freight rates. They are taking our markets here in the United States—not with cheap, shoddy goods but with quality products—and throughout the world they continue to absorb our markets of manufactured goods.

Let us now take a look at the foreign agriculture markets that we long thought belong to us—because of our superior know-how and the great progress we have made in agriculture production methods. We are now losing our agriculture world markets in wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and feed grains because of two factors—we taught them modern agriculture methods with U.S. tax dollars and now many of these countries are self-sufficient and as a result we not only lost these markets but in many cases they took away our markets in other countries because of cheaper prices. Since World War II we taught the Japanese how to eat bread. Last year we sold Japan some 60 million bushels of wheat. This year Japan is buying wheat from Canada and Australia. Why? Because they can buy their wheat 15 cents a bushel cheaper.

Now to be specific let us look at this statement copied from the Wall Street Journal:

WASHINGTON.—Grave fears about the direction in which Europe's young but potentially might Common Market is headed are now being voiced within the U.S. Government.

A secret paper, drafted in the Department of Agriculture and now being circulated "for discussion purposes," contends that commodity control schemes of the six-nation European Economic Community could go far toward wiping out an export market for U.S. crops which currently approaches $1 billion a year.

For a Government document, this one contains some pretty rough language.

It charges that the Common Market lands—Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg—are headed straight for "excessive (and abritrary) bureaucratic regulation of markets."

It accuses the Common Market of "aiming at self-sufficiency" in agriculture not at freer trade.

It states this may well reduce Common Market imports of major commodities from America and other suppliers to nothing more than a residual item.

So our international trade experts expect those who seem to want to help foreign nations instead of America—probably do not see any danger in this Common Market or that it will affect the American farmer. It would seem however that even our own Agriculture Department now sees clearly what effect this Common Market will have on selling our excess farm products.

The U.S. diplomats have hailed and supported this Common Market idea as a brilliant conception by the international do-gooders—but just how this Common Market will help the American laboring man or the farmer is just a bit hard to understand.

Certainly one of the major issues that should be decided in this coming election

campaign is that this American-last attitude should be brought to an end. There never was more a time when the ordinary citizen should rise up and elect a conservative, aggressively pro-American Congress.

Immediately after World War II this same group of "international do-gooders with U.S. tax dollars" promoted the idea that Russia should take back to Russia all the fine machinery of prewar Germany in payment of war claims Communist Russia claimed was due her as a result of German aggression in World War II. Millions of fine machinery was taken to Russia—then Uncle Sam with usual shortsightedness—gave Germany U.S. dollars to re-equip her factories with new and modern machinery. As a result, the Germans with their usual efficiency, with this new and modern machinery, and with no 40-hour week for the hard working efficient German workmen—have gone ahead and grabbed off many of the U.S. markets throughout the world. This is a good example of the United States rebuilding the economy of our future competitors.

As a result of this policy of building up our competitors both in Europe and Japan—unemployment in the United States will soon become a major problem in this country. Every Member of Congress who wants to stay in Congress must face these increased foreign imports which cause American unemployment. Already, there are areas in the United States where this unemployment is due solely to foreign imports. When these factories shut down there is always an epidemic of panaceas suggested, such as depressed area appropriation, bigger Government unemployment benefits, artificial work programs to sustain purchasing power in a declining domestic economy, and, of course, all the old WPA projects will be dusted off and a lot of new ones discussed—in most cases for the sole purpose of getting votes and not as a permanent solution.

Competition within the American industrial markets by American companies for the home market is a good thing but when the competitors from abroad come into the American market where they pay just one-fourth of our wage rate and with no penalties for overtime nor 40-hour week—that is a big advantage but here is another big advantage: the competing foreign companies rarely pay more than 9 percent of a profits tax, while in the United States it is 42 percent and these foreign countries give much more realistic writeoff replacement costs than the United States, all of which permits our foreign competitors to be constantly getting better and more modern machines.

Just a few years ago the boss-ridden international unions were all promoting these foreign aid programs—but what do we find today—they are crying for tariff protection.

At least three American unions are now demanding that Congress put up tariff bars on imports, and they want to negotiate labor contracts prohibiting American employers from handling foreign goods. However, these labor bosses never suggest that they or their members try out such realistic actions as reducing inflationary pressures by holding the line on labor costs or by reducing unit costs through higher efficiency and productivity.

The remedy for this taking of American markets is probably not to erect a wall of high protective tariffs in order to keep these products out of America, but rather a combination of a few simple laws applied with just plain commonsense; quit granting economic aid all over the world to our competitors and when we make a reciprocal trade deal make it a two-way street instead of a one-way street, as at present. Get Government out of business; give business a better writeoff policy; quit passing Federal laws and regulations which increase the cost of production, and reduce personal and corporate taxes which restrict the building up resources of capital to carry on experimentation in products on a competitive market, and above all else see that business and the man who labors is protected from the bossism-for-me type union leaders, such as Hoffa, Walter Reuther, and Hutchinson, of the carpenters.

Congress should do these things now and not wait until the breadlines form and emotion fills the air, then we will get only some quack, panacea remedies designed basically for votes and all at the cost of the taxpayers.

The Congress, from heavy pressure from two administrations, has tried to buy the love, respect, and support of the people of the world with your tax dollars. As a result, we have a tax load that has taken much of the incentive out of industrial advancement. Our Government, whether it has been the New Deal, Fair Deal, or present deal—has simply preached security instead of opportunity—neither political party seems to be aware that no one pays taxes but the consumer of goods and services.

Under these doctrines people have been brainwashed and conditioned for the coming of more socialism and the welfare state and, of course, there are many who believe the ultimate objective to all this is a one-world government, one parliament for all mankind, one church, one language, one color, and one policeman.

We as a nation, as led by our present administration and the Congress, not only seem committed to a welfare state here at home but to promote a planned economy of benevolent socialism throughout the world.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an editorial which contains ideas that should be fully understood by those who advocate bigger and better gifts, even though called loans. I highly recommend the contents of this editorial entitled "Blank Checks."

BLANK CHECKS

Congress, one of its committees unanimously recommends, should consider abolishing the Development Loan Fund if it doesn't straighten itself out.

The DLF is one of the proliferating bureaucracies spawned by Government foreign aid, and the House Government Operations Committee says it isn't operating the way Congress intended. Instead of approving loans only for specific projects in underdeveloped areas, it has been approving blanket credits to governments, with little or no check on what is done with the money.

As the committee report puts it, "Once the recipient governments have been promised aid in a certain amount, they have been known to take the view that DLF is merely being bureaucratic if it scrutinizes too closely the use to which that aid is to be put."

This melancholy history is in no way surprising when the agency's basic setup is recalled. The DLF was devised to provide "soft" loans, repayable in local currencies, to finance industrial projects in economically backward nations. So right off the bat it was on unsound financial ground.

An agency so conceived, moreover, is in poor shape to resist foreign political pressures. If the Government on the receiving end wants to take the money and build steel mills in deserts or other latter-day pyramids—well, so what? Only the unsophisticated would imagine that the money is actually supposed to improve the economic lot of the people concerned.

What is wrong with the DLF is symptomatic of the troubles of the foreign aid program as a whole. It is not merely the carelessness, the waste, the blunders, the blank checks. These but reflect the fundamental defect—the absence of sound principles and clear objectives.

We hope Congress will pay attention to the committee's recommendation concerning the DLF. But before a sensible foreign aid program can be built, more than this one annex will have to be torn down.

Report Against Best Interests of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 9, 1960, I introduced, for myself and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] a bill amending the act of March 3, 1933, the Intercoastal Shipping Act. Our bill, S. 3005, has been passed by the Senate. It would allow the Federal Maritime Board to suspend proposed increased tariffs for 7 months. The 7-month period corresponds to the period of suspension which the Interstate Commerce Commission may enforce under paragraph 7, section 15, of title 49, United States Code. Under existing law the Federal Maritime Board can suspend proposed increased freight tariffs for 4 months only.

In a letter dated April 13, 1960, to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the General Services Administrator said this about S. 3005:

As you know, it is the statutory duty of the General Services Administrator to represent executive agencies as users of transportation services in negotiations and in regulatory proceedings.

We are advised that this legislation is opposed by the Department of Commerce and other agencies which are concerned with the broad aspects of national transportation policy. We defer to their views in those areas in which GSA is not directly involved, although the additional 3 months' suspension authorized by the bill would be beneficial to the Government as a shipper.

It does not surprise me, Mr. President, that passage of S. 3005 by Congress will benefit the Government as a shipper. It does surprise me, however, that S. 3005 would be opposed by the Department of Commerce, of which the Federal Maritime Board is a part. In its recent action allowing higher freight rates in the Alaska trade before hearings and refusing to suspend new tariffs in the Alaska trade, the Board stated that the period of 4 months—the length of time by which tariffs may be suspended by the Board—was too brief to allow adequate consideration of the tariff schedules. S. 3005 was introduced to remedy the situation of which the Federal Maritime Board complained. The authority to suspend rates for 7 months would be permissive and not compulsory.

The suggestion in the General Services Administrator's letter of April 13 is the first inkling that the Department of Commerce does not favor enactment of S. 3005. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has received reports from the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Agriculture, and the General Services Administration regarding the bill. The Department of Commerce, however, has not voiced the opposition attributed to it by the General Services Administrator.

I recently addressed the Senate regarding the action of the Federal Maritime Board in suspending the proposed rate increase in the Guam trade. I applauded the suspension order delaying the imposition of proposed rate increases until hearings were held. This is the kind of procedure which we Alaskans would have appreciated when the carriers in the Alaska trade proposed the rate increases which became effective in January of this year. I noted today, Mr. President, that the Federal Maritime Board has suspended proposed rate increases in the Pacific coast-Puerto Rico trade, pending investigation. I wish to take this opportunity to praise procedures under which the Board holds hearings before allowing rate increases to be imposed. Although these procedures were not followed in the Alaska case, it is gratifying to note their acceptance by the Board in the Guam case and in the Pacific coast-Puerto Rico case.

Anticrime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the anticrime bill I have just introduced, my proposal would level a two-pronged attack on national gambling operations.

Phase one would require professional gamblers, applying for wire or radio communication facilities, to file affidavits that they had not transmitted or received in the 12-month period preceding such application, nor would not transmit or receive, gambling information, as defined in my bill, in interstate or foreign commerce, during the period such communication facilities are furnished. Severe penalties are provided for failure to file or for filing false or misleading information on such affidavits.

Phase two would require common carriers by wire or radio to exercise due diligence to insure that all gamblers registered or who should be registered under the occupational tax provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 USC 4412(a) or (b)) file such affidavits with them before communication facilities are furnished. Penalties are provided for failure to require the filing of such affidavits and for failure to keep Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials informed of the identity of persons filing under the provisions of this proposal.

Additionally, common carriers by wire or radio who furnish, or their employees who assist in furnishing or installing, communication services would be required to inform the Department of Justice where they have reason to believe that such facilities are or will be used by professional gamblers.

The term "gambling information" is defined to mean "the process of making, settling, paying, registering, evidencing, or recording any wager."

The term "wager" is limited to sports events, contests, wagering pools and lotteries conducted by those in the business of wager for profit.

Laments for a Dying Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting poem entitled "Laments for a Dying Language," written by Ogden Nash.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAMENTS FOR A DYING LANGUAGE

(By Ogden Nash)

What's the monster of this week?
"Mystique"—
A noun that in its current arcane use leaves me frigid,
Since it is not to be found in either the O.E.D. or Webster's Unabridged.
It is primarily the invention of the mystagogues of esoteric criticism, so it means whatever they choose.
But I will give you an example of what I think they think it means, only from the domain of a different muse.
I recently heard on the air a song in which the lover states that the loved one is his idea
Of a band of angels singing "Ave Maria."
This is not only a metaphor unique,
It is also an example of the songwriter's mystique at its peak.

II

Someone comes up with a linguistic gimmick,
And thousands flock to mimic.
This noisy age, when big loud bangs give way to bangs louder and bigger still,
And admirals, Congressmen, and minor Government officials pop off at will,
Gives us two gimmicks that reflect our minds' corrosion:
"Crash program" and "explosion."
See here the population explosion, the freedom explosion, the Broadway and off-Broadway incest-theme explosion, the explosion of British secretaries in offices of grandiose pretensions,
And there the crash program for defense, for space exploration, for a third major league, for nominating the candidates previous to the conventions.
With each successive bang my hopes grow limper
That the world's end will be a simple whimper.

III

In the nice-minded Department of Prunes and Prisms,
It's I for you
And euphemisms.
Hence the phrase I would eagerly jettison:
"Senior citizen."
Let us, then, retranslate
Joel, 2, 28.
To the sociologist squeamish
The words "Your old men shall dream dreams" are less than beamish,
So "Your senior citizens shall dream dreams" it shall henceforth be,
Along with Hemingway's "The Senior Citizen and the Sea."
I, though no Joel, prophesy that someday while the senior citizens are projecting the image of an aged-adjusted social group,
The old men will rise up and knock them for a loop.

IV

Those authors I can never love
Who write, "It fit him like a glove."
Though baseballs may be hit, not "hitted,"
The past of "fit" is always "fitted."
The sole exception worth a haricot
Is "Joshua fit de battle ob Jericho."

V

Coin brassy words at will, debase the coinage;
We're in an if-you-cannot-lick-them-join age,
A slovenliness-provides-its-own-excuse age,
Where usage overnight condones misusage.
Farewell, farewell to my beloved language,
Hence English, now a vile orangutanguage.

The Role of the Modern Seaport in Industrial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, In my extension of remarks, I include an informative speech by one who knows the subject on the importance to our gross national economy, as well as our export and import trade, of the existence of a well-planned and modern port entitled "The Role of the Modern Seaport in Industrial Development," delivered by Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and delivered by Mr. Casey before the World

Trade Week Conference on April 21, 1960, at Boston, Mass.

The views of Mr. Casey, by reason of his knowledge and experience, should be widely considered particularly by those interested in the various ports of our country.

THE ROLE OF THE MODERN SEAPORT IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Ralph E. Casey before the World Trade Week Conference, Boston, Mass., April 21, 1960)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to participate in your panel discussion on "The Role of the Modern Airport and Seaport in Industrial Development." As spokesman for the shipping industry, I feel that I have a distinct advantage over my counterpart from the airlines as I can refer to thousands of years of recorded history to show the reliance of the world's great powers on international waterborne trade. This has been true from time the time of the Phoenicians (over 3,000 year ago), the first great power to develop colonies and engage in foreign trade, on to the time of the Roman Empire, the Venetian merchants, the Spanish and Dutch colonization of the New World, the emergence of England (after the defeat of the Spanish armada in 1588) as the world's then leading power, down to today when we find our country, the United States, the most powerful and important military and trading Nation in the world. Our foreign trade, the largest of any nation (exports and imports), currently accounts for 30 percent of total world trade.

The roles of port and industrial development to serve our expanding trade are so interdependent that it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine which is the more important. This would be like trying to determine which is the more important—the product to be sold or the market in which it is to be sold. If there is a lag in port development, there will be a corresponding lag in industrial development and vice versa.

The shipping industry is not only all-important to a port area but it is vitally concerned with the growth and activity of the port. Our industry realizes that constant improvement of the port and port facilities is a must if our industry is to grow and keep pace with the national economy. The one thing certain, however, is the apathy of most national, State, and local officials to problems facing the maritime industry. And, when I say maritime industry, I include ports and port facilities.

The shipping industry, on a national basis as well as on an individual company basis, has spent much time and effort in taking its case to the people. This, however, is a most difficult task and one that never ends. Just when you feel you have a particular Government or industry group aware of the nature of the problem, a change of administration or management, or some other outside influence sets the effort back months or years. The modern port first must convince each individual industry in the immediate area of the importance of the port to its overall success. If State and local government and industry fail to recognize the importance of the port to continued growth, it is up to the local port officials to sell that idea.

It is a temptation when there is general prosperity to sit back and relax and neglect the day-to-day job of keeping up with the times. In this regard, it is a fact that our net waterborne trade (foreign and domestic) increased by 27.7 percent, or over 203 million tons, in the last decade and totaled 935,114,400 long tons in 1959. Some of the more progressive ports were able to exceed the national average increase by a wide margin, while others stood still or even lost ground during this period.

The prosperity of a port is determined by the same yardstick used by a steamship company—namely "cargo." Any sharp increase or decease in the movement of cargo over the dock means much more than is indicated on the surface.

For example, each long ton of cargo loaded or unloaded through a port area produces a direct dollar expenditure in the port area as follows:

General cargo	$15.51
Crude oil, including refining	10.50
Tanker cargo, other than crude oil	3.60
Coal	2.48
Grain	5.80
Ore	2.88
Raw sugar, including refining	44.91

These expenditures represent direct revenue. It is money that would not circulate if it were not for the port. It is easy to see from these figures that an increase in general cargo of even 100,000 long tons annually means a direct expenditure in the port of over $1.5 million annually. One vessel calling continuously at a port during the year could move more than this amount of cargo.

Preliminary figures for 1959 indicate that U.S. production of movable goods totaled $225.6 billion as compared to $144.8 billion in 1950, representing an increase of 55.8 percent. United States exports in this 10-year period (1950-59) averaged 8.6 percent of all our production of movable goods.

This means that the American business community depends on our export market to sell a percentage of their production which, in most cases, determines whether or not a corporation ends up in the black at the end of the year. Many companies, of course, do not deal directly in the foreign market, but their production and the jobs they create permit other firms to participate in foreign trade. In 1959, we exported $17.4 billion worth of perchandise or 7.7 percent of production. If American industry had been unable to sell this portion of their production overseas, it would have meant that we would have been unable to earn foreign exchange for the purchase of vital imports. Imports moving through our ports in 1959 totaled over $15.2 billion and represented 3.2 percent of our gross national product. The existence of a well-planned and modern port may determine where a new business requiring a large volume of imported raw materials decides to locate and in some cases may determine whether an existing firm will remain in the area. The dependence of many of our basic industries on raw material imported from overseas destinations makes it imperative that we have modern port facilities to cut handling costs.

For many decades the United States produced more raw materials than it consumed. This is no longer true. Our country has changed from a raw material surplus nation to a raw material deficit nation. If we should become isolated from the rest of the world and our stockpile of raw materials depleted, the operation of our basic industries would be sharply curtailed for lack of certain imported materials. In fact, our capacity to manufacture items needed in national defense such as ships, aircraft, and electronic equipment would be greatly curtailed and in some cases, completely halted. It is easy to understand our dependence on waterborne imports when one realizes that 90 percent of our asbestos—86 percent of our bauxite—90 percent of our chromite—100 percent of our hard fibers—89 percent of our manganese ore—98 percent of our mica—100 percent of our natural rubber, and 68 percent of our sugar come from foreign sources. This represents only a partial list of commodities that this country must import if we are to continue as the world leader in production and trade.

As we begin the decade of the sixties, the American-flag steamship industry is faced with one of the most crucial problems of its history, that is, the financing of replacement and modernization of its aging fleet. Plans are underway by many operators to build new and modern vessels. The use of mechanization and automation may be the key to our future. The port that keeps pace will undoubtedly be the one that will benefit by modern vessels employing modern techniques. New industry will locate in the areas where service and adequate facilities prove most economical. Now is the time for port authority officials to begin working with industry to determine what will be needed. All segments of the port community must work together to secure the financial backing needed for modern port improvements. Close liaison with local, State and National Government agencies concerned with foreign trade and port improvements is also a prerequisite in attaining these goals.

The modernization and development of gulf ports have been credited with having changed the South from its dependence on an agricultural economy and opened the way for its industrial development. This fact is seen readily when one looks at the increase in port traffic in many of the gulf ports. While this Nation as a whole shows a tonnage increase in cargo shipments of about 28 percent during the last 10 years, some of the gulf ports have recorded tonnage increases of two and three fold in the same period.

In a recent study by the Delaware River ports on the economic impact of the port area, it is stated that "'More than 1 job in every 10 in manufacturing industry and in wholesale and retail trade in the 11-county Deleware River port area depends upon the availability of materials and merchandise received through Delaware River ports. This statement is based on the fact, uncovered by the survey, that 11 percent of the total cost of materials for 'manufacturing and commerce in the port area are received through the port."

The study also indicates that one job in five in manufacturing depends on material received through the port. Port-created payrolls result in consumer expenditures of many millions of dollars in retail trade and service establishments. This money is spent in the food markets, drugstores, barbershops, service stations, etc. It is spent for housing, transportation, furniture, automobiles, clothing, and every item a citizen might need or buy. In this respect, every business or industry is the region served by the port is aided by, or dependent on, cargo shipped through the port. It is up to the port authority and directly related industries to sell the importance of the port and trade to our local, State and National economy, and often the toughest hurdle is the man on the street. At least, that is where the job must begin.

In my brief discourse, I have attempted to point out the importance of the port to industrial development and the importance of industrial development to trade. A look at the St. Lawrence Seaway, our fourth seacoast, after its first year of operation tells a great deal about the importance of adequate facilities. Original tonnage forecasts for the seaway were off considerably and much of the blame has been placed on inadequate berthing facilities, shortage of skilled labor, shallow channels, etc. The new seaway has a depth of 27 feet; however, not one port on the Lakes had a channel depth of 27 feet when the seaway opened for business last year. Port, industry, and Government officials in the Great Lakes area had 5 years in which to be ready for the seaway and failed to have the foresight to modernize their port and harbor facilities. A 27-foot seaway is limited to its use without a corresponding depth for the ports it is called

on to serve. Of the two major U.S. flag companies operating into the Lakes last year, one recorded a loss of $500,000 and the other lost over a million. The latter has indicated that they are through for the time being, at least, and there is no question but that the other will not continue indefinitely if port conditions and other facilities do not improve so that unnecessary delays can be avoided.

The shipping industry is very fluid and can be moved more easily than shore-based industry. This means that a vessel will go where there is cargo and where it can be loaded most economically.

The saying "you should learn from the mistakes of others—you haven't time to make them all yourself" still holds true. We should examine the performance of our competitors, along with our own past activity, in order to keep pace today and forge ahead tomorrow.

I have no crystal ball and have not attempted to tell you what specific facilities are needed for the future. One thing is certain, however, that if this country is to remain the bulwark of the free world, we will have to continue to ship an increasing amount of cargo in both our domestic and foreign trade. This cargo will have to move over the docks of this Nation's seaports. The U.S.-flag steamship industry intends to gain its fair share of this trade and undoubtedly will patronize the port facility which permits the most economic use of their vessels.

Mr. G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, predicts that by 1970 there is a good chance that the gross national product will reach $700 billion. This represents an increase of 46.9 percent over 1959 gross national product. If the transportation of goods maintains the same relationship to gross national product as it does today, this means that shipments by water should show approximately the same gain. Nineteen hundred and seventy is only 10 years away and on the decisions made now will depend whether or not the port of Boston and the State of Massachusetts gain their fair share of the predicted increase.

I wish you every success.

College Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "College Loyalty Oaths," written by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and published in the April 1960 issue of Coronet magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE LOYALTY OATHS—LOYALTY OATHS, ESPECIALLY IN EDUCATION, HAVE NEVER CONTRIBUTED TO OUR SECURITY—TRAITORS AND LIARS WILL EASILY TAKE THEM—BUT FREQUENTLY, PRINCIPLED PEOPLE WILL REFUSE—LOYALTY, INSISTS THE SENATOR, CANNOT BE COERCED OR COMPELLED—IT MUST BE INSPIRED

(By Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY)

In 1776, Benjamin Franklin—fully aware of the risk—decided to entrust secret plans of the American Revolution to a French agent. He believed the man's word of honor that even British torture would never wring these facts from him. What more could he ask? "He would have given me his oath for it," Franklin reported to the Continental Congress, "if I laid stress upon oaths. But I have never regarded them otherwise than as the last recourse of liars."

Franklin knew that many an American agent had hypocritically taken the new British oath of allegiance. On the other hand, he knew that little could be expected from those colonists with Tory sympathies who had been compelled by their crusading neighbors to take oaths supporting the revolution.

Unfortunately the American Nation, born in that year of divided loyalties, has rarely heeded Ben Franklin's sage advice. In times of crisis to the state—times of war insurrection or suspected subversion—both Federal and State Governments have repeatedly sought some swift, convenient, and reassuring means of publicly identifying and compelling citizen loyalty. Elaborate loyalty oaths and affidavits—going far beyond the simple pledge of allegiance or the oath to uphold and defend the Constitution—have inevitably been the answer.

But there is no evidence that they have ever contributed substantially to the security of the Nation.

Yet overzealous patriots keep trying to legislate loyalty. The latest example of this is the case of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which contains a welcome program for student loans.

Many bright students, whose talents this Nation needs to develop in competing with the Soviets, require financial assistance to continue their studies. But today, if those needy students attend Harvard, Yale, Mills, Grinnell, Sarah Lawrence, Oberlin, Swarthmore, and a dozen or so other schools—including some of our best science laboratories—they cannot obtain a Federal loan.

These colleges and universities are refusing to participate in the loan program. They need the money—they know their students need the money—but they refuse to administer one of the bill's strangest provisions: a section which requires every student, teacher, scientist or other scholar applying for a loan to not only sign the customary oath of allegiance, but also to sign a vague, sweeping affidavit declaring that he does not believe in or support any organization which believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government by illegal methods.

How can our universities police this affidavit they find so distasteful and humiliating? How can they investigate what organizations their students might believe in, and what those organizations believe? If a student does not belong to a subversive organization, might not his beliefs still be contrary to the affidavit? Which methods of overthrowing the Government are illegal and which are not?

No one can quarrel with the principle that all Americans should be loyal citizens and should be willing to swear allegiance to our country. But this is quite different from a doctrine which singles out students—and only those students who need to borrow money to continue their education—as a group which must sign a rather vague affidavit as to their beliefs as well as their acts.

Congress appeared, on the one hand, in this act to recognize that our students and teachers were one of our greatest assets in the cold war, our hope for the future—but then, in the same act, to single them out for scorn and suspicion in a demonstration of no confidence. An affirmative oath of allegiance may be understandable—but the negative disclaimer is at variance with the declared purposes of the act. It adds a needless barrier to many prospective students. More and more of our leading colleges and universities are refusing to participate in the loan program because of it.

The president of Wisconsin State College calls it unnecessary and distasteful. Father Michael J. Walsh, the president of Boston College, says it "represents a lack of confidence in the youth of the country." Mills College in California would not accept these funds because this section "invades the privacy and questions the integrity of individual belief." President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard called it vague in intent, useless in effect, inappropriate in context and insulting to the very group the Congress seeks to encourage. Oberlin College in Ohio declined all loans under the program because, its president stated, "it cannot compromise its historical devotion to freedom of expression and belief."

In introducing a bill to repeal this provision last year, I called it a futile gesture to the memory of an earlier age. Between the end of World War II and the end of the Korean war, a rising tide of fear and suspicion engulfed many Americans. The detection of Communist agents and the erection of new standards of loyalty and security were no longer left to responsible authorities. Neighbors, fellow workers, faculty members, Federal employees, friends—anyone might turn out to be "Red" (or said to be by someone). Easy answers and convenient scapegoats were sought, and provided, in a troubled time when the answers—How did the Russians get the bomb? Why did we lose China?—were not easy.

But one easy answer was the oath. Those who took it were loyal; those who refused were not. What could be simpler? And so countless hundreds of new oaths sprang up, administered by Federal, State and local bodies: oaths for schoolteachers, oaths for notary publics, oaths for professors, students and scientists and, in one State, a loyalty oath for professional wrestlers.

Finally, the furor died down—the atmosphere changed. Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin departed from the scene and the American people turned their attention from oaths of loyalty to the more positive tasks necessary for strengthening our national security. But in the summer of 1958, one relic of this earlier era crept into the National Defense Education Act.

The historical background of this kind of special oath is not confined to the recent era of hate and suspicion.

The first soldier in Washington's army to hang for treason—in a plot to capture the Continental Congress—had sworn to two special oaths of loyalty.

During the Civil War when Congress extended special oath-taking to itself, the only result was the resignation of a loyal but indignant Senator from Delaware, James A. Bayard. Another reluctant oathtaker, a civil servant in the Census Bureau whom a congressional committee had cited for disloyal feelings, enlisted in the Union Army and lost his sight at Gettysburg; while another Federal employee, when apprehended for disloyal conduct and asked about his oath, replied: "I could take 500,000 such oaths, as they amount to nothing."

In the post-World War I era, New York's famous Lusk laws included oaths among other special tests of teacher loyalty. But after only 2 years they were repealed, dismissed teachers were reinstated and Gov. Al Smith called the laws repugnant to the fundamentals of American democracy.

Nearly 2 million WPA workers were required to swear their loyalty in the unsettled days prior to World War II, before they could pick up their tools and rakes. After the war, when the Taft-Hartley Act required special non-Communist affidavits from union leaders, Harry Bridges took the oath—but John L. Lewis, a fighting anti-Communist, would not. Among the federally employed scientists working on secret weapons projects who

took a special oath was David Greenglass, convicted atomic spy.

This is hardly historical justification for the imposition of a special oath on student loan applicants today. And the history of special oaths in other lands should also have taught us a lesson. The student affidavit of disbelief is directly descended from the hated test oaths imposed centuries ago by successive contenders for the British crown. Under Charles II, for example, no one could teach at a university or school without taking an Anglican oath—and also an oath that the earlier oath imposed by Oliver Cromwell was unlawful. Article VI of our own Constitution reflected the fear of religious test oaths which had driven many to these shores.

In the 1930's our universities benefited from Italian professors fleeing Mussolini's requirement that all faculty members take a special oath stating that their teaching would be aimed at instilling devotion "to the Fascist regime."

The tragic fact is—as the history of loyalty oaths demonstrates—that the affidavit will not keep Communists or other subversives out of the student loan program. Card-carrying members of the Communist Party will have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves in the affidavit. I am proud as a U.S. Senator to reaffirm my own pledge to uphold the Constitution and flag. But I regard a special affidavit as to a person's beliefs—imposed on average citizens who have no special position of trust—as a wholly meaningless, impractical weapon against real subversives. This is particularly so when they are singled out, because they cannot afford the tuition their classmates can afford.

The only students who are adversely affected by this discriminatory provision are honest, non-Communist students—including:

(a) Students who attend universities that refuse to participate in this program.

(b) Students who feel they cannot execute the oath and affidavit for reasons of religion or conscience.

(c) Students who resent the requirement or consider it an unnecessary limitation on their academic freedom.

(d) Students who are overapprehensive in their interpretation of the affidavit or unnecessarily fearful of some official's interpretation.

It is all very well to ask: "Why not sign, if you're not guilty?" Most students will sign. Most universities will participate. Those who reject loans may be dismissed by some as overconscientious or as eccentrics, nonconformists, and chronic dissenters. But I thought the purpose of this act was to attract into scientific and other vital pursuits the best talents of the country, the most inquiring minds, the most thoughtful students. How can we if we exclude the overconscientious, the eccentrics, the nonconformists, and the chronic dissenters? What is the purpose of a provision that in operation could result in some Communists getting loans and some non-Communists dropping out of school—in some talented, needy students being included but some equally talented, equally needy, and equally loyal, students being left out?

There is a very real danger that this unnecessary, futile gesture toward the memory of an earlier age will defeat the purposes of the National Defense Education Act. Unlike the Soviets, we cannot take steps to keep our brightest minds in scientfic careers, but we might take steps that keep them out.

Early in the last session of Congress, I introduced and conducted hearings upon a bill to repeal this provision. But after 2 days of Senate debate—sometimes bitter, often confused—the bill was recommitted, dead for the session.

Another attempt to eliminate the affidavit will be made this year—this time emphasizing that it is the vague, sweeping, negative affidavit that is most objectionable and discriminatory. That may satisfy those who opposed us last year, who could not understand why the customary affirmative pledge of allegiance should not be taken by all students as a positive act of rededication.

But it will not satisfy those who want the negative affidavit retained, who insist that only subversives would oppose signing it, who criticize institutions refusing to participate, on the grounds they are denying aid to needy students merely to demonstrate abstract theories of academic freedom—and those who shrug off nonparticipants with the reply that there are other colleges and students eager to get the money. This is a minor issue, they say, raised by a few eggheads and unrealistic professors.

But if this affidavit remains on the statute books, we will have cause for concern. First, I will be concerned about the chances for success of the entire National Defense Education program, with some of our leading science-trained institutions and best-known colleges refusing to participate. These colleges need the additional source of scholarship moneys—all colleges do, as enrollments and costs increase faster than available funds. But they also know that once they accept this precedent of Federal dictation as to the beliefs of their scholarship or loan applicants, a tradition of American education will have been shattered.

These colleges, training future atomic scientists in their laboratories, do not want to protect Communists—but they know that any Communist will gladly take any number of oaths. They cannot understand why a prosperous freshmen is assumed to be loyal, but—if his financial needs become more pressing so that a Federal loan is required—he suddenly becomes suspect in his sophomore year. And why is a less talented studen, ineligible for a Federal loan, permitted in the laboratory without question—while a more talented student is denied entry unless he executes a vague affidavit which he may not accept or even understand.

To waste desperately needed educational funds trying to administer this kind of provision is the height of folly.

Secondly, I would be concerned about those students who did sign the affidavit. We want their minds to be free and flexible, searching out new ideas and trying out new principles. But a young student who has sworn—under penalty of a Federal indictment for perjury—as to what he privately believes (and what he thinks some organization he believes in believes) is likely to be rather cautious about changing his beliefs or joining new organizations. Other students may feel that Federal inquiry into their beliefs is so unrealistic as to be meaningless—and, in their minds, oaths of allegiance as well as sworn affidavits will be dangerously cheapened.

Perhaps a few perjurers will be caught under this requirement. But we already have enough anti-Communist, antisedition, and antiespionage statutes to catch these few students, if any, without damaging—in the minds of millions of other students—their respect for free inquiry and free government.

If William Penn or Benjamin Franklin or Henry Thoreau attended college in America today, I doubt that they would sign the affidavit, despite their great loyalty to this country. And our effort to develop the best minds of the country needs all the Penns and Franklins and Thoreaus we can attract.

Finally, I would be concerned, if we cannot eliminate this provision, about the United States of America. Never before have we tried to legislate orthodoxy in our colleges, sought to put students in jeopardy for their private beliefs or assumed a scholar is disloyal until he swears to the contrary.

Surely this is not the way to "catch up" with the new Russian excellence in education, science, and research—by imitating their objective of teaching students what to think instead of how to think. What kind of security is it that assumes all is well because thousands of affidavits are signed: do we really believe that loyalty can be reduced to an automatic formula, coerced and compelled instead of inspired?

I think it high time that we recalled the words of Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black: "Loyalty to the United States can never be secured by the endless proliferation of loyalty oaths. Loyalty must arise spontaneously from the hearts of people who love their country and respect their government."

Local Versus Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have always been opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education in any form, for I feel that, regardless of whether there is a need for better facilities or better salaries for teachers, this is primarily a local responsibility, and I believe in my congressional district the majority of the people feel this way and have, as a matter of fact, faced up to their responsibility.

I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a timely editorial from the April 21 morning edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Local Versus Federal Aid."

LOCAL VERSUS FEDERAL AID

(By C. L. Dancey)

One of the ruling emotions of the age is the impression that only the Federal Government can accomplish big things, and we on the local scene can only do little things.

This is because Uncle Sam talks in big totals, and we forget that these big things are merely a whole lot of little things put together.

What happens if we do some totaling of the little things we've been doing right at home in all our communities?

Schools, for example?

We have built 680,000 new classrooms since World War II. If the Federal Government had done this, what a mammoth project it would have been. What overwhelming proof of the ability of Federal power to get things done.

This fall we have 1,330,000 classrooms in use and half of them have been built since the war all without so much as a Federal subsidy, and certainly for a great deal less money than the same buildings would have cost under U.S. administration.

What's more, this building is a major victory and the crisis is past. The next 5 years present needs which can be met with only half as much performance per year as has been our pace up to now. This can certainly be done, as it has been, at the local level, and the job will be much easier now.

And, even after these great demands have been met, less than a single percent of the country's school districts has reached the limit of its bonding power—and there are strict legal limits.

Our Federal Government has never successfully carried on any program to compare with this local accomplishment—and it has been done with due consideration to all the diversity of geography, climate, economic

differences, and the unusual characteristics of local populations.

Parent teachers groups throughout America have played an important role in these accomplishments—and have won their major fight. The little things they have done total a great result.

This building program (that was not a national program as such) is even less important than the individual PTA's influence on what is actually happening to their own children in their own schools in their own home towns.

We suggest that this is much more than can possibly be accomplished by the State or national PTA as a standardized voice.

The PTA's great strength is its diversity, just as diversity is the great strength of America.

We sincerely hope that the PTA will not surrender now that victory is in sight, and the hardest battle won. We hope this great organization will not abdicate its responsibilities in every city and town and country district in favor of passing the buck of its problems on to planners in Washington, D.C., who can never do the job half so well.

What Else Can Kennedy Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, among the extensive recent press comments on the so-called religious issue, I have been especially impressed with two. I submit for the attention of my colleagues the following editorials from the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as examples of thoughtful and responsible journalism.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Apr. 9, 1960]

WHAT ELSE CAN KENNEDY DO?

That issue of religion trailed Senator JOHN KENNEDY through Wisconsin, and it will follow him now into West Virginia.

It must be deeply disturbing to the man, for he has done everything but deny his own church in trying to get out from under the cloud.

He has said that he does not favor public aid to church schools, and here he is opposing the position of most of the leaders of his own denomination.

He has said that he would not, as President, appoint a diplomatic representative to the Vatican. Even Baptist Harry Truman once tried to name such a representative.

He has said that his highest allegiance as President would be to his oath to support the U.S. Constitution. One of the basic tenets of that Constitution is the separation of church and state.

He has expressed, repeatedly and patiently, his deep belief in the liberal democratic principles upon which American Government rests. No one has pointed to anything in his record as Congressman and Senator which does violence to these principles. We know no reason to doubt that *he would not uphold them as President in* any conceivable conflict with chuch authority.

If KENNEDY *should be nominated and* elected, he would be watched carefully on this score *by Congress and by the country* at large. No one would know better than he that the first Catholic President is in the White House. Public vigilance would be an important factor, and we believe that KENNEDY would bend over backward to avoid even the slightest appearance that his religion affects his political action.

It should be remembered, too, that Catholics come in all shapes and sizes, just as do Baptists and Lutherans. Some are orthodox and devout; some are neither. Some are much more subject to rigorous discipline than others.

There are some Catholics, we admit, who would give us pause on these grounds if they sought the country's highest political office. But there are book burning, antievolution Protestants who would inspire the same fears that they might carry their religion too far.

It is perhaps an individual matter. And as an individual, JOHN KENNEDY has satisfied us that America has nothing to fear from him because he was born of Catholic parents.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 14, 1960]

NO RELIGIOUS TEST

Senator KENNEDY has already begun to encounter anti-Catholic sentiment in West Virginia, and even some of his supporters believe the religious issue may be the decisive factor in the presidential primary.

Since a large part of the Senator's 105,000 plurality in Wisconsin was supplied by voters of Catholic faith, some persons will regard it as no more than rough justice that a certain number of West Virginia votes should be likewise cast on religious grounds, but cast the other way. The truth is that the religious issue has and had no place in either election, and we deplore its being raised on any pretext.

Senator KENNEDY has fully and frankly answered all the questions that can justly be asked him because of his religion. He has expressed himself on such issues as separation of church and state, and tax support for parochial schools, far more frankly—than many Protestants would—especially Protestants running for office in heavily Catholic districts. He has made it very clear that he believes strongly in our constitutional principle of church-state separation, and strongly opposes public support for religious schools. For taking this stand he has undergone severe criticism from Catholic sources, but has stood his ground.

So it is not for any views on questions of special interest to the Roman Catholic Church that Senator KENNEDY can be rejected. Those who oppose him on religious grounds, if they are not victims of bald bigotry, must believe that because of some special characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church, Senator KENNEDY if elected President would not in fact be a free man; that he would be subject to a special and unique discipline from Rome; that he could not be trusted to live up to his oath of office, or to keep faith with millions of Protestants and nonchurch members; that he would subordinate the interests of his country and the obligations of the Presidency to the will of the Vatican.

Merely to state these propositions is to suggest how preposterous they are. Those who, preoccupied with church history or ecclesiastical disputation, frighten themselves with the vision of a Vatican running the White House by remote control overlook entirely the political realities of modern-day America. *Whatever his faith, no President* could permit Vatican interference in American civil affairs without sacrificing his leadership of the whole people. *We firmly believe* that a Catholic of the measure of Senator *KENNEDY would be considerably more inde*pendent of Rome than the average Protestant politician with one eye on the Catholic vote.

It is too often forgotten that in addition to the great principle of separation of church and state, our Constitution lays down the principle that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." There is only one way to hold true to that principle. That is by not applying, directly or indirectly, a religious test to candidates for office.

Vermont Has Stake in Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the North Adams Transcript, from an American citizen who intelligently appraises the problem of immigration.

[From the North Adams Transcript, Mar. 31, 1960]

VERMONT HAS STAKE IN IMMIGRATION BILL

EDITOR OF THE TRANSCRIPT: Six or seven times in the past President Eisenhower has tried to get a law passed that would increase the quota for immigrants into this country. Labor, of course, opposes it. Another element in the Nation opposes it, a sort of "let well enough alone policy." Maybe the President is so right this time that the opposition will sink party politics and get into line for a little real service to the Nation. Here in Vermont we have a vital stake in this business, maybe more urgent than in any other State.

Back in the days when men worked and were proud of their ability to lift the other end of anything that was loose, Vermont hills were cleared and prosperous little farms, hundreds of them, sustained large families of sturdy citizens. Then came the free lands of the West, wider opportunity, and the exodus from Vermont began. Same old economic problem that has followed civilization for 10,000 years. The covered wagon has always treked toward the main chance. Most of the big jolts to civilization have come from the mass shifting of populations for economic betterment.

Now we are an inch or two further along in intelligence and well-being than in the days when the city States colonized the provinces for the handy collection of food and taxes. Today we have science which questions everything and proves its contentions with actual accomplishment. With us the food supply is no longer a problem. The surplus has become the problem. Any increase in population founded upon increased food supply, at first glance seems crazy. Let us look into it a little.

Authorities who know about these things tell us that the lot of millions of people in central Europe could be bettered by small holdings of land ownership and freedom to work out their own status in life. This is based upon the idea that self-sufficiency through personal effort has not become obsolete.

Through industrial activity and wealth we have grown into the habit of "needing" everything we see or hear about. We feel *abused and downtrodden if we do not get* it. That state of mind, apparently, always *has come about in the course of increasing* plenty and the mass movement of people from a lower to a higher standard of living.

We need some new frontiers. Educationally, politically, economically, religiously, and morally we are threshing too much old straw. Unpopular as it always is, it becomes necessary to reexamine our sense of values. This Nation is leveling off from the land of opportunity for quick and great wealth. It is becoming a land where the real human values count. We are again learning that our real niche in the march of time is summed up in the philosophy of the four freedoms.

In Vermont nature has put back the fertility into our hills. The grub hoe, the hook, and the sidehill plow can be resurrected overnight. The manpower exists in these men the President would welcome to our soil and our economy. For the gift of freedom and equality these men and women will come here and build up again the character and the stamina for our way of life.

If those birds who perch on park benches and dolefully chirp about opportunity and the raw deal would get out into the hills at 4 o'clock in the morning, lay up a couple of rods of stonewall, and burn half an acre of brush, and grub hoe in three or four rows of corn and potatoes before breakfast, their outlook upon life would change. It was that kind of life that cleared up the Grants and made Vermont the Sparta of this continent. It can be done again by men and women to whom freedom and independence mean more than the night spots and keeping up with the Joneses.

And finally, I hope no half-baked nincompoop arises to say that this kind of immigration brings in undesirable citizens. For more than 60 years I have worked side by side with these men from all over Europe. I never shall forget the day when the news of the armistice following the First World War came into our shop. Next to me, on a 5-ton hammer, was a Polander. Proud, rugged and clean. Said he—"Thank God, Poland will again be a nation." I wish some of our white birch Yankees, blear-eyed with laziness and drooling desire for the shiftless life, could have looked into this man's eyes.

President Eisenhower knows that citizenship is a matter of mind and heart and soul. He knows along with everybody else who has had firsthand contact with these people, that the brawn and brains and the longed-for ideals of hard-pressed Europe constitute the motivating influence in our real allied core of friendship and aid. These men may become the salvation of liberty itself.

Tourists, summer residents, industry, racetracks, yes, yes, of course; but let us never forget for a minute that it was the little hill farm that sustained us for so long and sent so many he-men out into the world to build up the most enduring and satisfying way of life yet devised. It can be done again. Let us ease off a little on this parasitic pandering to outside resources and build up our human element. After all, government is for men and women. Let us forget the half-baked and stinking politics and go to work. Let us make our own little old State of Vermont again the frontier of liberty and independence.

FAXON BOWEN.

ARKMONT, POWNAL, VT.

Water Not Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very cogent editorial which was printed in the North Adams Transcript, concerning a problem which is of utmost concern in my district and in the entire New England area:

WATER NOT UNLIMITED

Water is one of the great natural resources of New England and the Northeastern States. Its place is the economy of the region is incalculable, in terms of dollars and cents. Without it, any steps toward industrial development or expansion would be futile, agriculture and lumbering would be fruitless enterprises, and recreational and resort centers could not exist.

But this natural blessing should not be considered as a permanent asset, existing by itself, and as something that can be squandered recklessly. It must be conserved, controlled, and cultivated, and that is a function of which only government is capable.

That's why more than passing attention should be given to legislation under consideration in Washington that would establish, with Federal support, a water and resources compact among the Northeastern States.

Such a program, of course, would have primary benefit for the States immediately involved. But since a question of economic growth and insurance also is concerned, the entire Nation would benefit ultimately. By the same token, if the regional economy were to suffer through the blind waste of such a resource, the national economy, too, eventually would be damaged.

There is opposition to the proposal, chiefly from midwestern legislators, who should be the last to decry any Federal support for a natural resource. They never have been averse to accepting Government assistance for less worthy projects in their own States.

The progress of this legislation in Congress should be watched closely. It is vital to the future welfare of this entire region.

Age, Health, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the more the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, is understood and discussed the more it is being favored.

Conservative organizations, newspapers, and magazines are seeing the problem of health needs of the aged and recognize the need of Congress taking action to meet this problem now.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial on the subject which appeared in the April 25 issue of Life magazine.

The editorial follows:

AGE, HEALTH, AND POLITICS

The hottest political potato so far in this election year is the question: Are Americans over 65 entitled to Federal help to meet their hospital and doctor bills?

The Forand bill, which would raise $1 billion for such care by a one-half percent boost in the social security tax, has produced floods of favorable mail and given the Democrats an unexpected issue. Republicans, while granting the need for aid, are trying to find a more private, voluntary alternative. Since the issue is important, let's try to separate its social realities from its politics and facts from principles.

Unquestionably, many older Americans (15.8 million are over 65) are in real need. The average $72 a month they draw from social security scarcely provides food and shelter, much less for the medical expenses which increase with age. Few are in a position to meet the cost of chronic illness from which many suffer. Yet even to get "charity" care—itself inadequate in quantity and often inferior in quality—they must suffer the indignity of a pauper's oath.

Can their need for medical aid be provided by private, voluntary Blue Cross-type plans? These are expanding, but can never meet the whole need. Premiums for the aged as a separate group are prohibitively high. The least burdensome method of insurance is for the whole society to spread the costs over the whole working life cycle. The cheapest and most logical way of doing this, whether by the Forand bill or a better one, is by extending the existing system of social security.

To provide this aid need not be "socialized medicine," as opponents claim, since payments could be made through private channels and patients select their own doctors and hospitals as before.

The first question of principle is whether this form of aid will undermine the private duty of providing for one's own old age through old-fashioned virtues like foresight and thrift. Being a floor, not a ceiling, it need not do so. Individuals will still have plenty of incentive to save for the future, though less fear of it.

Another question of principle is whether it is the proper function of a free government to offer special help to its older citizens. That principle was accepted when social security itself became effective in 1937. The presumption against any extension of Federal activity and expenditure, though Jeffersonian in origin, is now championed, though weakly, by the Republicans, who don't want to be tagged as enemies of the aged. But an extension of an established system like social security is not a violation of principle. But there is also an issue of cost.

Not even the Democrats can extend the welfare state without reference to the price tag. Enough spending bills were introduced in Congress last year to add $50 to $60 billion to our existing $78.4 billion budget if passed. Priorities, therefore, have to be determined. Health aid to the aged can be provided, but it may mean fewer schools, highways, or other needs which may also be urgent. A related question is whether aid to the aged can be done without renewed inflation. The aged, on small and fixed incomes, have been the chief sufferers from inflation, and this is a good reason for giving social security a high priority. By the same token, any aid program that feeds inflation would defeat its own purposes and fool its beneficiaries. So the costs of any plan adopted must be carefully limited and controlled.

Doubtless the Forand bill can be improved. Some $200 million could be saved simply by raising the eligible age from 65 to 68. Moreover, many oldsters able and eager to work could better provide for their own security if the $1,200 limitation were raised on the income they may earn without forfeiting social security pensions.

But in principle, such aid is proper public business. The issue is therefore inevitably and properly a political one. It should be decided according to the Nation's sense of justice, urgency, and choice of priorities in the use of scarce resources—as interpreted by the Nation's elected Representatives in Congress.

Proclamation Condemning the Recent Massacre in the Union of South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

CONSULATE GENERAL
OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA,
New York, N.Y., April 14, 1960.

The Honorable Dr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Pastor, Abyssinian Baptist Church,
New York City

DEAR DR. POWELL: I am forwarding herewith a joint resolution passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the National Legislature of Liberia and a proclamation issued by the President of Liberia condemning the recent massacre of defenseless Africans in the Union of South Africa. I thought that these might be of interest to you as you plan to observe Africa Freedom Day.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. THOMAS,
Consul General.

JOINT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING CONDEMNATION OF AND GRAVE CONCERN OVER THE RECENT MASSACRE OF DEFENSELESS AFRICANS IN THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA AND AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA TO PROCLAIM SUNDAY, APRIL 3, A.D. 1960, A DAY OF MOURNING AND INTERCESSION

Whereas the Government of Liberia in support of its constitution, the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights which are definitely opposed to racial segregation as especially practiced within the Union of South Africa; and

Where the United Nations, since its organization, has continuously called upon the Union of South Africa to abandon its inhuman apartheid policy and racial segregation to no avail; and

Whereas the African peoples within the Union of South Africa, quite recently, in a peaceful manner demonstrated against the infringement of their natural and inherent rights; and,

Whereas because of this demonstration, armed police of the Union of South Africa, in the pursuit of their ungodly desire to perpetuate their inhuman apartheid policy of racial discrimination, did deliberately, viciously and without any regard for the lives of Africans, fire upon, kill and wound a great number of innocent, unarmed and defenseless Africans; and,

Whereas the Legislature of Liberia, representing the sovereign people of the Republic, having considered with grave abhorrence this violent outrage on part of the Union of South Africa, which act, the said representatives of the people of this Republic do vehemently condemn, deprecate and denounce; Now therefore,

It is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Republic of Liberia in Legislature assembled:

SECTION 1. That the Legislature of Liberia sitting in the 1st session of the 44th legislature expresses profound regrets for and condemnation of the vile and wicked massacre of innocent as well as unarmed and defenseless Africans and declares that this outbreak of violence is an outrage and great blight upon civilization and world conscience.

SEC. 2. That immediately after the passage of this act, Sunday, April 3, 1960, be and is hereby set aside as a National Day of Mourning for those who lost their lives in their peaceful pursuit of their inherent and natural rights by this cruel massacre and that it also be a day of intercession for the abandonment of the inhuman and despicable apartheid policy pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa.

SEC. 3. That the President of the Republic of Liberia be and is hereby authorized and empowered to proclaim and declare the same throughout the Republic of Liberia in consonance with the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately and be published in handbills.

Any law to the contrary notwithstanding.
Approved March 25, 1960.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT

"Whereas the Government of Liberia considers it proper and befitting to express its complete abhorrence for systematic, ruthless, cold-blooded and vile slaughter of helpless Africans in the Union of South Africa, who on March 21, 1960, while peacefully demonstrating against certain aspects of the inhuman, savage and internationally outlawed policy of apartheid such as practiced in the Union of South Africa; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Liberia sitting in the 1st session of the 44th Legislature of the Republic did pass a joint resolution authorizing the President of the Republic to proclaim Sunday, April 3, A.D. 1960, a day of mourning for the dead, victims of apartheid, and of intercession for relief of the Africans of South Africa from the baneful yoke of oppression, which resolution reads:

" 'Whereas the Government of Liberia in support of its Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, which are definitely opposed to racial segregation as especially practiced within the Union of South Africa; and,

" 'Whereas the United Nations, since its organization, has continuously called upon the Union of South Africa to abandon its inhuman apartheid policy and racial segregation to no avail; and,

" 'Whereas the African peoples within the Union of South Africa, quite recently, in a peaceful manner demonstrated against the infringement of their natural and inherent rights; and,

" 'Whereas because of this demonstration, armed police of the Union of South Africa, in the pursuit of their ungodly desire to perpetuate their inhuman apartheid policy of racial discrimination, did deliberately, viciously and without any regard for the lives of Africans, fire upon, kill and wound a great number of the innocent, unarmed, and defenseless Africans; and

" 'Whereas the Legislature of Liberia, representing the Sovereign people of the Republic, having considered with grave abhorrence this violent outrage on part of the South African police upon the lives and persons of South Africa, which act, the said representatives of the people of this Republic, do vehemently condemn, deprecate and denounce: Now, therefore,

" '*It is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Republic of Liberia in Legislature assembled:*

" 'SECTION 1. That the Legislation of Liberia sitting in the 1st session of the 44th legislature expresses profund regrets for and condemnation of the vile and wicked massacre of innocent as well as unarmed and defenseless Africans and declares that this outbreak of violence is an outrage and great blight upon civilization and world conscience.

" 'SEC. 2. That immediately after the passage of this Act, Sunday, April 3, 1960, be and is hereby set aside as a National Day of Mourning for those who lost their lives in their peaceful pursuit of their inherent and natural rights by this cruel massacre and that it also be a Day of Intercession for the abandonment of the inhuman and despicable apartheid policy pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa.

" 'SEC. 3. That the President of the Republic of Liberia be and is hereby authorized and empowered to proclaim and declare the same throughout the Republic of Liberia in consonance with the provisions of this joint resolution.

" 'SEC. 4. This Joint Resolution shall take effect immediately and be published in handbills.

" 'Any law to the contrary notwithstanding. Approved March 25, 1960'; and

"Whereas the Government and people of Liberia in support of their Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, have always been opposed to Racial Segregation in any form, especially that as practised in the Union of South Africa: Now, therefore,

"I, William V. S. Tubman, President of the Republic of Liberia, by authority in me vested by the Act above cited, do hereby proclaim the 3d day of April A.D. 1960, a national day of mourning throughout and within the territorial confines of the Republic, for those who lost their lives in their peaceful pursuit of inherent and natural rights.

"I do also proclaim the 3d day of April to be a Day of Intercession for the abandonment of the inhuman and despicable apartheid policy practiced in the Union of South Africa.

"I hereby call upon all rectors and pastors of churches and all ministers of the gospel on the said day to have special services and to offer special prayers in commemoration of this day.

"And I do call upon all citizens and foreigners within our borders to observe the said 3d day of April 1960, as a National Day of Mourning and a Day of Intercession and to observe a minute of silence at 12 meridian in memory of those Africans in South Africa who have laid down their lives that right and justice may prevail."

Given under my hand and seal of the Republic in the city of Monrovia, this 26th day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty and of the Independence of the Republic the One Hundred and Thirteenth.

WILLIAM V. S. TUBMAN.

By the President.

J. RUDOLPH GRIMES,
Secretary of State.

Labor Views Unemployment Insurance in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to make a part of this RECORD a most significant address by Harold C. Hanover, president of the New York State AFL–CIO, at a meeting of the Albany Chapter of the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security held at Latham, N.Y., on April 6, 1960.

The address follows:

We of the New York State AFL–CIO, of course, have a particular interest in the employment security program and in your organization, because we believe that such a professional group as yours can serve not only as a center for the exchange of ideas, but it can do much to keep high and improve the standards of the profession in which you are engaged.

Further, your organization can provide and exercise a strong impetus toward a more effective employment security program that has such a direct impact on workers whom we represent and whose interests we, along with yourselves, seek to protect and improve, because it is a program designed to meet a basic social and economic need.

All of you as individuals and members of this association, I am sure, are mindful that employment security is an economic mainspring of the lives of more people, more frequently, more vitally and more fully than perhaps any other arm of Government, not excluding the Armed Forces.

You represent our State with every individual who comes to the division. For this reason we have, with you, a very special interest in an effective, humane, and clean-cut administration of the employment security laws. After all, the best way to kill a good law is to twist and distort it through prejudiced or inept administration. Likewise, the most effective way to kill a bad law is to enforce it strictly, honestly and fairly.

But what is a bad or a good law in the field of employment security? What are the objectives of unemployment insurance? I think it is an appropriate time to take stock of where we are as of now with the unemployment insurance program as compared with where we started, and to reflect on the part that this program should play in the future.

Dr. Arthur Larsen, the former Under Secretary of Labor and a most prominent authority on social insurance lists the following most important objectives of unemployment insurance:

1. To meet the personal income-loss problem of the unemployed and his family "by providing weekly cash payments in lieu of wages lost through temporary economic unemployment".

2. To maintain consumer purchasing power in the local community and in the Nation during such unemployment.

3. To "provide unemployment benefits in a way which will preserve the self-respect and complete freedom of the recipient and his family, and to place the cost ultimately upon the consumers of the product, rather than upon local taxpayers in the form of relief."

In evaluating our unemployment compensation system from the viewpoint of these objectives as stated, mind you, not by labor but a prominent spokesman and theoretician of the present administration in Washington, we have to look back a little. We will then find that with all its weaknesses and shortcomings, the unemployment compensation system now plays a significant role in our economic life and serves a social purpose in helping unemployed individuals and their families to some extent tide themselves over periods of temporary unemployment, aiding, in turn, the community, its shopkeepers and merchants.

During the 2 years, 1958 and 1959, over $900 million in benefits were paid out in New York State and, if the $98 million paid out in TUC and in extended State benefits are included, the unemployment insurance benefits total exceed $1 billion for these 2 years.

These benefits paid as a right, with no means test in any case, undoubtedly mark a distinct advance over the relief and work relief program to which we had to resort some 20 years ago when benefits were paid only in cases of proven need, and when there was some 20 percent unemployment.

However, while we have made some progress, it is well at the beginning of a new decade as we are setting new goals, to face up to a searching appraisal of the system. An analysis of the program reveals certain basic structural weaknesses which stem from some erroneous concepts that found their way into the unemployment insurance law.

The first major deficiency we see is the fact that benefit payments have steadily declined in value. In making this statement, I do not lose sight of the dollar increases in benefit payments that are cited to show the progress which has been made. In a program which is designed to provide wage-related benefits, however, statistics showing that average benefits have increased from $15 to $50 have little meaning unless related to what has happened to wages in the same period.

In 1939, the national average weekly wage in jobs covered by unemployment compensation was a little over $25. Most States—and New York was among them—provided maximum benefits of $15, which was 60 percent of the average weekly wage. The weekly wage loss suffered by the unemployed person receiving the benefit maximum was about $10 a week. Today the State average weekly wage in manufacturing is over $90 a week. Thus the maximum benefit of $50 will be 55 percent of the average weekly wage, as contrasted to 60 percent in 1939. The unemployed worker, who will be fortunate enough to receive the maximum benefit, still will suffer a weekly wage loss of over $40 as contrasted with $10 in 1939.

This serious inadequacy of the program is most strikingly shown during a recession period in the small portion of the total wage loss that is recovered through benefit payments. May I recall that this is also the view of the Advisory Council on Social Security which the Senate Committee on Finance appointed in 1947. This Committee, in which management, labor, the insurance industry and the general public were represented, unanimously pointed out in a survey in 1958 that not more than 25 percent of the wage loss caused by the unemployment of covered workers was compensated by unemployment benefits in preceding years.

As a result, unemployment compensation as it is today would have a very limited value as "the first line of defense" in compensating for income loss due to unemployment. In 1958, the survey estimated that only 20 percent of all wage loss due to unemployment was compensated by unemployment insurance, and even this may well be a high rather than a low estimate because there are some economists, for instance Prof. Richard Lester of Princeton University, who estimated than only 13 percent of the loss in wages had been compensated by unemployment benefits.

Another major factor in the total picture of the inadequacy of the unemployment insurance program is the limitation on the duration of benefits that denies benefits to thousands upon thousands of workers every year because they have exhausted their unemployment compensation rights and are no longer entitled to compensation even though they are still unemployed and otherwise eligible. In our State 176,500 workers exhausted their rights to regular unemployment compensation benefits in 1959 alone as compared with 70,000 in 1956—another post-recession year.

This policy of dropping an unemployed person after 26 weeks is as irrational as the policy of a tuberculosis sanitorium would be if it required discharging all patients after 6 months simply because statistics showed that tuberculosis should be cured in 6 months. What is even worse, statistics on unemployment do not give any sign whatsoever of improvement. On the contrary they not only show us an increase of unemployment in recent years but they distinctly warn us that higher levels of unemployment can be expected in the future. Structural changes related to automation and rapid technological development; speeding up of migration of industry; changes in the composition of our labor forces; failure of our economy to expand more rapidly to provide enough new job opportunities for those who are entering the labor force—all these factors are evident causes of a persistent rise in unemployment and only show how unreasonable it is to give automatic effect to a mathematical formula of 26 weeks of benefit duration.

Perhaps even more fantastic than the duration arrangements—and perhaps more serious in terms of the social damage—is the growing tendency in the legislature to increase maximum weekly benefits and at the same time to tighten up eligibility requirements for workers who become unemployed because of voluntary quits, refusal of employment and misconduct. Of course, a good unemployment compensation law should not pay benefits immediately to the man who in a moment of pique over some real or imagined grievance, walks off the job. Nor should it pay benefits to the man who wilfully provokes his own discharge, or who after a layoff from one job refuses to accept another just as good. To protect the fund from unemployment due to unreasonable acts of workers is one thing, but to pervert the intent of this law so as to produce complete forfeiture of benefits, is entirely different.

Unfortunately, our unemployment compensation law becomes more and more weighted with all manner of ingenious provisions designed specifically to disqualify a claimant whenever possible. Not only does he have to pick his way carefully through a tangle of redtape before he can prove his eligibility—but he must also expect his employer to put every obstacle in his way. And the law provides the employer with a built-in motive for doing so. This motive goes by the name of experience rating, a device responsible not only for washing the insurance feature out of unemployment compensation, but also for giving a few big corporations competitive advantage over smaller, less financially strong companies, and finally for inadequate financing and inadequate benefits in unemployment insurance.

The public is not sufficiently informed of these inequities of the system. It hears about the exceptional cases of fraud where an undeserving person is paid a benefit, but it is not told of the thousands and thousands of cases of disqualification based on arbitrary and capricious provisions of our State law. The public is subjected to poisonous propaganda that the whole unemployment insurance system is in danger because of thousands of loafers, quitters, schemers, and cheaters.

Actually, there is nothing new in charges of this kind. They remind me of charges hurled against the proposal to enact unemployment compensation early in the depression of the 1930's, to the effect that such a system would encourage people to quit their jobs in order to draw benefits. And yet the unemployment history of America shows that greatest unemployment has occurred during periods when there was no unemployment compensation whatsoever. Since we have had unemployment compensation, unemployment figures have never reached the heights of the long period when there was no national social security program of any kind.

The cynic may still wish to talk about individual cases rather than the statistical totals upon which programs are based. An

article that recently appeared in a leading American magazine is a special case in point. The author, a staff writer of the magazine, allegedly worked for more than a year to uncover that somewhere in Pittsburgh a retired man wrongfully picked up unemployment benefits; that a woman in New York improperly drew 9 weeks of unemployment compensation after she quit her job to become a bride; that in the last 3 years 170,000 cases of fraud were officially reported and that the take by gypsters amounted to more than $12 million.

I do not intend to go into polemic arguments with the writer. This is neither the right place nor the right time for it, but what I would like to say here is this:

Organized labor, of course, is opposed to deliberate fraud. We favor requiring the claimant who has obtained his benefits fraudulently to refund them, and, if penalties are imposed uniformly and fairly against both employers and employees who attempt deliberately to cheat the unemployment insurance fund, we do not oppose such punishment as fits the offense.

Thus, while labor does not condone, but condemns fraud when practiced by workers, it should be stressed that most fraud is committed not by claimants, but by employers. But this fact was completely disregarded by the pseudoscholarly author of this article, who felt fit to disregard study after study made in recent years that completely destroys the legend of excessive abuses in unemployment insurance.

These studies, made by Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Philip Booth, Chief of the Division of Program and Legislation, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor; Dr. Joseph M. Becker, Research Associate of St. Louis University; the archconservative and probusiness magazine U.S. News & World Report, and finally the Division of Employment of the New York State Department of Labor, clearly indicate that there are very few people in the labor force who prefer idleness to work. Says Mr. Booth in his study entitled "Myths and Realities in Unemployment Insurance."

"In a program protecting more than 40 million workers, some 'chiselers' are bound to show up. But if we take account of benefit payments equaling as much as $2 billion a year, the amount of money going out in improper payments in comparison with proper payments is remarkably small. Neither the weekly amount of benefits nor the methods of administration make the system particularly inviting to chiselers."

Even this distorted and slanted recent magazine article bears out this conclusion. The take by gypsters of $12 million in 3 years rightfully makes its author indignant, but what, probably out of modesty, he does not mention is that those $12 million represent slightly more than one-thousandth of 1 percent of the total amount of about $7 billion paid in unemployment benefits in the respective years 1956–58.

But what about crooked employers? What about their delinquencies in reporting their tax liability and in paying their unemployment compensation taxes? One glance at official figures will tell us the shocking story:

The January 1960 statistical supplement to the official Labor Market and Employment Security Bulletin published by the U.S. Department of Labor shows that for the second quarter of 1959 alone, 43,067 employers, or 2 percent of employers required to report, were delinquent in reporting their tax liability and unpaid unemployment taxes amounted to $41,862,205.

The same report shows that for the same period of time, that is, the third quarter of 1959, only one-tenth of 1 percent, mind you, only one out of a thousand claimants was denied benefits because of refusal to take available work. Now compare these sets of figures:

A $41 million delinquency in tax payments by employers in 3 months compared with $12 million in improper benefits paid to workers in 3 years.

Delinquent employers totaling 2 percent as against one one-tenth of 1 percent claimants disqualified because of refusal of suitable work.

Forty-three thousand, sixty-seven delinquent employers reported in a period of 3 months alone and 170,000 delinquent employees reported over the span of 3 years.

And if this is still not enough, there is another report of the Treasury Department on delinquent employment taxes printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1960, (p. 6210). This report shows that in December 1959 there were 256,287 delinquent employer accounts for an amount of $216,439,000 in employment taxes alone, that is, money which had been withheld from the pay checks of the employees as income taxes, social security taxes, unemployment taxes, etc., and which therefore should be treated as trust funds. But none of us, I'm sure, will see the author of this article shedding tears about these 256,000 cases of embezzlement by employers in just 365 days.

Whether this writer collected all the facts he could and then drew a picture based on facts, or had a preconceived idea and collected only the facts to support it and fit the mold of the wishes of some employer organization, is neither here nor there.

I prefer to leave to you the answer to this question. But frankly speaking, I would like to suggest that we picture for ourselves a program geared to the needs of the sixties. In the light of shortcomings, inadequacies and contradictions now characterizing our unemployment compensation system, the logical goals for legislation in this area are obvious.

They are even more obvious in view of predictions made by economists that we can anticipate another recession by 1961 and possibly another one by 1965. The experience ever since 1953 has been that we have come out of recessions with higher levels of unemployment than before. We came out of the 1953 recession with a higher level of unemployment than we had before that. We seem to have come out of the 1957–58 recession with a still higher level of joblessness. If this same ratio persists, according to the forecast of some leading economists, we are going to hit 6 million, 7 million or even 8 million unemployed mark sometime within the next few years, and perhaps even more than that.

Should we then wait idly for another recession or should we rather fix the roof before it rains again? I think that now there is still time to carry out permanent improvements, not only with a view to mitigating individual hardships but also to aid our economy to better meet the many problems arising during a recession.

Among the most urgent improvements in State legislation which are vitally needed while the lessons of the recession are still fresh in our memory are:

1. Coverage should be broadened to protect all persons attached to the labor force not now covered.

2. The maximum duration of benefits should be increased to at least 39 weeks with provision for longer duration whenever the average unemployment in an area reaches recession levels, of say, 6 to 9 percent.

3. The weekly benefit amount should be established at about two-thirds of the State's average weekly wage in covered employment, with dependent allowances' to supplement the basic benefit schedule.

4. Eliminate harsh, restrictive, and arbitrary provisions in regard to eligibility and disqualifications, and improve the financing of benefit costs.

5. Substantial improvement of the employment service through: fully effective placement service geared to the needs of all kinds of workers in all occupational and industrial fields; the employment counseling service for the use of the people with the need to make vocational decisions; community labor market information which would also describe the national employment and unemployment situations; special services to meet the needs of such groups as veterans, young people, migratory workers and the handicapped.

I have enumerated a number of policies, which if adopted, would do much not only to alleviate present unemployment but go far to prevent future crises when large numbers of people are willing and able to work but unable to find it. This program will not be an easy one to get enacted, but you can be sure that labor will not give up its fight to improve unemployment compensation laws through State, and if necessary, Federal action. We firmly believe that every worker wants a job rather than unemployment benefits. If spokesmen of industry would spend less time in publicizing the question of fraudulent payments and more time in studying the adequacy of benefit provisions in terms of the needs of workers who are dependent on unemployment compensation and what happens to them when they are unemployed and are forced to get along on unemployment compensation, we believe they would do much to create a public attitude which will lead to the development of laws that will provide adequate unemployment compensation.

The Airspace Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the very capable publisher of the New Japanese American News of Los Angeles, Calif., Mr. Saburo Kido, has written a very commendable editorial on the progress the United States has recently made in the space race.

As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have consistently been confident of the ability of the United States to equal and surpass Russian scientists in the space race.

I commend Mr. Kido for his favorable observations which conform with my own, and am pleased to include in my remarks his editorial:

THE AIRSPACE RACE

(By Saburo Kido)

The numerous successful shots being fired by the American team in the space race seem to overshadow the original sensation created by the Russian sputniks. Little is being heard from the Soviet side about their latest achievements.

The American scientists may have been holding things up because of the changes being made in the assignment of the work.

The work that is being carried on at the Vandenberg Air Force Base and at Cape Canaveral is verging on the spectacular these days. One after another, new instruments are being carried aloft. There is no doubt that the prestige of the United States is being regained rapidly.

On the other hand, there seems to be a suspicion that the Soviets may bring another surprise to offset the news that the Americans are creating these days.

There are other good news to bring encouragement to the American people. For a while, it seemed as if all the good scientists were in Soviet Russia and that our men were not able to match the Russians.

The Polaris firing from underwater is one of the major programs of the U.S. Navy. The success it achieved the other day by being fired from underwater was another new step toward the strength this country is attaining.

Furthermore, Congress is appropriating more money to speed up the research and experiments. If money is what the scientists and Government agencies need to catch up with the Russians, the people have clearly indicated that they are willing to see larger appropriations.

The change in emphasis toward missiles can be a dangerous risk. In other words, in national defense preparations, the shift can unbalance the soundness of the tactical forces.

The President was not afraid of criticisms when he refused to go ahead with the huge propeller-driven airplanes for the Air Force buildup. Today, his judgment is being vindicated. And when Congress wants to stir up controversy about the so-called lag in defense preparations, the President is standing his ground. He is making adjustments which are considered to be a sound approach instead of being panicked into a shift under hysteria.

The American progress in the missile race seems to be speeding up. The people and the world at large are beginning to find out that our scientists are not bad after all.

The Negro in American Church Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber during this session about the place of the Negro in American society. Some Members have contended that the separation of the races in the South and elsewhere has been maintained by a dominant white majority as part of an evil design of oppression. Those who express this view apparently find it difficult to realize that any substantial number of Negro people would prefer to maintain their own racial integrity through their own institutions of worship, study and recreation.

To dispel these misconceptions, it seems appropriate to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to a recent article in the magazine of The Northern Neck Historical Society, written by the Honorable Robert O. Norris, Jr., a distinguished attorney, a noted historian and an able former member of the Virginia State Senate. The article shows that, prior to the Civil War and for some years thereafter, all of the Negroes in the Northern Neck area of Virginia were admitted as members to the white churches there. Between 1865 and 1870, the Negroes withdrew voluntarily and organized their own churches out of a natural desire for closer communion with God among members of their own race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF LEBANON BAPTIST CHURCH
LANCASTER COUNTY, VA.

(By Senator Robert O. Norris, Jr.)

According to Semple's History of Baptists in Virginia, members of this denomination first appeared in the southeastern part of the State about the year 1714, but it was not until Baptists began to come from New England about the year 1750 that the denomination began to really take form and grow in this State. The foundation of this denomination was laid in the Northern Neck by Lewis Lunsford, a native of Stafford County, who when not yet 18 years of age, began to preach and large crowds flocked to hear the wonderful boy, so remarkable were his talents and eloquence. He made his appearance in the lower Northern Neck about 1774 and in 1778 Morattico Church, the mother church of the Baptist denomination in the four lower Northern Neck counties, which is still in existence, was organized. The tradition is that this church was organized at a private home, "Morattico Hall," in Richmond County and that it received its name on account of this circumstance, although the church itself was located some 30 miles away. For many years prior to this time there had been a considerable congregation of Presbyterians in Lancaster and Northumberland Counties, which had once been ministered to by the celebrated Mr. Waddell, the blind preacher. By 1778 their local organization had very largely ceased to function and it is my opinion that these people contributed very largely to the foundation of the Baptist denomination in these parts.

It is the duty and should be the delight of the student of history to uncover the rubbish and accumulations of the years and to bring to the attention of the reader circumstances and personalities that have exercised a powerful control for good not only in their day and generation but upon the generations as they come and go for centuries thereafter. The philosophy of history is not so much a matter of dates and figures as it is of cause and effect and it is with this object in view that I shall discuss the history of this beloved old church.

On Saturday, September 4, 1841, a group of men and women, who were then members of Morattico Baptist Church, met at Corrottoman Meeting House, now known as Ottoman, withdrew from the mother church and organized Lebanon Baptist Church. From a perusal of the names of these 49 persons enrolled at the organization meeting, it is obvious that they embraced a large number of the leading citizens of the upper part of Lancaster County. The name of Rawleigh Dunaway, Sr., heads the list, who was then or had been high sheriff of the county. Included is the name of Thomas S. Dunaway, whose son was destined to be one of the leading Baptist ministers in the Virginia Assocation; Robert T. Dunaway, clerk of Lancaster County; William T. Jesse, Ralph H. Chilton, Samuel Gresham, Commonwealth's attorney of the county; Thomas D. Eubank, and many others whose names are household words in this section. It is interesting to read the covenant signed by these 49 devoted and sturdy pioneers, a part of which reads as follows:

"And with regards to one another we do hereby covenant and agree (reserving to ourselves respectively the right of conscience and our Christian liberty in general) that we will give ourselves mutually to each other as members of the same body; that we will endeavor to subject one to another in the Lord; to bear each other's well being, and to unite our efforts in the common cause of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

On the same day William T. Jesse was elected clerk and Robert D. Dunaway, treasurer of the church, and commissioners were appointed to let out and superintend the building of a new brick church. On October 23, 1841, a committee was appointed to select a suitable place for their church, and reported that it be located on the "corner of land belonging to Brother Thomas S. Dunaway—who kindly offered to give to the church an acre—near Haynie's gate on the south side of the road leading from Farnham Church to Lancaster courthouse," which report was adopted and the location confirmed. Also on that day the following deacons were elected: Ralph H. Chilton, Robert T. Dunaway, Thomas S. Dunaway, and Thomas D. Eubank, and the committee on church building reported that it had contracted with Col. Thomas S. Dunaway to do the brick work for $920, the building to be 36 by 50 feet, which however was later changed to 30 by 50 feet. In 1842 Thomas W. Toby and Thomas S. Dunaway, licentiates, were requested to preach for the church, which they did until the end of the year.

It is interesting to know that Thomas W. Toby moved to this county from the State of Rhode Island bringing with him a letter from the Minister of the First Baptist Church of Bristol in that State. Therefore, it may be said that one of the first preachers to preach in the newly organized church was a man who brought with him the ideals and traditions of Roger Williams, the founder of the State of Rhode Island and who perhaps did most to advance the Baptist faith on the North American Continent. The new brick church in which we are now assembled, was completed and the dedicatory sermon preached by Dr. Jeremiah B. Jeter on the third Sunday in May 1843, and at the same time Elders Addison Hall and William H. Kirk accepted the joint pastorate of the church. Elder Hall was to continue this pastorate for 27 years and Elder Kirk continued as joint pastor until December 3, 1853, at which time he resigned in order to take up another charge.

In 1846 the first Sunday School was organized and opened with 10 teachers and from 40 to 50 pupils.

On Saturday before the first Sunday in August 1847, the Baptist Association met with the church for the first time.

In January 1849, it appearing that Col. Thomas S. Dunaway, then deceased, had executed a deed of gift for the land on which the church stood but had not delivered same, a committee was appointed to secure the deed from his administrator, Robert T. Dunaway. They secured this deed and later dissension developed in the congregation, which apparently was divided into two factions, with the result that in that year a number of the members withdrew from the church and organized Mount Pisgah Baptist Church which was to be located at Lancaster Courthouse. There ensued a sharp disagreement between Lebanon Church and Mount Pisgah in that the members of Mount Pisgah demanded a return to them of their contributions toward the building of Lebanon Church. Lebanon offered to turn over to the new organization the meeting house at Corotoman, which the new church refused, and offered in lieu thereof that the matter be arbitrated, to which Lebanon Church replied by saying that it in all modesty felt that it could attend to its own business without calling in foreign assistance and reaffirmed that it was the owner of Lebanon Church and would not agree to return to anyone any contributions or to admit that anyone other than the members of Lebanon Church had any interest in said church property. It is evident that Lebanon Church was triumphant in the controversy

for it appears that Mount Pisgah Church dissolved on October 11, 1850, and all of the members of that church with the exception of one or two immediately took membership in Lebanon.

By July 1859, the membership had increased to 185, 110 white and 75 colored, it then being the practice among all the churches to accept as members of the church those colored persons who desired to join. From 1859 to 1863 there are no minutes of the meetings but in 1863, a committee was appointed and this committee spread upon the minute book a history of the church during those years. In 1862 William T. Jesse resigned as clerk and was succeeded by Thomas D. Eubank, Jr., known to us as Dr. Tom Eubank. Two of the younger members of the church, who had patriotically volunteered to fight for their country in the War Between the States, Abner Revier and Thomas Denny, sacrificed their lives for their country in the terrific 7 days' battle before Richmond in 1862, and in the same year Thomas S. Dunaway, Jr., was ordained as a preacher.

On May 23, 1863, there is this notation in the minute book. "No meeting today in consequence of the presence of the public enemy." On April 23, 1864, Samuel Gresham and Thomas Rice were elected deacons in the place of Thomas D. Eubank, deceased, and Thomas S. Dunaway, Jr., who had been ordained to preach. At the meeting on October 22, 1864, it was necessary to elect a treasurer pro tem, for the reason that Edgar E. Dunaway, treasurer, and Thomas D. Eubank, Jr., clerk, were both absent in the military service of the country. On November 20, 1864, two members charged with desertion to the enemy were excluded from the church and many slaves, who had joined the public enemy, were also excluded.

In July 1865 a resolution was passed informing the members that they could not engage in the sale of ardent spirits and continue to hold their membership in the church. On November 24, 1866, resolutions were passed on the departure of Thomas S. Dunaway, who had been called to preach at the Baptist Church at Fredericksburg, Va. On December 22, 1866, Jessie Wiggins, colored freedman, was licensed to preach and the colored people were given the use of Corrottoman Meeting House during the months of winter and spring. On November 23, 1867, a general letter of dismissal was given all the colored members upon their request so that they could organize their own church.

On November 21, 1868, two additional deacons, Thomas D. Eubank, and Charles R. Kirk, were elected. In September 1869, A. B. Dunaway was elected clerk in place of R. W. Eubank, resigned. In August 1870, A. B. Dunaway, and William T. Marsh were elected deacons. In October 1870, the Reverend Addison Hall resigned as minister of the church and A. B. Dunaway was requested to preach until a new minister could be secured, which he agreed to do. On June 24, 1871, memorial resolutions were adopted on the death of the Reverend Addison Hall. On July 23, 1871, W. F. Dunaway and A. B. Dunaway were ordained and W. F. Dunaway was called to preach at Morattico and A. B. Dunaway became pastor of Lebanon and Farnham. On the same day a resolution was adopted thanking Maj. John Norris for "The real and handsome manner in which the pulpit of the church had been fitted up by him."

On October 21, 1871, John A. Rogers was elected deacon in the place of A. B. Dunaway, resigned.

On March 28, 1872, a mission Sunday school was established near the residence of Royston Marsh, which was undoubtedly the beginning of Providence Baptist Church.

On March 22, 1873, a resolution was passed denouncing dancing and on June 21, 1873, memorial resolutions were adopted on the death of Samuel Gresham, one of the founders of the church and for many years deacon and commonwealth attorney of the county. There was at that time 146 members of the church and 134 members of the Sunday school.

On September 27, 1873, Warner Eubank was elected deacon. In 1875 there appears to have been an epidemic of dancing that struck the younger members of the church and a very emphatic resolution was passed against "The giddy dance," and committees were appointed to notify the offenders that they must either stop dancing or that they would be excluded from the church. That same year the Rappahannock Baptist Association met with the church for the second time and Isaac H. Marsh was elected deacon.

In 1876 the number of members was 181 and the following year many of the members were given letters for the purpose of organizing Providence Baptist Church.

On March 23, 1876, A. B. Dunaway resigned as pastor to accept another call and the Reverend F. W. Claybrook was called and accepted.

In 1881 Frank Settle was elected clerk and Joseph Davenport deacon. In 1883, George Cottingham, Thornton B. Sampson, Frank Settle, and George Shackleford were elected deacons. In 1885 land was purchased from W. P. Haynie for a parsonage and a committee was appointed to build same. On February 28, 1886, F. W. Claybrook resigned as pastor and later the same year certain members requested letters from the church to organize Corrottoman Baptist Church. On June 12, 1887, James T. Eubank was called to preach at Lebanon and Corrottoman. In 1889 James T. Eubank resigned as pastor to accept another call and W. E. Wright was called as pastor for a short time.

In 1890 it was ordered that the spittoons be removed from the church and Rev. W. A. Street was called as pastor and accepted. Elder Street continued to act as pastor until 1900 which takes us out of the realm of history and brings us well within the memory of living members of the church.

During the first one-half century of the life of the church it appears that it was the custom among the members to use the church meetings as a forum for the trial and adjustment of all difficulties between the members and of all charges of moral delinquency on the part of the members. It is not only pathetic but amusing to learn from a reading of the minutes of the church meetings that some few of the members, who by reason of moral weakness were prone to yield to temptation and were inclined to look upon the wine too often when it was red or to indulge in the pastime known as gambling or to violate some other moral law of the church, would after due summons appear in church meetings and express their sorrow at having violated the laws of the church and ask that they be allowed to remain in fellowship, only to shortly thereafter yield again to temptation and be again cited to appear before the church. Violators were not excluded from the church unless they disregarded the citation and treated the proceedings with contempt or requested that they be excluded. Reference is made to a case in point when two of the members of the church (who were engaged in the mercantile business and who apparently conducted barrooms in connection with their merchandising establishments) were summoned to appear before the church and show cause why they should not be excluded from membership. One of them did appear and admitted that he was in error in conducting a barroom in connection with his merchandising business and that as soon as he disposed of his present supply of liquors, he would close up his barroom and not engage in the sale of strong liquors again. The other one paid no attention whatever to the summons and did not appear with the result that he was excluded from membership in the church, while the member who had promised to close up his barroom was permitted to continue in good standing. It should be stated that the member who had promised to close his barroom after he had disposed of his then supply of liquors measured up to his promise and continued for many years to be a leading member of the denomination.

Since the year 1900, the church has been served by a number of earnest, capable and devoted ministers, among whom can be named the following: Dr. Wayland F. Dunaway, who had returned to Lancaster County to spend the evening of his life, the Reverend E. M. Ramsey, the Reverend S. C. Walker, the Reverend George T. Schools, the Reverend J. L. Waldrop, the Reverend W. W. Shelton and the Reverend R. S. Whitescarver, who is the present minister, all of whom were and are untiring in their devotion to the arduous duties of a minister of four churches, including Lebanon.

The present deacons of the church are I. L. Forrester, John Marsh, Collin Marsh, Marvin Davenport, Charles Davenport, Edmond P. Christopher, T. T. Jackson, Jr., and Ford Warwick. The present clerk is Ford Warwick and the treasurer is Marvin Davenport. The superintendent of the Sunday school is Garland Forrester. The present minister, Rev. Roy Whitescarver, is a man of ability and untiring devotion to his duties and although he has come from a distant portion of the State, he has greatly endeared himself to the people of this section.

In 1954 Lebanon church entered upon a period of renovation, additions and repairs. A large, handsome educational building was added to the church, heat installed, new pews were placed in the church, and the entire interior was renovated. This effort on the part of the membership, had it been let to contract, would have cost many thousands of dollars. Fortunately, however, some of the members were themselves contractors and builders and they did a great deal of work themselves with the aid of the membership and with the assistance of a friend who kindly loaned them some money they were enabled to complete this addition and renovation without further expense and have now almost entirely paid off the loan. The exterior of the church has not been hurt by the addition of the educational building as the same style of architecture has been preserved in the addition. The interior of both the church and the educational building is of the same pattern and all who visit the church are impressed with the plain but handsome interior.

The church is at this time well organized and embraces in its membership a large majority of the people living in the surrounding country, for which the present minister, his predecessors, the board of deacons and officers of the church are entitled to large credit.

In conclusion, it must be said that a church is after all measured by its works, by the influence for good it has created, by the number of sons and daughters it has sent out into the world whose lives and deeds have tended toward the uplift of humanity and have encouraged the cultivation of the high and noble attributes of the human race. This old church has been the mother church of the upper part of Lancaster County, two other churches having sprung directly from its loins as well as all of the colored Baptist churches in the upper part of this country and another, Norwood Chapel, is in part the offspring of this church. It has contributed a number of men to the Baptist ministry of Virginia, all of whom became leaders of the Southern Baptist Association. Can one doubt but that all of these results have been inherited from those 49 pioneers who over 100 years ago signed a solemn

covenant and organized this church. Anyone who reads that covenant will realize that they were men and women of the highest integrity, of sturdy independence, actuated only by the desire to do right and imbued with a religious faith that enabled them to surmount all obstacles in the full and complete consummation of what they had set out to do. Anyone who reads the address of the committee of the united Baptist churches in Virginia to George Washington, the newly elected President of the United States, is forced to the conclusion that there were no more enthusiastic patriots among the American Colonies than were the Baptists and no more enthusiastic supporters of General Washington upon the field of battle than they; and anyone who reads the reply of President Washington must know that he cheerfully conceded that fact for he says:

"While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members have been throughout America uniformly and almost unanimously the firm friend to civil liberty and the preserving promoters of our glorious revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be faithful supporters of a free yet efficient general government."

It may be truly said that this old church has fully carried the burden that its organizers assumed in that it has always from its origin down to the present stood for the promotion and cultivation of those high and noble qualities of the human heart and mind, and in that its influence has always been exercised for the acquisition and promotion of the good things of life. My fond wish is that it may continue along the line that it has always worked, that it may always stand for the high, noble, and spiritual things of life and that it may always register its opposition to those things that debauch the human race, and that for centuries to come, here it may stand, under the spreading shade of the noble oaks that surround it, as a monument to the devotion of its founders and as a guidepost to the coming generations as they come and go.

Nixon Makes Friends in Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the finest diversified congressional districts in the Nation, in the heart of Illinois. We have some of the best farmlands in the country, producing some of the highest yields in grains and prize livestock. In the industrial center surrounding the Peoria-Pekin area, labor is well organized with 38 separate unions, including the largest United Auto Workers local in Illinois numbering some 19,000 members. It is important to me that our presidential nominee be sympathetic to the problems of the workingman and the farmer.

I know from personal conferences with DICK NIXON that he fulfills this requirement. He has some ideas of his own on a farm program which I am sure will be refined for presentation to the people at the appropriate time. The rank and file of organized labor stand to benefit by the election of DICK NIXON and I am sure he will be regarded as as good a friend of labor as I am in my own district where it would be impossible to be elected without a sizable vote from working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a recent article of Victor Riesel entitled "NIXON Makes Friends in Labor" be printed at this point:

NIXON MAKES FRIENDS IN LABOR
(By Victor Riesel)

Nelson Rockefeller would have just cause for action against RICHARD NIXON if he sued the Vice President for alienating the affection of some of the Nation's most influential labor leaders. Perhaps "affection" is too strong a word. So make it "respect."

Whichever way you say it, the fact is that in a recent series of meetings the Vice President has turned some of his most bitter critics into the friendliest of enemies. If they are as fond of him in November as they are in May, the policymaking union chiefs will fight NIXON, but there'll be an unprofessional amount of padding in the gloves they throw at him.

Most recent of these unpublicized talks had an "Alice-in-Wonderland" touch. Into NIXON'S office in the Senate Building on Wednesday, April 6, walked a small group of labor leaders who had been Franklin Delano Roosevelt's close friends and who loved to call the late F.D.R. their "best business agent."

On that day—the morning after the Wisconsin primaries—there sat around NIXON'S desk such militant liberals as the sagacious David Dubinsky, the Ladies Garment Workers' chief; Arthur Goldberg, the man who has become known as the legal prophet of American labor; Alex Rose, the Hatters Union president who wears two hats, naturally, one being the leadership of New York's Liberal Party, and Jack Potofsky, leader of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, long sophisticated politically, for theirs is the union created by the late Sidney Hillman.

The union men had come with Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, the Republican's minister with heavy portfolio to the world of labor. For 2 hours they talked politics. They heard the Vice President appear to predict that Senator JACK KENNEDY would get the Democratic nomination. They kidded NIXON about being on the wrong side. They nominated Jim Mitchell for Vice President on the Republican ticket.

They talked about trying to get a national minimum wage law of $1.25 an hour and heard NIXON say that the time would come. They spoke of the Forand bill for health aid to the aged and the "veep" was sympathetic to swift action on some sort of a formula which would make it possible for the older folk to pay hospital bills. They were grave about the threats from foreign imports.

After they left, they told each other and their personal friends that they had gone through the intricacies of modern labor's future problems and found NIXON "well informed and sympathetic." For most of them it was their first meeting with him since he had been booed by AFL delegates at the federation's 1954 convention. They said their personal picture of him was different from the image that had been projected.

NIXON'S ever-widening contact with labor is Jim Mitchell's doing. Day and night the Secretary has been working on his project of the politically impossible—swinging labor's top men closer to the Republican administration.

It was Mitchell, for example, who arranged AFL–CIO president George Meany's conference with President Eisenhower in the White House on April 26.

The conservatives in the Cabinet view this coming conversation with the enthusiasm the NAACP would show for awarding Governor Faubus a man-of-the-year medal. Secretary of Labor Mitchell knows this, of course. Yet he worked it all out with Meany at a private dinner on April 11. They were in Miami Beach and met at the Shamrock Isle Motel.

Meany wants President Eisenhower to sponsor a labor-management summit conference. The business people want to know what will be discussed and who will speak for industry before they walk into such a gathering—and before the White House sponsors one.

But it appears that there will be a summit at home. Labor knows it has Mitchell to thank and that Mitchell looks to DICK NIXON for advice and frequently consent. So it isn't likely that labor is going to really clobber these men come election time.

Census of Lead and Zinc Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a necessary tool in the mechanics of collective bargaining is the productivity index, the output per man-hour. Imbalance here affects the whole complex and delicate machinery.

Recently, President John Clark of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers detected such imbalance and called for a revision of U.S. Department of Labor estimates of employment in lead and zinc mining.

In a letter to Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the president of the nonferrous metal miners' union said recent surveys of lead and zinc mine employment by the U.S. Tariff Commission and Census Bureau indicate "upward bias" in Labor Department estimates.

Use of "biased" Department estimates in calculating productivity indexes tend to understate recent gains in output per hour of lead and zinc miners, Mr. Clark said, adding that it now appears that productivity in the industry was about 75 percent higher last year than in 1947, the base year of the Bureau of Labor statistics index.

The text of Mr. Clark's letter to Mr. Mitchell follows:

Recently the U.S. Tariff Commission in its latest report on lead and zinc, and the Census Bureau, in its preliminary summary of the 1958 Mineral Industries Census of the Lead and Zinc Ores Industries have reported the employment of production and development workers in the lead and zinc mining for recent years.

These data indicate an increasingly upward bias since 1956 in the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates of employment of production and development workers in lead and zinc mining.

The Tariff Commission and Census Bureau data would appear to be comparable conceptually with the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates, and should be more accurate because the former agencies did not employ sampling techniques.

Data from the three agencies are compared in the following table. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates given here are the latest annual estimates available in pub-

lished form except for 1957 and 1959, where simple arithmetical averages of the first 9 months are presented for comparability with Tariff Commission data.

Average number of production workers employed in lead-zinc mining and milling as reported by Federal agencies

Year	Labor Department estimates	Census Bureau	Tariff Commission
1954	13,800	13,592	----------
1955	14,200	----------	----------
1956	14,900	----------	14,251
1957 (Jan.–Sept.)	14,700	----------	13,208
1958	10,500	8,682	8,566
1959 (Jan.–Sept.)	10,066	----------	7,983

This matter is of direct interest to my union because of the use we make of the Bureau of Labor Statistics productivity indexes in collective bargaining. In current negotiations with the northern Idaho lead-zinc mining operators we have had available Bureau of Labor Statistics productivity index numbers for this industry only through 1957. The data presented above indicate that the index number for 1957 is low, and we estimate roughly that the numbers for 1958 and 1959 on a 1947 base should be on the order of 165 and 175, if the Bureau's estimates were adjusted, say, to benchmark levels indicated for 1958 by both the Tariff Commission and the Census Bureau.

I am writing to ask that your Department give consideration to a revision of its employment estimates in lead-zinc mining in the light of the new data that are now at hand, and that the calculation of productivity index numbers be speeded up. It should be possible by this time to calculate index numbers for 1958 and 1959, as well as to check the numbers for 1957 and possibly 1956.

Time To Farm Effectively

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Family Farm Income Act of 1960. In so doing I am supporting the legislation proposed by many of my colleagues who have expressed dissatisfaction with the administration's farm policy, including my colleague from eastern Oregon AL ULLMAN. Many variations of farm policy renovations have been introduced this Congress. From them I am hopeful that the hard-working Committee on Agriculture will report a bill which will solve the ever-mounting too long continued crisis in American agriculture.

Around us we watch as surplus commodities stockpile. We are told that in time of drought our surplus would be used up. It makes as much sense to pronounce solemnly that in the event of extreme heat the Potomac would dry up.

Our agriculture know-how is the best in the world. Our farmers produce more and more on less land. The administration's soil bank program has in no way alleviated the problem of overabundance. It is time for a change. It has been time for a change for a long, long time.

The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 is designed to raise family farm income while simultaneously reducing the cost to taxpayers.

Representative POAGE, the knowledgeable vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, calls this legislation a farmers' bill of rights. He says it answers the President's call to draft effective farm legislation. He has explored the bill completely with other farm experts and has already offered corrections which improve it.

It is not difficult to point out the trouble spots in agriculture today. One only has to look at the revealing drop in net farm income in 7 years. It has dropped from $15.3 billion in 1952 to $10.3 billion in 1959. The per capita farm income has failed to even remain at half that of the city resident. The parity ratio, the relationship of farm prices to other prices, has dropped from 100 percent in 1952 to 77 percent in 1960.

As my colleague, Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, noted in February, farm prices are down 16 percent from the 1952 figure while costs are up 11 percent. The squeeze is not new to the family farmer.

There are other trouble spots which have been recounted often in this House. Farm indebtedness is up $6.8 billion this year over 1952; interest charges have climbed. Representative MCGOVERN notes they are up 80 percent since 1952.

Statistics show that the farm population declined 3.5 million in 8 years. While this occurred the number of farm units dropped.

The legislation I have introduced has been designed to restore family farming to its rightful position.

It restores the farmers' bargaining power through self-imposed commodity regulations on production and marketing.

By balancing production with demand our national economic health would be strengthened. I believe that farmers can develop their own program to establish nationwide marketing quotas which will insure production to meet demand. I believe that it is possible to cut our reserve surpluses by 10 percent each year in an orderly program of distribution.

The bill I have introduced provides for the use of direct compensatory payments up to a maximum of $5,000 to any one producer to assure him a fair return for his marketing quota. This relief will be used only if needed. My farmer friends suggest that properly established marketing quotas will eliminate need for such compensatory payments.

Under this proposed bill each farm operator would have to place at least 10 percent of his tillable acres in a soil-building base. He could add to 30 percent more for which he would be compensated in payments of surplus Government-held feed grains rather than through cash payments as now established under the soil bank program. I think the two-pronged effect of such a system is obvious.

Under title II a new type of food distribution program is proposed. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to increase the amount of high protein foods such as dairy, poultry, and meat products distributed to the needy, to institutions, and through the school lunch program. To carry out the program, the Secretary is directed to purchase any of the products which are not in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the language of the bill:

> Whenever any donee eligible to receive commodities desires to do so, such commodities may be purchased on the local market in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, thereby relieving the Government of the necessity of storing and transporting such commodities. The sum of $500 million per annum for each year is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

As proposed the estimated cost of the program would be limited to no more than 5 percent of the annual market value of each of the commodities participating in the program. It is estimated that the program would cost about one-tenth the sum now being spent—or $0.5 billion yearly as compared to today's $5.3 billion.

In discussing this legislation with my colleagues I am aware that amendments will be necessary. I understand, for example, that the dairy industry has a working marketing program and does not feel it is wise or necessary to change it. Changes in wheat marketing are needed. I know that revised bills include such provisions.

My purpose in joining with my colleagues is to lend support in an area which does affect every other area of our economy. A healthy and strong farm economy is not an impossibility.

Surplus food, stored in warehouses at high cost to the taxpayer, benefits no one.

Poor acreage confined to a soil bank program does not meet the need to take out of operation highly productive land. This sort of operation does little more than rob the taxpayer as well as cripple the farmer.

The taxpayer and the farmer demand a new, effective farm program. Piling up surpluses is no answer. The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 offers the best route out of a distressing situation.

Economic Picture Looks Brighter for Oneonta, N.Y., a Bright Spot in the Midst of Much New York State Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oneonta Star of April 15, 1960. There is so much unemployment in so many parts of my district, and I have been fighting so hard here in Congress to deal with that problem, that it is a pleasure indeed to be able to report that the picture has brightened at least to some extent in the city of Oneonta. Let us hope that this trend continues, though we surely cannot afford to let even this bright spot lull us into any complacency. Oneonta has moved swiftly to promote the welfare of its people. I feel sure the effort is already beginning to pay off:

ONEONTA AREA ECONOMY BETTER THAN NATIONAL

It appears that Oneonta is a slight bright spot in a tarnished national employment picture.

While the Nation as a whole picked up another quarter of a million unemployed last month, Otsego and Delaware Counties actually showed a slight gain.

The excuse presented by the Labor Department for the national situation is that bad weather further reduced farm and construction work. Both those fields are important percentages of this area's employment and we certainly had the bad weather; still we are up.

With this encouragement at the start of a new season, the area seems ready to have a good year. Stable employment in the hard goods industries and stores is a good start. Construction on the $1.7 million phys-ed building at the college campus seems a sure bonus.

Nationally the picture is not supposed to be so bright even as good weather approaches. Steel is a problem; and if steel dips, can the auto industry be far behind? Our economy is so diversified today that a temporary weakness in either of those industries is felt throughout the land.

This sounds like a time for alertness among Government economists. We are supposed to be headed for a big national year but we shouldn't be so sure of it that we let a few small leaks in the dike get out of hand.

We've had enough of floods for one year.

He Hiked From Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention an article which appeared in the Family Weekly, April 10, 1960.

This article points up the great desire of Vern Carrol, of Dubuque, Iowa, for strengthening Boys Clubs of America. He hiked from Dubuque to Fairbanks, Alaska, to help demonstrate the great need for establishing a Boys Club in that State—the only one with no Boys Club. Vern Carrol is to be congratulated for his fine work and enthusiasm in Boys Clubs of America.

The article follows:

HE HIKED FROM IOWA

Iowa to Alaska is some 4,000 miles, but a wiry, bearded man named Vern Carroll knows every step of the way because he recently covered it—on foot.

He went from Dubuque to Fairbanks, a march lasting almost 5 months, during which he slept under bridges and in culverts and enjoyed such delicacies as moose, porcupine, and wild berries when his store-bought groceries gave out.

"It was a wild, wonderful adventure, and I had a good, rough time of it," says Carroll. "The outdoor life made me feel like a man of 20 again, and I'd do it over if it'd help the boys."

"The boys" of whom the 49-year-old former truckdriver speaks are the youngsters who are members of Boys' Clubs of America. Carroll, a volunteer worker in the Dubuque club, staged his trek to dramatize the need for a club to be established in Alaska, the only State which doesn't have one. Orphaned as a boy himself, Carroll declares, "I've always been interested in kids, and while I've seen evil men I've never met a bad child."

The hiker started from Dubuque with some food, clothing, and camping gear stuffed into a golf cart, but he switched to a shoulder pack on the Alcan Highway. "All along the way people offered to pick me up, but when I explained I was walking in behalf of the boys' clubs, they'd wish me well and go ahead," says Carroll. "In fact, the only problem I had was dogs—they're not always as friendly as people."

His most memorable experience was in the Yukon. Picking berries one day, he glanced up to spy a bear foraging in the same bushes. "I moved on," he admits. Other times, incessant rains washed out his campsite, and he spent the nights trying to get warm and dry.

"As he goes through life, every man has to take some bitter with the sweet," Carroll wrote the Dubuque club from Alaska. "When you can do that, it makes a good man out of you, and I know all you lads will be real men some day."

The walk from State No. 29 to State No. 49 already has borne fruit: an Anchorage businessman named Henry Wolff has donated land for Alaska's first boys' club, and a number of carpenters have volunteered to erect the building.

What a Career Will Mean to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening I had the honor of attending the Career Key Awards dinner sponsored by the Girls Clubs of America and Reader's Digest Foundation. This privilege came to me because a young lady from the Seventh District of Indiana, Miss Maryka Ruth Matthews, was among the nine finalists in the Career Key awards competition.

Miss Matthews is a freshman at Lawrence College in Appleton, Wis. She was graduated last year from Franklin High school, Franklin, Ind., where her scholastic record was almost perfect. In addition, she had been the editor of the yearbook, associate editor of the paper, president of the honor society, and vice president of four other groups. She was voted "best all-round girl" in her senior class.

I was further gratified to learn that Miss Matthews was selected from among the nine finalists as the winner. As part of the competition she had submitted an essay on her interest in a career, and I would like to enter it at this time:

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME
(By Maryka Ruth Matthews)

A career, to me, is a chance to make a contribution to humanity. It is my responsibility to mankind. I owe a debt for the privilege of being alive—for the sheer joy of living. It is as though I took out an I O U in order to be born. This document would say, "for the loan of one life and its talents, I owe you (humanity) a contribution."

Career comes from the word to run, as to run a race. I will be running that race and my goal will be to pay my debt. With this in mind I can never give up and say, "so what?" For I have been given the supreme gift—the gift of life—and though I can never hope to stamp my I O U and mark it paid in full, I must push on toward the goal.

I can't just work at any job. This career must be the particular thing for which I have a talent and for which I feel a call. As someone once said, "A call is seeing a need and feeling within oneself the ability to answer it." For that I must be prepared—prepared by an education which makes me aware of the world and its ideas.

My career won't be important because of the classes I teach or the lectures I give, but because of the lives I help to mold; it won't be important because of the papers I type, but because of the influence those papers have no people; it won't be important because I give vitamin A, or vitamin B, or prescribe penicillin, but because by giving these I help to rebuild life. It will be the total of my life, my debt, my responsibility—my career.

Alameda County Labor Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Robert Louis Burgess, editor of the East Bay Labor Journal in Alameda County, Calif., this week retires after years of service. It has been my personal privilege to count Mr. Burgess as one of my closest and dearest friends. He is also a man whose editorials and columns over the years have given Alameda County a great weekly newspaper.

Margaret Miller, staff writer for a competing newspaper, the Labor Review, also of Alameda County, has interviewed Mr. Burgess and written a profile on his life and times. I believe my colleagues in Congress will appreciate reading about an unusual man who has created a great tradition and, under permission to extend remarks, I submit Miss Miller's article for the RECORD. In it his competitor describes Mr. Burgess as her "illustrious colleague"—a tribute which Lou Burgess will appreciate above all others.

The article follows:

GADFLY EDITOR'S BEST STORY IS HIS OWN LIFE

(By Margaret Miller)

"I have to laugh when they call me a martyr. The international even set up a Louis Burgess martyr fund * * * and do you know it's still in existence?"

Lean and 69, the retiring editor of the East Bay Labor Journal settled back to enjoy the noiseless mirth of irony. He was being interviewed by a competitor in tribute to his character, his dedication, his unique contribution to independent labor editing and to the almost forgotten era of personal journalism.

Burgess has been the Newspaper Guild's first martyr since the big 1935 organizing drive in San Francisco. The work, he said, was mostly done "by a group of skilled Communist organizers on the Examiner, using people in the middle salary range, like me, as a front. My work was nominal—until it came time to face the boss."

Burgess was fired and blacklisted. Ten years later, when he went back to newspapering on the San Francisco Chronicle, Burgess devoted himself to driving Communists out of the Guild and CIO leadership. "I do have to give them credit though—they did a good job of organizing the union."

In the interim, Burgess felt more lucky than persecuted. A Time magazine headline "Guild Hero Fired" caught attention of a lieutenant of Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace. The article told of Burgess' years as a farmhand in Santa Clara County, and of his family's "following the lumber" from Florida to Georgia, Louisiana, Kentucky, and Oregon. "That's just the kind of a bozo we need out in that crazy State" this lieutenant told Wallace—"somebody with a farm background who can get along with labor, somebody who can mediate."

The wry half-smile crossed his thin lips again. "I mediated a fat salary. Right in the middle of the depression, when everyone else was out of work, I was traveling all over the State in a Government car."

He left the Government ("or rather the Government left me") in 1944, worked for the SF Chronicle and helped elect the anti-Communist guild slate headed by Sam Eubanks, still executive secretary. About this time the Alameda County AFL council decided a broken down newspaperman could do a better job of editing its paper than a broken down painter and Burgess, then 59, was asked to do it.

"My wife was against it. She was the daughter of a former secretary of the Building Trades Council in San Jose and she thought she knew how unions treated their employees. 'How can you work for 100,000 people?' she asked. 'I won't be working for 100,000 people,' I told her, 'I'll be working for just three wheels and I'll be the fourth.' We men have ways of putting a woman in her place."

This last was typically tongue in cheek, for Burgess says he has always sympathized with the lower classes—workers, Negroes, and women.

Every good editor must have deep convictions to sharpen his perception and burnish his humanity Burgess believes, but, despite his disconcerting honesty, his own ideas has been held on a leash, to allow his readers to keep pace with them. "I remembered William Allen White (one of the Nation's great editors) said that when he first started out he was determined to lead the pack and when he looked behind him the pack was out of sight. He was all alone. After that he made sure he was leading the pack," Burgess recounted.

Lou's guiding lights were set aglow in his early life and by his unorthodox education. His father was the keeper of the Tampa Beach, Fla., lighthouse when he was born, but a sawyer in the southern mills most of his life, earning $7 a day when most hands got 90 cents a day—"a real labor aristocrat," Lou observed. "The town treated the sawyer's son as the Duke of York." Lou himself worked in the mills as a setter. "My people were really carpetbaggers against secession. They came from Kentucky on the Ohio River, the line that divides good white bread from beaten biscuits," Lou explained when asked about his southern background in relation to his defense of equal rights.

Burgess remembers that his father had a Kentuckian's mixed attitudes. "He would sometimes go so far as to advocate social equality, but he always kept a big wrench at his bench, to wave around if somebody forgot to say "sir."

My first job at 14 was as boss of a gang of six Negroes loading a freight car, all grown men. I was told, in a loud voice so they could hear, "if those so-and-so's give you any trouble you jes come to me, and I'll give you my big pistol." The Negroes were cautious—caution is something everybody in the South is good at, black or white—but they had their fun. "Look at that big man up there," they'd joke. "Better do what he say, or he'll get his big horse pistol."

The boy was saved by the humanity of literature.

With only 5 weeks' schooling himself, Lou's father had been taught to read the classics by his own mother and was inspired by an account of how John Stuart Mill had educated his son. He taught young Louis Shakespeare, Virgil, MacCauley, Herbert Spencer. Burgess says the main literary influences on his life were three great epic poems: Virgil's "Aeneid," Dante's "Inferno," and Milton's "Paradise Lost," which deal with man's condition, his fate, and his purposes. "My most important philosophical influences were probably Thoreau, first (accounting for Burgess' deep appreciation of nature) and then Karl Marx, and Veblen, who de-Marxized me."

"I get terribly annoyed," Burgess said, "when people are horrified by the mention of Marxism. Everybody is influenced by Marx whether he knows it or not. Marxism is just economics."

As a young man, Burgess first became acquainted with economics, then, when he decided there were easier things to do than sawing up eucalyptus trees on Santa Clara County farms and went a year to College of Pacific, then in San Jose. "They were nice to me," he said, "even though I was not a high school graduate." Bookshops faced the park where orators spoke against God and for the single tax. Students gathered in their favorite shops, and Burgess found himself among followers of the Socialist Labor Party, who influenced him. "They demanded rigorous intellectual thinking, and I began to require it of myself. Somehow Virgil and Dante and Milton, all stirred up with hard thinking, made me what I am. I'm really a Jeffersonian liberal, you know."

At college Lou met a Stanford student who married him "against the better judgment of her parents" and went on to work as schoolteacher. Louis went back to farm work until he got a chance to work on the San Jose News. "I couldn't even write the English sentence," Burgess smiled. "Minnie taught me, after I was working at the trade."

The culture and conviction he put into those sentences won him the chance to write editorials, and he has been doing so ever since. He tackled the president of the local bar association on the issue of corruption ("I thought he would be a nice tiger shark to wrestle") and, as a pacifist, fell out with the American Legion. "I spent most of the time placating the groups I alienated in my editorial column," Burgess said. Once, while speaking to a Rotary club he noticed an important looking old man with an ear trumpet listening hard and scowling, and Burgess was sure this meeting marked the end for him on the News. After the speech the old man, the town banker and a pious Methodist, shuffled up to Burgess and declared loudly, "I know what's the matter with you young man, you're a Christian." "I was somewhat startled at the thought, but after that everything was all right."

How much of his almost quixotic independence Lou was able to express as an editorial writer for Hearst is a little vague, but Burgess found room for it at the East Bay Labor Journal. His front page column was aimed, he says, at proving that labor journalism can be good journalism, and at defending civil liberties. That he believes labor is mostly right goes without saying, but it was harder to express his antipathy to two "isms in the labor movement: pie-cardism and institutionalism" which, he feels, stunt the growth and repress the effective activity of the membership.

How, with such an orientation, did he hold onto enough institutional support to keep his job? "By edging, always edging. I'd see a crack and push through, wait for a story to hang my convictions on. And then I remembered the advice of the editor of the old (SF) Call, Fremont Older, whom I worshipped. 'Young man,' he told me in San Jose, 'always have one good hot controversy going—but never more than one.' "

Burgess had support from Oakland's anti-Hoffa Teamsters when he raised the issue of corruption before it was acceptable in the AFL-CIO hierachy to do so. "But you should have heard the howls when I printed the story of a police raid on a gambling setup in the basement of a union hall. It was on the front page of the Tribune but I was told I was giving labor a bad name. That's just silly." He once told a key building trades leader (later removed) that he was a crook and should get out of the labor movement. As a result of this kind of thing the council's publication committee was split 5-5 for a long time over the issue of firing Burgess.

Now that he is retiring, primarily to spend more time in East Palo Alto with his ailing wife, Burgess will edit the poems he has been writing easily and happily every day. He will spend time on the school board, for though "I have never been much at playing games with children—the ladies can play games with them—I am very much interested in their development." And he will do a nature study of Alameda Creek, "an antecedent stream that was here before the hills were." And now, with the San Ramon project, we're going to dump tons of sewage into it. Just think what man does in adjusting to his environment."

Yes, Lou Burgess, son of a sawyer, farm hand, guild martyr, and illustrious colleague. Man does do wonders.

The Terrible Cost of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, American citizens and constituents in all of our districts are sincerely and vitally concerned about the effect that inflation will have and is having upon our country, our economy and the value of the property which American citizens own. It is well that the people of this country should be aroused, because it is only through an aroused citizenry that any-

thing effective can or will be done to stop the paralysis of inflation from engulfing and paralyzing the economy of our Nation.

This is an election year and matters of such great concern to the people will, during the coming campaign, be discussed openly and vigorously. It is well that this be done. I, as a Democratic Member of this body, place the blame for the inflation that already exists and for that which may come upon our Republican leadership. We had little or no inflation during the Korean war and after World War II because President Truman and the Democratic leadership inaugurated steps to prevent it. When the Republicans took office in 1952, they virtually invited inflation and are continuing today the very policies that have caused the inflation that presently exists. The Republicans refused to take steps to have the Federal Reserve bank support the bond market of the Treasury Department. The Federal Reserve bank then went on strike against the Government of the United States and refused to buy the 2½-percent bonds which the Government was issuing to finance its public debt. During the Democratic administration, steps were taken to force the Federal Reserve bank to support the Treasury Department. This resulted in the bond retaining the full value of 100 cents on the dollar and in interest remaining at 2½ percent on the public debt. Private interest rates follow the public interest rates and remain about 2 percent above. It, therefore, resulted in private interest rates ranging from 4 to 5 percent.

When the Federal Reserve Bank went on strike against the Treasury of the United States, it forced the Secretary of the Treasury to offer an increased rate of interest on the Government bonds. This policy continued with the Federal Reserve Bank continuing to keep pressure on the Secretary of the Treasury until they forced the interest rate on the long term bonds to the maximum legal limit of 4¼ percent. This drove the private interest rate to approximately 6 percent and in some cases 7 percent. The President of the United States then led the drive to secure for the bankers of this country a further increase in the interest rate; and has continued, to the present time, to put pressure on Congress to remove the 4¼ legal rate on long term Government bonds. To date, Congress has resisted this pressure but may possibly weaken before the end of this session. If Congress does weaken, it will mean that the interest rate on long-term Government bonds will increase, I believe, to at least 6 percent. This would bring the private interest rate to 8 or 9 percent. The result of the present interest increase is that the interest on the public, private, corporate, and municipal debt has increased by approximately $15 billion per year. These are all inflationary dollars, since neither the Government nor the people receive anything in return, either in the way of service or commodities for the additional interest that is paid. Inflation is also brought about by constant wage increases where employers pay more for the same productivity, and no one denies that wage increases have had an inflationary effect. The Government, however, and the Republican Party attempts to deny that the interest increase has had a deflationary effect. They are wrong. The Republicans issue news releases to the paper viewing with alarm the inflationary trend, and then inaugurate interest increase which is the most inflationary act that any government or people could permit at a time such as we are living in. This same party advocated the vault cash bill which gave without consideration to the Federal Reserve banks $15 billion worth of American bonds, and then required the taxpayers of America to repurchase these same bonds with further tax dollars to the tune of another $15 billion. This act also denies the U.S. Treasury the interest that it was receiving on the $15 billion worth of bonds which it has authorized to be turned over to the Federal Reserve bank without consideration. I ask each Representative in Congress if the people in your congressional district can afford to pay the taxes necessary to repurchase the $15 billion in bonds that the Republican Party wanted given without consideration to the Federal Reserve banks. I ask you if the people in your congressional districts can afford to pay the increased interest on the private and public debt to the tune of $15 billion per year that the Republican policy has brought about as a result of their permitting the Federal Reserve bank to strike against the Treasury of the United States.

I point out, too, that Republican administration increased the cost of operating the Department of Agriculture from slightly over $2 billion per year when they took over in 1952 to better than $7 billion per year at the present time. They removed the local committee jobs that were handled gratis by local committeemen on an honorary basis and replaced them with an army of bureaucrats drawing from $5,000 to $10,000 per year each. They have failed to improve the farm situation, but they are spending $5 billion inflationary dollars each year more than was being spent under the Democratic administration when the farmers were receiving 100 percent of parity for their produce. The Republican Party continues to engage in diversionary tactics to attempt to throw the blame for inflation upon the Democrats, while they yield to the big money interest and the banking interest and engage in consistent inflationary programs that injure the taxpayer and help only the banks.

I have recently received a communication from the St. Mark's Home and School Association which is located in my district. Those who prepared this resolution are sincere, honest, God-fearing Americans and who truly have at heart, the best interest and the welfare of this country and its people. They are thinking of the future of their children and of the American way of life and they have good reason to be concerned. I print at length the resolution received, as I believe that it testifies to the thinkings and feelings of the average American citizen in this country today.

RESOLUTION OF ST. MARK'S HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

Whereas for nearly two decades, and particularly following World War II, the United States has experienced a sharp inflation of its currency, which inflation is still continuing; and

Whereas during the last decade the value of the U.S. dollar has been reduced more than half; and

Whereas if this trend continues it will seriously affect our economy, destroy our position as a leader in world affairs, aid Russia's avowed intention to destroy us as a democracy, and may even destroy the form of government under which we now live; and

Whereas such inflationary trend has already wreaked havoc upon many of our citizens who depend upon fixed incomes such as pensions and other like means of income, and has debilitated the savings of the older citizens who have frugally prepared for their old age and further inflation will wreak even further havoc upon them; and

Whereas one of the causes of such inflation has been the Federal Government's policy of refusing to live within its income, borrowing money for current expenses and increasing the legal debt limit; and

Whereas during times of war it may be necessary for the Government to borrow in order to meet extraordinary expenses, but to continue to do so in times of peace is against the rules of sound economy and against our tradition as a nation; and

Whereas our Government, by pursuing a policy of thrift and frugality can, we believe, live within its income, balance its budget and reduce its indebtedness, and by pursuing such a policy reduce the heavy burden of taxes as well: Now, therefore, we do hereby

Resolve, That we urge our elected Members of the Congress of the United States to use their voices, influence, and votes to reduce waste and extravagance in Government, to cease borrowing additional moneys with which to meet current expenses, to work for a balanced budget, and to refuse further raises in the debt limit except in cases of extreme emergency.

Dated at Kenosha, Wis., this 21st day of March A.D. 1960.

Mrs. LAWRENCE RUETZ,
President.

Attest:

Mrs. EDWARD W. JEANNAT,
Secretary.

The Religious Issue in American Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, most thoughtful people have been rightly alarmed at the proportions the issue of religion has suddenly assumed on the national political scene. Despite the best efforts of the primary candidates themselves to place the question in proper perspective, press reports have persistently tended to magnify its importance.

Under these circumstances, I think that Senator KENNEDY's remarkable address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors here in Washington last Thursday, April 21, deserves careful reading by every thoughtful American. His statement is forthright, unequivo-

cal, and in the highest traditions of American public service.

Let us hope that, once and for all, there will be an end to innuendo and distortion from whatever quarter they may spring. There are great public issues to be debated and discussed. The candidates themselves have been discussing them and want to continue to discuss them. Let us let them concentrate on the real issues and debate them fully and thoroughly, and with their own and the country's undivided attention.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit for my colleagues' thoughtful attention Senator KENNEDY's address:

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

(By the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, April 21, 1960)

I have decided, in view of current press reports, that it would be appropriate to speak with you today about what has widely been called the religious issue in American politics.

The phrase covers a multitude of meanings. There is no religious issue in the sense that any of the major candidates differ on the role of religion in our political life. Every presidential contender, I am certain, is dedicated to the separation of church and state, to the preservation of religious liberty, to an end to religious bigotry, and to the total independence of the officeholder from any form of ecclesiastical dictation.

Nor is there any real issue in the sense than any candidate is exploiting his religious affiliation. No one's candidacy, by itself, raises a religious issue. And I believe it is inaccurate to state that my candidacy created the issue—that, because I am replying to the bigots, I am now running on the religious issue in West Virginia—or that my statements in response to interrogation are fanning the controversy. I am not trying to be the first Catholic President, as some have written. I happen to believe I can serve my Nation as President—and I also happen to have been born a Catholic.

Nor am I appealing, as is too often claimed, to a so-called Catholic vote. Even if such a vote exists—which I doubt—I want to make one thing clear again: I want no votes solely on account of my religion. Any voter, Catholic or otherwise, who feels another candidate would be a superior President should support that candidate. I do not want any vote cast for me for such illogical and irrelevant reasons.

Neither do I want anyone to support my candidacy merely to prove that this Nation is not bigoted—and that a Catholic can be elected President. I have never suggested that those opposed to me are thereby anti-Catholic. There are ample legitimate grounds for supporting other condidates (though I will not, of course, detail them here).

Nor have I ever suggested that the Democratic Party is required to nominate me or face a Catholic revolt in November. I do not believe that to be true; I cannot believe our convention would act on such a premise, and I do believe that a majority of Americans of every faith will support the Democratic nominee, whoever he is.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

What, then, is the so-called religious issue in American politics today? It is not, it seems to me, my actual religious convictions, but a misunderstanding of what those convictions actually are. It is not the actual existence of religious voting blocs, but a suspicion that such voting may exist. And when we deal with such public fears and suspicions, the American press has a very grave responsibility.

I know the press did not create this religious issue. My religious affiliation is a fact—religious intolerance is a fact. And the proper role of the press is to report all facts that are a matter of public interest.

But the press has a responsibility, I think you will agree, which goes far beyond a reporting of the facts. It goes beyond lofty editorials deploring intolerance. For my religion is hardly, in this critical year of 1960, the dominant issue of our time. It is hardly the most important criterion, or even a relevant criterion, on which the American people should make their choice for Chief Executive. And the press, while not creating the issue, will largely determine whether or not it does become dominant; whether it is kept in perspective; whether it is considered objectively; whether needless fears and suspicions are stilled instead of aroused.

The members of the press should report the facts as they find them. But they should beware, it seems to me, of either magnifying this issue or oversimplifying it.

I spoke in Wisconsin, for example, on farm legislation, foreign policy, defense, civil rights, and several dozen other issues. But I rarely found them reported in the press, except when they were occasionally sandwiched in between descriptions of my handshaking, my theme song, family, haircut, and inevitably, my religion.

At almost every stop in Wisconsin I invited questions and the questions came—on price supports, labor unions, disengagement, taxes, and inflation. But these sessions were rarely reported in the press except when one topic was discussed: religion.

One article, in a news magazine for example, supposedly summing the primary up in advance, mentioned the word "Catholic" 20 times in 15 paragraphs—not mentioning even once dairy farms, disarmament, labor legislation, or any other issue. And, on the Sunday before the primary, the Milwaukee Journal featured a map of the State, listing county by county the relative strength of three types of voters—Democrats, Republicans, and Catholics.

PROBLEMS ARE STRESSED

Now we are in West Virginia. As reported to today's Washington Post, the great bulk of West Virginians paid very little attention to my religion until they read repeatedly in the Nation's press that this was the decisive issue in West Virginia. There are many serious problems in that State—problems big enough to dominate any campaign—but religion is not one of them.

I do not think that religion is the decisive issue in any State. I do not think it should be. And, recognizing my own responsibilities in that regard, I am hopeful that you will recognize yours also.

For the past month and years I have answered almost daily inquiries from the press about the religious issue. I want to take this opportunity to turn the tables—and to raise some questions for your thoughtful consideration.

First: Is the religious issue a legitimate issue in this campaign?

There is only one legitimate question underlying all the rest: Would you, as President of the United States, be responsive in any way to ecclesiastical pressures or obligations of any kind that might in any fashion influence or interfere with your conduct of that office in the national interest? I have answered that question many times. My answer was and is "No."

Once that question is answered, there is no legitimate issue of my religion. But there are, I think, legitimate questions of public policy—of concern to religious groups which no one should feel bigoted about raising, and to which I do not object answering. But I do object to being the only candidate required to answer those questions.

Federal assistance to parochial schools, for example, is a very legitimate issue actually before the Congress. I am opposed to it. I believe it is clearly unconstitutional. I voted against it on the Senate floor this year, when offered by Senator MORSE. But interestingly enough, I was the only announced candidate in the Senate who did so. Nevertheless I have not yet charged my opponents with taking orders from Rome.

THE ENVOY ISSUE

An ambassador to the Vatican could conceivably become a real issue again. I am opposed to it, and said so long ago. But even though it was last proposed by a Baptist President, I know of no other candidate who has been even asked about this matter.

The prospects of any President ever receiving for his signature a bill providing foreign aid funds for birth control are very remote indeed. It is hardly the major issue some have suggested. Nevertheless I have made it clear that I would neither veto nor sign such a bill on any basis except what I considered to be the public interest, without regard to my private religious views. I have said the same about bills dealing with censorship, divorce, our relations with Spain or any other subject.

These are legitimate inquiries about real questions which the next President may conceivably have to face. But these inquiries ought to be directed equally to all candidates. I have made it clear that I strongly support—out of conviction as well as constitutional obligation—the guarantees of religious equality provided by the first amendment—and I ask only that these same guarantees be extended to me.

Secondly, can we justify analyzing voters as well as candidates strictly in terms of their religion? I think the voters of Wisconsin objected to being categorized simply as either Catholics or Protestants in analyzing their political choices. I think they objected to being accosted by reporters outside of political meetings and asked one question only—their religion—not their occupation or education or philosophy or income—only their religion.

And I think they had a right to object. The flood of postprimary analyses on the so-called Catholic vote and Protestant vote—carefully shaped to conform with their author's preprimary predictions—would never be published in any competent statistical journal.

Only this week, I received a very careful analysis of the Wisconsin results. It conclusively shows two significant patterns of bloc voting: I ran strongest in those areas where the average temperature in January was 20 degrees or higher, and poorest in those areas where it was 14 degrees or lower—and that I ran well in the beech tree and basswood counties and not so well among the hemlock and pine.

Anyone who thinks these trends are merely coincidences of no relevance has never tried to campaign in Wisconsin in January. In any event, this analysis is being rushed to West Virginia, where I am assured that the winter is less severe and the basswood are abundant. It has been suggested, that to offset my apparent political handicaps I may have to pick a running mate from Maine or, preferably, Alaska.

KENNEDY DOUBTS ANALYSES

The facts of the matter are that this analysis stands up statistically much better than all the so-called analyses of the religious vote. And so do analyses of each county based on their distance from the Minnesota border, the length of their Democratic tradition and their inclusion in my campaign itinerary. I carried some areas with large proportions of voters who are Catholics—and I lost some. I carried some areas where Protestants predominate—and I lost some.

It is true that I ran well in cities—and large numbers of Catholics live in cities. But so do union members and older voters

and veterans and chess fans and basswood lovers. To say my support in the cities is due only to the religion of the voters is incapable of proof and an unfair indictment of their political maturity.

Of those Catholics who voted for me, how many did so on grounds of my religion; how many because they felt my opponent was too radical; how many because they resented the attacks on my record; how many because they were union members; how many for some other reason? I do not know. And the facts are that no one knows.

For the voters are more than Catholics, Protestants, or Jews. They make up their minds for many diverse reasons, good and bad. To submit the candidates to a religious test is unfair—to apply it to the voters themselves is divisive, degrading, and wholly unwarranted.

Third and finally: Is there any justification for applying special religious tests to one office only—the Presidency? Little or no attention was paid to my religion when I took the oath as Senator in 1953—as a Congressman in 1947—or as a naval officer in 1941. Members of my faith abound in public office at every level except the White House. What is there about the Presidency that justifies this constant emphasis upon a candidate's religion and that of his supporters?

The Presidency is not, after all, the British Crown, serving a dual capacity in both church and state. The President is not elected to be protector of the faith—or guardian of the public morals. His attendance at church on Sunday should be his business alone, not a showcase for the Nation.

On the other hand, we are in no danger of a one-man constitutional upheaval. The President, however intent he may be on subverting our institutions, cannot ignore the Congress—or the voters—or the courts. And our Highest Court, incidentally, has a long history of Catholic Justices, none of whom, as far as I know, was ever challenged on the fairness of his rulings on sensitive church-state issues.

Some may say we treat the Presidency differently because we have had only one previous Catholic candidate for President. But I am growing weary of that term. I am not the Catholic candidate for President. I do not speak for the Catholic church on issues of public policy—and no one in that church speaks for me. My record on aid to education, aid to Tito, the Conant nomination and other issues has displeased some prominent Catholic clergymen and organizations; and it has been approved by others. The fact is that the Catholic church is not a monolith—it is committed in this country to the principles of individual liberty—and it has no claim over my conduct as a public officer sworn to do the public interest.

So I hope we can see the beginning of the end of references to me as "the Catholic candidate" for President. Do not expect me to explain or defend every act or statement of every Pope or priest, in this country or some other, in this century or the last—and that includes the mayor of Dijon.

TWO ALTERNATIVES NOTED

I have tried to examine with you today the press' responsibility in meeting this religious issue. The question remains: What is my responsibility? I am a candidate. The issue is here. Two alternatives have been suggested:

1. The first suggestion is that I withdraw to avoid a "dangerous religious controversy"; and accept the Vice Presidential nomination in order to placate the so-called Catholic vote.

I find that suggestion highly distasteful. It assumes the worst about a country which prides itself on being more tolerant and better educated than it was in 1928. It assumes that Catholics are a pawn on the political chessboard, moved hither and yon, and somehow "bought off" by the party putting in the second spot a Catholic whom the party barred from the top for reasons of religion. And it forgets, finally, that such a performance would have an effect on our image abroad as well as our self-respect here at home.

Are we going to admit to the world that a Jew can be elected mayor of Dublin, a Protestant can be chosen Foreign Minister of France, a Moslem can serve in the Israeli Parliament—but a Catholic cannot be President of the United States? Are we to tell Chancellor Adenauer, for example, that we want him risking his all on our front lines; but that—if he were an American—we would never entrust him with our Presidency—nor would we accept our distinguished guest, General De Gaulle? Are we to admit to the world—worse still, are we to admit to ourselves—that one-third of our population is forever barred from the White House?

So I am not impressed by those pleas that I settle for the Vice Presidency in order to avert a religious spectacle. Surely those who believe it dangerous to elect a Catholic as President will not want him to serve as Vice President, a heartbeat away from the office.

2. The alternative is to proceed with the primaries, the convention, and the election. If there is bigotry in the country, then so be it—there is bigotry. If that bigotry is too great to permit the fair consideration of a Catholic who has made clear his complete independence and his complete dedication to separation of church and state, then we ought to know it.

But I do not believe that this is the case. I believe the American people are more concerned with a man's views and abilities than with the church to which he belongs. I believe that the Founding Fathers meant it when they provided in article VI of the Constitution that there should be no religious test for public office—a provision that brought not one dissenting vote, only the comment of Roger Sherman that it was surely unnecessary—"the prevailing liberality being a sufficient security against such tests." And I believe that the American people mean to adhere to those principles today.

But regardless of the political outcome, this issue is here to be faced. It is my job to face it frankly and fully. And it is your job to face it fairly, in perspective, and in proportion.

I am confident that the press and other media of this country will recognize their responsibilities in this area—to refute falsehood, to inform the ignorant, and to concentrate on the issues, the real issues, in this hour of the Nation's peril.

The Supreme Court has written that as public officials, "we are neither Jew nor gentile, neither Catholic nor agnostic. We owe equal attachment to the Constitution and are equally bound by our obligations whether we derive our citizenship from the earliest or latest immigrants to these shores * * * [for] religion is outside the sphere of political government."

We must all, candidates, press, and voters alike, dedicate ourselves to these principles—for they are the key to a free society.

Address Delivered by Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I include herewith the text of the address delivered by Vice President NIXON at a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Saturday, April 23. I am sure Members of the House and Senate will be interested in this forthright statement.

The address follows:

The first subject I would like to discuss today is one that is commanding major attention throughout the Nation. The second is one that deserves such attention.

I can dispose of the first subject quickly.

Is religion going to be an issue in this campaign?

The answer to that question is that religion will be an issue exactly to the extent that the candidates and those who support them continue to make it an issue.

There is only one way that I can visualize religion being a legitimate issue in an American political campaign. That would be if one of the candidates for the Presidency had no religious belief. While the candidates in this campaign have differences on other issues, they are all men who recognize and cherish, both in their personal and public lives, the religious and moral principles which are the very foundation of our American ideals. As far as I am concerned, this fact removes any excuse for continued discussion of a so-called religious issue in this campaign.

That is why I intend to put the emphasis today and throughout the campaign where I believe it belongs—on the issues which the American people should be considering—the vitally important questions which affect the very survival of our Nation and our civilization.

The second subject I would like to discuss today is such an issue—how should Americans appraise the impending summit conference?

Let us begin by considering the question of what yardstick should be used in judging the success or failure of this conference.

It is too generally supposed that the success of an international conference can be measured only in the amount of agreement that is reached, and agreement is too often equated with peace. This can be a serious and even fatal intellectual trap. The Summit at Munich resulted in agreement—but the agreement meant war, not peace. It meant war because it was based on the fiction that there was a limit to Hitler's ambition.

Consequently, as we approach this meeting, let us recognize that the success of a conference should be measured not in terms of whether there was an agreement but on whether the agreement was on the right things.

I do not mean by what I have said to endorse the view that meetings like this one can produce no constructive results and should therefore be avoided.

I believe it is vitally important for the United States and our allies to approach this conference as an opportunity rather than as, at best, something of a hazard from which the optimum result would be to leave us no worse off than before.

We should look upon the coming talks with the Soviets as a chance to champion and to achieve some affirmative fundamental objectives.

First, this conference provides an opportunity for us to make at least a beginning on practical arms control.

In this connection, we should concentrate on trying to get agreement on measures which would reduce the risk of war by miscalculation. Our Geneva proposal for prior notification of space vehicle launchings is the kind of step that might be agreed upon. We should also explore every avenue for breaking the logjam which bars the way to an enforcible nuclear test suspension agreement.

Fears have been expressed that the Soviets may try to make propaganda capital of their unspecific and completely unguaranteed proposal for general disarmament. If they do, there is no excuse whatever for us to be on the defensive against this kind of propaganda offensive. This conference will provide a world forum in which we can set the record straight.

We should emphasize that adoption of our general disarmament program with its effective controls will assure disarmament by deeds and not just by words.

We must make evident to the entire world that if the Soviets are willing to consider some progress toward the kind of open society which we in the West maintain, both disarmament and peace itself can become realizable objectives rather than hopeless dreams. The closed society of the Soviet Union is, in fact, the major barrier to the disarmament which the great majority of the people in all nations want.

Second, this conference provides an opportunity for "defusing" the Berlin crisis and for laying the groundwork for negotiations which would lead to a formal and definitive solution of that problem.

We must make clear at all times our steadfast determination that we can never enter into an agreement which would in any way jeopardize the right of the people of Berlin to choose and retain the kind of government they want.

Any Communist action, such as a separate Soviet treaty with East Germany, which purported to threaten our rights or those of the free people of Berlin will torpedo any prospect for progress toward the disarmament and reduction of tensions which Mr. Khrushchev insists he wants and which we also want.

Third, this conference affords a unique opportunity to demonstrate the confidence and unity of the Western Alliance.

Mr. Khrushchev seldom misses an opportunity to express his confidence in the ultimate triumph of his system. Here is an area where we can and should go him one better.

Our military position is strong and will remain so. The Soviets, in spite of their missile boasts, are conscious of the restraint our strength imposes on any aggressive designs they might have.

But it is in terms of non-military strength, the area of so-called peaceful competition which Mr. Krushchev discusses at every opportunity, that we have reason for the greatest confidence.

We can have no doubt after the President's recent trips through Asia and Latin America that the peoples of the world do not want totalitarianism. The leaders and people of the newly developing nations know that their own independence will die if the free West does not survive.

We should never cease to stress our faith that the future belongs to governments and ideologies firmly based on the principle of self-determination—a principle which applies to all people who want to be free whether in Europe, Asia, Africa, or the Americas.

We can make clear that we welcome the peaceful competition to which Mr. Khrushchev has challenged us. We should call on free people everywhere to mount the increased effort that this competition will require.

The summit conference in other words provides an opportunity for us to mobilize the moral and physical energies of the free world for the economic and ideological struggle which will go on through the last half of the 20th century.

Moreover, as the great forces of history are shaped the West is in a singularly providential situation as the summit approaches.

Never in the years since World War II when this fight for the survival of freedom and the dignity of mankind was forced upon us, has the West had such an array of leadership. At the head of the four nations most directly involved, the three that will sit at Paris and Germany, whose people are most immediately threatened, are men who command immense public confidence and prestige both at home and abroad. As the time for this conference nears, de Gaulle of France, Macmillan of Great Britain, Adenauer of Germany and our own President Eisenhower are fortified by the strongest national support which the West has yet produced.

We can rightly approach the summit with full confidence that the spokesmen of the free world, rather than Mr. Khrushchev, represent the tide of history.

And, as far as our own Nation is concerned, there has never been a time when Americans of both parties were more united than they are in this instance.

Mr. Khrushchev could make no greater miscalculation than to assume that President Eisenhower will be hamstrung in exerting strong leadership at Paris because we happen to be having a presidential election in the United States this fall.

In this connection, I recall a revealing conversation involving Mr. Khrushchev at the dinner in his honor given by the President at the White House. I introduced Senator LYNDON JOHNSON to Mr. Khrushchev by saying, "Senator JOHNSON, as you know, is the leader of the opposition party in the Senate." Mr. Khrushchev responded by saying, "Well, I've never been able to see any differences between your two parties in the United States."

He was certainly right in one respect. There is no difference between the two parties in their support of the President's uncompromising stand for the right of people everywhere to choose the kind of government they want and against those who by their aggressive policies would imperil or deny that right.

The summit finally provides an opportunity for us to clarify our position toward the Communist bloc during the kind of peaceful competition which Mr. Khrushchev invites.

We can and will make clear that the moral difference between our system and the Soviet system is fundamental and cannot be narrowed in any way by the dialog of peaceful competition. We can establish once again that we will not trade away our belief in that fundamental right of peoples to freely choose their own form of government.

At the same time we can make equally clear that we have come to Paris to make a determined effort to reduce the risks of atomic war and that we are ready for real progress toward control of armaments and an end to the recurring crises threatening atomic war.

We should demonstrate our willingness to participate in discussions which might attain these objectives at this summit conference and at other summit conferences in the future if they are needed.

What chance is there that any or all of these objectives can be partially or wholly attained at the summit? This depends primarily on Mr. Khrushchev.

Never before in history has a man had more responsibility for the fate of mankind in his hands than Mr. Khrushchev will have at this conference.

As I said in my farewell radio-television address to the Soviet people, "If he devotes his immense energies and talents to building a better life for the people of his own country, Mr. Khrushchev can go down in history as one of the greatest leaders the Soviet people have ever produced. But if he diverts the resources and talents of his people to the objective of promoting the communization of countries outside the Soviet Union he will only assure that both he and his people will continue to live in an era of fear, suspicion and tension."

What will Mr. Khrushchev's attitude be at Paris? There are strong reasons to believe that Mr. Khrushchev may actually want to make progress at this conference toward disarmament and in reaching settlement on some of the explosive issues which confront us. I think this may be his attitude not because he is motivated by what he scorns as sentimental idealism but because, realist that he is, he is concerned by some hard facts of international life.

What are the circumstances that tend to convince Mr. Khrushchev that disarmament and reduction of tensions are in his self-interest?

Mr. Khrushchev never fails to obtain satisfaction from pointing out the weaknesses and divisions which he believes plague the West. We must remember as the summit approaches that he, too, has problems.

There is the demonstration of freedom in action which free Berlin affords to the people of East Germany.

There is the unceasing restlessness of the satellites some of which are under intolerable state of occupation by foreign troops.

There are the natural desires of his own Soviet peoples for an increasing share of their limited productivity, so much of which now goes into armaments.

And while it is probably too early to conclude that he may be troubled by his Chinese ally, it is appropriate to call to your attention that our distinguished guest, President de Gaulle, has suggested that he may well be deeply concerned by the nightmare which is taking form on his long common border with China.

Finally, Mr. Khrushchev is bound to be influenced by the fact that he has seen, as we have, the diabolical enormity of nuclear weapons. Some of the Soviet nuclear devices have been among the dirtiest, radioactively speaking that have ever been exploded.

On the basis of my conversations with him, I am convinced that he is proud of what communism has done in the Soviet Union. He would prefer not to risk destruction of that progress.

And, as Chancellor Adenauer put it, while Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist colleagues will never cease to work for their basic objective of a Communist world, they would prefer that the world over which they rule will not be one of ruined cities and dead bodies.

In other words, Mr. Khrushchev believes he can accomplish his objective of world domination without war, that he can win more and lose less by peaceful competition than by resort to war.

These, then, are the stark realities which will be working at Paris in behalf of progress toward disarmament and the settlement of differences without war.

It is because the hard facts of international life are on the side of peace and disarmament that I believe that we can look to this conference and to the future not with starry-eyed complacency but with justifiable confidence that responsible world leaders will slowly but inevitably develop more effective methods for settling differences between nations without war.

Congress Labor a Mouse to the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article in Sunday's Washington Post discusses the effect of the recently

passed Civil Rights Act of 1960. Unfortunately, the author, George McMillan, finds that as far as the southern Negro is concerned only a few will be enfranchised as a result of our work. He does conclude, however, that our action was taken and is being measured against a new and heightened urgency in the integration crisis. We were moved to say at the time the bill was on the floor of the House, and we repeat, if this bill is good as far as it goes, it is also true that it does not go very far.

Against the background of today's world and the demands in our own country for full citizenship, Mr. McMillan's article should be read soberly and thoughtfully. We have further legislative work to do in this field. The article follows:

CONGRESS LABOR A MOUSE TO THE NEGRO

(By George McMillan)

AIKEN, S.C.—In 1957, Congress huffed and puffed and passed a civil rights bill. That was the bill that was going to lead to a "black revolution" at the ballot box. Now, 3 years later, there is no evidence that a single Negro gained his franchise as a direct result of that legislation.

Last week, Congress finished its work on another civil rights bill, and did plenty of huffing and puffing in the process. Yet it is almost certain that this bill, again designed ostensibly to give southern Negroes the ballot, will enfranchise only a handful of the thousands who are voteless today.

Apart from this similarity, there is one striking difference between them. The 1960 act is being measured against a new and heightened urgency in the integration crisis.

ONE MORE LEGALISM

To some, Congress' most recent effort must seem not so much pointless as tragically irrelevant. For what the 1960 bill does is create a new piece of legal machinery—new and complicated at a moment when it has become dramatically apparent that many southern Negroes are fed up with legalism.

Even if the 1960 bill were practical and effective, even if its enactment meant that new thousands of southern Negroes could go freely to the ballot box, it still would not be particularly pertinent.

The vote is a long-range gradual and evolutionary way of achieving social gains, and today it is plain that the southern Negro is looking for a speedier and more direct method of solving his dilemma. In fact, the Negro has had enough experience with the ballot since World War II to discover that in the South, at least, there is not much in it for him.

AN EMPTY BALLOT

Between 1947 and 1958, Negro registration in 11 Southern States grew from 595,000 to 1,303,827, according to the authoritative Southern Regional Council. But except for having won an important bargaining position for himself in Atlanta and a lesser one in a few other large Southern cities such as Nashville and Durham, the Negro can't show much for his nearly million and a half votes.

What really makes it difficult for the Negro to use his ballot in the South is not that he can't vote, but that he can't find anything to vote for.

There is, of course, a slate of candidates in most elections, but in this one-party region the candidates often stand for nothing more than constellations of friends and neighbors, as V. O. Key called the groupings in his definitive "Southern Politics."

Very often there are no issues at all, and more often than not there are no issues that involve the Negro's rights or interests.

DEDICATED INSTRUMENT

Indeed, the most fundamental truth in the whole voting rights picture is that southern politics is today, and almost always has been, an instrument whose principal purpose is the preservation of the racial status quo. It would be very unusual if the Negro did find a place for his vote in this world of candidates who are avowedly dedicated to keeping the Negro in his place.

The 1958 South Carolina gubernatorial election was a good example of the kind of reality the Negro voter must face. The successful candidate, the present Gov. Ernest Hollings, was opposed by Donald Russell, one-time president of the University of South Carolina and a long-time assistant of former Gov. James F. Byrnes.

Although both candidates were generally conservative by national standards, Russell was locally considered the candidate of the eggheads and reformers, as a newspaperman put it, while Hollings was considered to be the candidate of the long established organization which dominates the South Carolina Legislature.

Both Hollings and Russell issued allout prosegregation statements throughout the campaign. But toward the end, word somehow spread that Russell was going to get the Negro vote. To prevent a large anti-Negro white vote going to Hollings, Russell, or so say some observers, started an even heavier campaign against the Negro.

The result of RUSSELL's last-minute diatribes was that the Negroes voted for Hollings and made the margin of difference that defeated Russell and elected Hollings—in office, one of the South's most resolute opponents of change in racial status.

A TORTUOUS ROAD

It is this kind of irony that keeps the Southern Negro from fighting more vigorously for the ballot. In certain small counties of the South, where no other avenues of self-assertion are open, Negroes may press, under the 1960 act's provisions, for their voting rights. But at best, this would be a long, county-by-county legal fight.

The other titles in the 1960 bill—making it a Federal offense to obstruct Federal court orders, or to cross a State line to avoid prosecution for burning or bombing—these are deterrents, to be sure. But the suspects, investigated and apprehended by the FBI though they might be, would still be turned over to local courts for trial—and the record of convictions in the South recently has not been high.

Ultimately, the prospect is that where the Negro uses the 1960 civil rights bill to help him gain his rights, it will be the right to his self-respect that he wants more than it is his right to vote.

The new South of the past month or so is a South in which a young, rising generation of Negroes is showing that it is going to fight for its dignity—or, put another way, for the right to refuse to suffer any further personal indignities.

It is one of the curiosities of the racial struggle, and its eccentric progress, that today in the South, a lunchcounter seat is more important than the ballot.

Don't Gripe—Write

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared recently in the Democratic Messenger of Snow Hill, Md. For many years this outstanding weekly newspaper has contributed timely editorials pertinent to the local community, State, and the Nation. I feel every Member of Congress will find the following editorial one to be appreciated:

DON'T GRIPE—WRITE

Your spokesmen in Washington are the two Senators from this State and the Representative from the First Maryland Congressional District.

This is true whether they represent the political party to which you belong or the opposing party. Once they have been elected to public office they represent all of the people.

But they cannot be expected to do a good job for you unless they understand your views and you, in turn, understand their problems. They need and want the opinions of their constituents.

It must be remembered that a public official's first obligation is to his constituents. Their views are always given first place in his thoughts. Accurate and useful information sent by voters in his district is always appreciated. When he hears from "back home" it shows him the people he knows are alive and interested in him and what he is doing.

Until we realize our Representatives welcome our views and we take the trouble to make them known, our relations in Washington will not be what they could be—or ought to be.

Remember, too, you don't have to wait until you have a complaint to register. Our elected officials are human, too, and a pat on the back is as appreciated by them as it is by you. The important thing is: Don't gripe—write.

The Village of Cooperstown, Resort Center of New York and the Home of Baseball, Plans for Future Progress and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Otsego Farmer of April 16, 1960, which discusses the important action being taken in Cooperstown, N.Y., the beautiful scenic resort area in my district which is also world famous as the home of baseball, to plan for future progress and development. The action which this community is taking attests to the vigor and capability of its citizens and its leaders.

COOPERSTOWN'S FUTURE

Next week the citizens of Cooperstown and its immediate surrounding communities may well hold the future in their hands. That is when the campaign begins to raise funds for financing the work of the planning commission to study all angles of the business, economic, social, and, shall we say, traditional, future of this lakeside community.

Much has appeared in these columns during the past several months on the subject.

For instance it is clear that with the $14,000 to be raised the commission will retain the services of Blair Associates of Providence, R.I. and Syracuse, to make a complete survey of "where we are going."

We believe we are stating the matter correctly when we say that now the program is understood by the people of the community, there is very little opposition. Certainly, on the part of those who realize what is underway, support is universal and enthusiastic.

During these past years when Cooperstown, because of its history, tradition, and natural beauty has become one of the Mecca spots of the world we owe a debt to those who have gone before, and especially to the thousands who will visit here in the next decades, to see to it that nothing is lost—in fact that nothing ever may be lost to mar the charm of their visit.

We have all heard the beauties of the village and lake compared favorably to the finest in Switzerland and Scotland. When we go to the far places we certainly expect to find the famous landmarks of which we have always heard. Few communities excell this one in the number of its attractions but because we live here we are ampt to forget. Only when we talk with the stranger who has been saving his money and counting the days until he could set foot within our borders do we realize what we have and those are the things we must preserve in the face of the normal growth in population, business changes, and whatever the future may hold.

But more than that we frankly do not wish to be so overwhelmed by our visitors that we cannot properly accommodate them, nor do we want to suffer the ill effects that in some communities have despoiled the very benefits which their coming has brought. As a summer resort, as host to thousands, and as a wonderful place in which to live Cooperstown and its surrounding areas are hard to beat. So the aim of good planning must be above all else to protect the best interests of all the residents of this area.

We can't do this alone.

Planning must be objective and by those who have been expertly trained. This sort of thing has become a profession and has grown in importance in this country during the last decade. Many communities have found out to their sorrow that it is already almost too late.

Now is the time—for Cooperstown is not too late—but late enough.

Let's look forward, that we may have the kind of a future we know we should have.

When you stop to think of it, the cost is small—the possibilities are great.

"Darkness at Noon" Technique Collectivizes East German Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Sebastian Haffner of the London Observer, reprinted in the Washington Post April 19, provides still additional information about recent developments in East Germany of pertinence to our continuing study of that still unsolved problem. I submit Mr. Maffner's article under permission to extend remarks:

"DARKNESS AT NOON" TECHNIQUE COLLECTIVIZES EAST GERMAN FARMS

(By Sebastian Haffner)

BERLIN.—Methods recalling Arthur Koestler's novel "Darkness at Noon" were applied on a mass scale in the recently completed collectivization drive in East Germany.

This emerges from the stories told by numerous new refugees from the East German villages as well as from admissions in the Communist provincial press of East Germany.

The collectivization, to which all independent peasant farmers of East Germany fell victim during the last 6 weeks, was not imposed by law or even by decree, but enforced by individual blackmail, in which the whole pressure that party, state and political police are capable of, is brought to bear relentlessly on each individual farmer till he breaks down. Thousands of individual tragedies were played out in the East German countryside in this "black spring" of 1960.

VILLAGES OCCUPIED

The operation always started with the "occupation" of a village by a group of trained party agitators, usually about 50 strong. They called on the peasants to surrender both their possessions and their personal services to a local collective.

Sometimes a village meeting was held, sometimes not. The real work of "patient persuasion" which provided the results was always done in subsequent home visits to the individual peasants, and enforced marathon talks which were never relaxed till the victim gave in.

It is admitted in many reports in the local Communist press that these visits were in most cases enforced against the active resistance of those visited. The peasants bolted their gates, loosed their dogs, tried to flee to the fields—all in vain. One agitator described how a peasant, after having been forced to let him in, listened to his talk "lying on the couch with his face turned to the wall, never uttering a word."

"But," the report triumphantly went on, "each day a little more of this thick layer of protection he had put on crumbled away."

STOCK ARGUMENT

The stock argument always used by the agitators was that by refusing to join the collective the farmer in question would declare himself "for Adenauer and against peace," and would henceforth have to be considered an enemy of the state.

If the farmer denied this, he was often in the ensuing political discussion trapped into making anti-Communist remarks and thereupon threatened with arrest and trial unless he signed on the dotted line. Sometimes arrests were actually carried out, and some farmers were given widely publicized deterrent sentences—of up to 14 years' hard labor—for exactly this offense.

PERSISTENCE PAYS

Often political blackmail was complemented by economic blackmail; for example, a peasant's driving license might be taken away because of alleged road unworthiness of his tractor, or his animals seized for an alleged deficit in his deliveries; he was then told that he had only to sign on for the collective to get driving license or animals back. Other resisting peasants were threatened with proceedings for alleged economic offenses (such as buying fodder in the black market, or having more or fewer animals than were declared at the last farm census) unless they signed on.

But always the chief means by which resistance was finally overcome was sheer wearing down through relentless insistence—the "Darkness at Noon" technique. The agitators never left off, kept at it for hours on end and unfailingly returned next day, sometimes alternating with each other, sometimes bringing in police officers as a reinforcement, sometimes camping in the house altogether. While a village was under this treatment, the local police were often reinforced from outside and extra precautions were taken against the flight of the inhabitants.

The process, which was at first slow—some villages occupied in January, February, or early March, resisted for weeks and even months—later gathered momentum, as the news of the irresistable campaign spread and an atmosphere of terror gripped the countryside. Peasants tended to surrender more quickly so as to save themselves weeks of unavailing mental torture.

Jobs for the Handicapped: Passports to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, Miss Jane Gavin, a student at the Winneconne (Wis.) High School, was one of the four winners in writing a prize-winning essay entitled "Jobs for the Handicapped: Passports to Dignity."

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include Miss Gavin's essay. It is most heartening to know that our students are interested in this all-important subject and I am sure all the Members will find her paper most interesting and enlightening.

The essay follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED: PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY

(By Jane Gavin)

I am the conscience of the American people.

I live in a place called "Anytown, U.S.A." My town can be constantly moving, with flashing neons and huge brute factories lining the river that divides it into east and west sides. Or it can be just a sprinkling of stores somewhere on the plain, where silence is loud, and a shopping spree is a trip to the post office with an order blank from the big city catalog.

Either way, my town has people. Individuals of every size and description, running together to form the population. I've noticed something lately—the number of handicapped in my town is increasing. I suppose that's because many who would have died at birth, or in the emergency room of a hospital, are now saved; heaven and earth are moved to save them. Yes, I am proud of the advances my people have made in the field of medicine; glad that they might live today, who would have died yesterday.

But I am sad, a little angry, perhaps ashamed, because even though these others have helped them to live, they have, in most cases, neglected to give them a chance to attain a place in life. They aid them to exist; then desert them. I see this, and it disturbs me.

Regardless of what the afflicted have lost, they still retain that ultimately valuable asset—they are human beings. As human beings they want to be independent and to feel that they are part of the world. They don't want to be kept alive, then shut up in a dark room, something to be ashamed of, indulged, or pitied.

Let me tell you what I see when I look into some of the personnel offices in my town:

An average-looking young man is filling out an application blank for a job. He sits directly acress from a well-to-do businessman who watches him closely as he writes. Finished, he hands the paper to the man who smiles as he glances at it. Mentally, the man recalls past applicants, and suspects with pleasure that this clean-cut youth is surprisingly well qualified for the job. The man dismisses him, saying that he will let him know when he has looked over all the applications filed. As the young man rises and walks to the door, the man notices for the first time the empty, pinned-up sleeve. A thought of that boy learning to fill in an application blank with his left hand brings a choking mixture of pity and pride. Pity for that boy and his cross; and pride in the quiet way he was carrying it. But then a sudden shock interrupts this benevolent thought, and his brain shouts, "Courageous yes. But do you want him to be on your staff? Working for you?"

Now I'm asking you. What would you do if confronted with this problem? Would you turn away in embarrassment from the crippled who want a job, shrug your shoulders and say, "I can't afford to hire the handicapped. It's just not good business, and I am a businessman. Don't look at me with condenning eyes. I do feel sorry for him, but there is nothing I can do." (You see, I, your conscience, am ever present.)

Sorry, indeed. These handicapped don't want to be pampered, don't want sympathy; they don't need sympathy. They are insulted by the condescending pat on the head. What they want is something you, the American businessman, can give them. They want a chance, one chance, to prove themselves.

Give them that chance. You can't lose. Let me tell you why:

The majority of the handicapped who come to you for jobs do not come empty-handed. They bring with them the training they gained from counselors employed in the great State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation. At these centers, their abilities are stressed, not their disabilities. The handicapped are guided in choosing an occupation that is within their capacities. They learn to use artificial limbs, to walk with braces, or to read lips—whatever is necessary to restore them to near-normal life. Did you ever stop to think that when you hire a person with glasses, you are hiring a handicapped person whose disability has been corrected by artificial means? This is somewhat like an artificial limb, yet you pause in doubt before hiring a person with an artificial arm, and never give a thought to accepting a person with glasses.

How can I make you see that it is not only your responsibility, but that it is to your advantage to hire the handicapped? You will find that they possess a perseverance and patience peculiar only to their breed. A fierce pride in their hard-earned skills makes them determined to succeed. A blind girl answering the telephone, or an accountant in a wheelchair will not cut your production rate. In fact, production is likely to be increased because of the low absence rates. When they feel wanted and needed, the handicapped respond like plants to the sun. Their enthusiasm and vitality spreads and increases the entire efficiency of your business. Another, and an important, benefit you will gain is in the reaction of people (customers) when they recognize the fact that you are hiring the handicapped.

The handicapped have a passport to dignity in their rehabilitation training. Listen to me, your conscience. Sign that passport; make them independent and useful. Tell the handicapped, "The job is yours," and see if you don't agree that a million dollars couldn't buy that happy smile. By the way, you'd be surprised how tall the handicapped are when they stand alone.

The Right To Live Decently, With Dignity and Self-Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that an increasing number of Americans are becoming aware that our older citizens have the right to live decently, with dignity and self-respect. They do not expect to live in castles, nor do they demand diamonds. Their needs are necessary but not numberless.

As they made today possible for us as well as our tomorrows it seems to me it is time for us to start thinking about them—not ourselves alone. I am encouraged by the growing interest in the field of medical care for older citizens. I bring to your attention two recent editorials dealing with this subject which have appeared in Oregon newspapers, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Apr. 17, 1960]

FORAND BILL ET AL.

Medical care for the 16 million or so Americans now aged 60 or more is one of today's most argued issues.

A great majority of this 16 million have below-average incomes, and at a time of life when they are more apt to need medical care than when they are younger.

Whether or not this session of Congress will pass a measure to provide Federal administration for medical care for oldsters, the issue will remain. For the proportion of older citizens in the Nation is large, and getting larger. And whether or not they can afford medical care, they can still vote.

We do not, as a matter of fact, understand the medical fraternity's violent opposition to such proposals as the Forand bill.

They assail it as a "foot in the door" for socialized medicine. This may have some truth to it. But if some provision such as the Forand bill, or a similar alternative, is not enacted, then the medical profession, in a few years, will be facing real socialized medicine.

One would think they could see this coming, and support a step which will provide medical care for older people, but still permit the doctors to retain their professional, independent status.

Not all doctors, incidentally, oppose the Forand bill or its alternatives as blindly and resolutely as does the American Medical Association.

One doctor recently wrote to the New York Times and compared the Forand proposal, which would operate through Social Security, with some of the so-called voluntary plans, which involves State governments and private insurance companies.

He came to this conclusion:

"The social security mechanism provides a method for collecting the required earmarked reserves, and also for spreading the risk of higher hospital costs in later life throughout the preceding years of employment."

The writer was George Baehr, M.D., a former member of the executive committee of the Commission on Financing of Hospital Care, sponsored by the American Hospital Association, and chairman of its committee on prepayment. He is now consultant to the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. The day is rapidly coming when the Federal Government will have a role in providing medical care for the aged. This simply is a political reality.

One would think that those who oppose the Forand bill would be doing everything they can to design a workable alternative; one with comparable benefits, comparable simplicity, and a comparable plan of equitable financing.

This is about their only chance of averting socialized medicine, perhaps on the British plan, which, despite the protestations of its opponents, is workable, and is supported strongly by a large majority of the people of Great Britain, if not by their doctors.—E.A.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, Apr. 12, 1960]

HEALTH CARE FOR AGED BURNING ISSUE

There is terrific pressure on the current Congress to develop a medical-health protection bill to help persons over 65 pay ever-increasing medical-hospital bills.

Democrats, backed by the AFL–CIO and the National Association of Social Workers, have brought out the Forand bill, which would extend social security payments by another one-half of 1 percent (shared by employers and employees) to provide health insurance for the elderly.

This bill, which set off a first-class hassle in both House and Senate, appears to be stymied in the House (is strongly opposed by the American Medical Association), and probably would invite a veto by President Eisenhower.

But the election-year pressure on the Congress and the administration is so great that seven liberal GOP Senators have introduced a new voluntary public-private health insurance bill designed to meet at least some of the President's opposition to the Forand bill.

In general, here's the difference between the two proposals:

The Forand bill, strongly supported in the recent report of the Oregon chapter of NASW to the legislative interim committee on public welfare, would add one-half of 1 percent to the present 3 percent paid by both employers and employees to pay the medical, surgical, hospital and nursing care bills of social security pensioners. This is branded "socialized medicine" by the AMA.

The counterproposal of Republican Senators, led by Senator JAVITS, would set up a voluntary health insurance program for the aged to be financed jointly by Federal and State governments and by social security recipients, who would pay from 50 cents to $13 a month for their share of the coverage, depending upon incomes. It is estimated that this plan, covering up to $10,000 for all purposes, would cost the Federal Government about $480 million, State governments about $640 million and voluntary subscribers $400 million per year. This assumes 70 percent signup and that States could either buy the coverage from insurance companies or provide it themselves.

In light of administration and AMA opposition to the Democratic Forand bill and the likelihood that the Congress could not muster sufficient strength to override a Presidential veto, it appears that some variation of the Republican (JAVITS) bill has the better chance of passage. But whatever way it falls, better health protection for the aged has become one of the burning issues of this presidential election year.

That's because of the growing recognition throughout the United States that a high percentage of the 15,500,000 persons past 65 cannot afford adequate medical-health care at today's inflated prices.

This is brought home by testimony before the legislative interim committee that the medical expenses of old-age assistance recipients in Oregon take two-thirds of the dollar Oregon spends for the medical care of all public assistance recipients—and there is growing evidence that this care is far from adequate.

Even those who oppose Federal health programs, which they term "socialized medicine," concede that something must be done to cope with the health problems of the aged. The Javits bill is at least a step in this direction.

Public Power Does Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, over the years all of us have seen advertising by the commercial utilities seeking to convey the thought that "every time public power wins, you the taxpayer, lose."

The allegation that investment of public funds in multipurpose water resource development projects is not in the public interest is demonstrably false. These projects repay reimbursable costs with interest—and at a substantial saving to the consumer.

This was the subject of an article in the February 1960, issue of the Flathead Electric News, publication of the Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Kalispell, Mont. In that article, President Byron Graham, of the cooperative's board of directors, states that public power in 1959 cost the cooperative members $201,608.55 less than the same amount of power would have cost them prior to completion of Hungry Horse Dam.

In addition to the savings, this project, farthest-most upstream in the American portion of the Columbia River system, provides substantial flood control, reclamation, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

The article follows:

PUBLIC POWER DOES PAY

(By Byron Graham, president of the board of directors of the Flathead Electric Cooperative)

Now that America is no longer in a shooting war with a neighboring country, the citizenry seems to be bending its vindictiveness against each other. There is a certain group of people, either for personal gain or for other reasons, that must seemingly be mad at someone. Witness the advertisements that have been appearing in certain periodicals during the past few years against public power. These paid headlines which have been costing someone millions of dollars annually, continually convey the thought that "Every time public power wins, you lose." The finger is pointed directly at you, the taxpayer. But who is the taxpayer? What is this all about, and how does it affect the people of the Flathead Valley?

When they talk about public power, they are referring to such Government financed enterprises as the Bonneville Power Administration, Hungry Horse Dam, and Grand Coulee Dam. After reviewing the financial reports, it is difficult to see where these dams have cost the American people anything. It is certainly impossible to find where they have extracted any money out of the pockets of our local people; and this is the group that we actually are concerned about.

Now, what has Hungry Horse Dam done for the people in Flathead Valley? That million-dollar advertising campaign certainly doesn't say anything about that; nor is their advertising agency in New York City concerned with our local problems.

HERE IS THE RECORD

Let's take a look at the ledger sheet from the point of view of a member of the Flathead Electric Cooperative. The cooperative purchases power generated at Hungry Horse Dam and together with other buyers, is repaying the Government's cost with interest.

As you probably know, the Flathead Electric Cooperative, as a distributor of electric energy, must purchase all the power its members use. In 1949, prior to the Hungry Horse Dam, the Flathead Electric Cooperative paid an average of 1.077 cents per kilowatt-hour for all energy purchased. Its local wholesale power bill at that time was $52,392, for 4,866,600 kilowatt-hours. For the year 1959, 10 years later, and after a period when everything else doubled in price, the Flathead Electric Cooperative paid $84,028 for 26,521,500 kilowatts-hours purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration. This is an average price of .317 cent per kilowatt-hour. If the cooperative paid the same unit price for the power consumed by its members in 1959, as it did in 1949, the wholesale power cost would have been in 1959 the tidy little sum of $285,636. There is no disputing the fact then, that the members of Flathead Electric Cooperative saved $201,608.55 during the year 1959 because of Hungry Horse Dam, can any of us say that Hungry Horse Dam cost us anything? It didn't me; did it you?

HERE IS THE RESULT

This saving in power cost has been passed on to the consumers of Flathead Electric. For instance, the average price paid by all consumers for electric service from the Flathead Electric Cooperative was 1.72 cents in 1959, as compared to a national average price on all REA's throughout the United States of 2.52 cents. In 1949, the average power user receiving service from Flathead Electric paid 3.49 cents per kilowatt-hour. In other words, patrons of the Flathead Electric Co-op paid approximately 100 percent more for their power in 1949 than they did in 1959.

Part of the reason for this reduction is due to the increased use of electricity. But, the average American uses more gasoline than he did in 1949. What has happened to the price of gasoline during the past 10 years? Gasoline prices increased, but not more than the price of other products that we buy, except electricity.

Electric power is penny cheap. Public power does pay, and it will continue to pay as long as we make beneficial use of electricity.

Algeria Is Seeking Self-Determination and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last August 6 a group of U.S. Representatives, of which I was a member, urged the Government of France to enter into negotiations to end the 5-year Algerian war.

Today French Premier Charles de Gaulle is a visitor in our country. He has met and will meet with President Eisenhower. I hope they have included on their discussion agenda the struggle in Algeria today and ways and means of initiating a new era of friendship between the French and Algerian peoples.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter sent April 14, 1960, by the spokesman of the Algerian Front of National Liberation in the United States, A. Chanderli, to the President of the United States:

APRIL 14, 1960.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States.

MR. PRESIDENT: In September 1959, the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic and the Government of France, the two parties to the conflict in Algeria, both accepted the principle of self-determination as the basis for a peaceful settlement of a war now in its sixth year.

We recall that, on behalf of the U.S. Government, on September 17, 1959, you declared that the promise of self-determination was "completely in accord with our hopes to see proclaimed a just and liberal program for Algeria * * * it is our hope that it will lead to an early peace."

Seven months have passed and there are no prospects of an "early peace".

We most earnestly shared your hopes for an early peace, and during this time, have neglected no opportunity for its realization. On September 28, 1959, we announced our view that peace could, in fact, be immediate. In order to reach an agreement on a ceasefire, we called for pourparlers with the French Government to insure the honesty and fairness of the electoral process by which the Algerian people would freely decide their future, consistent with the often proclaimed U.S. support for genuinely free elections.

During the 14th session of the United Nations General Assembly, the U.S. Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, referred to U.S. hopes that no action would be taken "which would prejudice the realization of a just and peaceful solution for Algeria such as is promised by General de Gaulle's far-reaching declaration with its provision for self-determination by the Algerian people." Thus, at the plenary session of the General Assembly on December 12, 1959, the United States refused to support a draft resolution urging "the holding of pourparlers with a view to arriving at a peaceful solution on the basis of the right to self-determination."

Until now, the French Government has refused the Algerian request for pourparlers to discuss the guarantees of the application of self-determination.

On February 29, 1960, in a renewed appeal for talks to bring about an immediate end to the war in Algeria, Ferhat Abbas, Premier of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic again called for "the immediate opening of pourparlers" and reaffirmed that "it is not a question of negotiations on the future of Algeria. This future will be what the Algerian people want it to be * * *. A democratic procedure, self-determination is indeed capable of solving the Algerian problem once and for all."

But France has now removed the substance from self-determination and is trying to revive the illusion of a military solution.

1. Speaking on January 29, 1960, the President of the French Republic assured the French army that "* * * When the time comes for the consultation, you will have to guarantee its complete and sincere free-

dom," thus denying the freedom of self-determination in Algeria.

2. During a special visit to the French Expeditionary Corps in Algeria, General de Gaulle declared on March 4, 1960:

"The Algerian problem will not be settled for a long time to come. The condition for this settlement is the definitive victory of the French army. * * * France must remain in Algeria."

3. A communique issued by the French Ministry of Information, on March 7, 1960, in behalf of the President of the French Republic prejudged the choice of the Algerian people by announcing: "General de Gaulle holds that the possibility of a majority vote for secession in Algeria is excluded." The menace of the partition of the Algerian nation was raised as follows: "* * * It would be necessary, under this detestable hypothesis, to proceed to a vast regrouping of the populations."

4. Speaking in Algeria on April 12, 1960, Mr. Michel Debré, Prime Minister of France, officially announced his government's intention to partition Algeria if, exercising their right to self-determination, the Algerian people chose independence from France. Mr. Debré declared: "There is not, there will not be, an abandonment of Algeria by France. In the unbelievable and disastrous hypothesis that a majority in Algeria should opt for secession, that would happen. * * * Secession would in truth mean partition."

This new policy set out by the President of the French Republic and his Prime Minister has shocked world public opinion, and even many French political leaders who have consistently supported his Government. Renewing the illusion of a military solution, this policy has closed the door to an early peace in Algeria.

In view of this French policy, the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic declared on March 14, 1960 that "we will pursue the war of national liberation until the realization of our independence. Colonialism leaves us no other alternative."

At the same time, this declaration recalled the Algerian Provisional Government's conviction that it is "our duty not to neglect anything in order to arrive at a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the Algerian problem." Our recent declarations have fully demonstrated our desire not to miss any valid opportunity to put an end to the war. We affirm again our desire to reach a peaceful and just settlement on the basis of real self-determination for Algeria, in the interest of the people of both France and Algeria, and recall Premier Abbas' statement on February 29, 1960: "Since, as of now, peace is possible on the basis of free choice, no obstacle should remain insurmountable."

The visit of General de Gaulle to the United States occurs in the midst of preparations for a summit conference whose aim is to reduce international tensions and insure world peace and stability. In this context, we recall that as far back as June 28, 1957, the U.S. Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, affirmed that "a conflict such as now raging in Algeria clearly imposes a responsibility on the members of the world community." It is clear that today the full-scale war in Algeria places an even greater responsibility on the members of the world community.

In considering this responsibility, we note, with regret, that the United States has freely extended aid to France of a political, moral, financial, and military nature. The greatest part of this aid has been used by France in the pursuit of the colonial war against the Algerian people. In effect, the continuation of this American aid permits France to pursue the only war being waged in the world today, a war which violates the highest traditions upheld by the United States throughout its history. It is therefore clear that the President of the United States will contribute greatly to the return of peace in Algeria by stopping all further aid to France and by impressing upon the President of the French Republic that the United States can no longer accept the continuation of this tragic war which has already taken the lives of hundreds of thousands of our heroic people.

In the eyes of Africans, upon whose continent this war is being waged, and in the eyes of millions in the "world community," the United States bears a very grave responsibility for the continuation of this war and for the far-reaching consequences which its continuation will inevitably produce.

Today the colonial war in Algeria is a test which poses the greatest challenge to the United States, as the leader of the Western World, and to you, Mr. President, hailed throughout the world as a man of peace.

There can be no real peace in the world without peace in Algeria.

Respectfully yours,

A. CHANDERLI.

The Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, labor in the United States had during the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century a very stormy existence. It was a federally unregulated commodity when management-labor disputes arose. The only recourse that either side had to a responsible legal tribunal was in the event the criminal law was violated or in the event a situation existed which permitted the seeking of an injunction. The days from Samuel Gompers to William Green were hectic days for labor; days when working men and women found that they had no rights that could be protected in a court of justice and that the democracy for which this country was known throughout the world including the right to a fair trial did not exist when a labor dispute was involved. Criminal prosecution for violence was frequently prosecuted by management against individuals whose emotions caused them to violate the criminal law during their picketing operations. Management used the injunction to the fullest extent possible, but there was no legal tribunal prior to the passage of the Wagner Act during the Roosevelt administration in 1934 that could determine whether a bargaining unit existed among the employees and what union, if any, represented the employees. There was no law that required management to sit down with labor's representatives and bargain collectively on the issues involved in the labor dispute. Working men and women were thus powerless to demand better wages, hours or working conditions. The Wagner Act became the Magna Carta of the American working man and woman. For 25 years, American labor grew and prospered under the protective arm of the Wagner Act. Congress attempted to repeal it, to amend it out of existence, or in other ways to scuttle it. Nineteen States passed right-to-work laws which virtually repealed the Wagner Act insofar as those 19 States were concerned. Congress refused to appropriate adequate funds to permit the act to be administered properly throughout the United States. This required the Labor Relations Board to reject many classes of cases. These became known as the "no-man's land" cases because there remained no court to which the issues and disputes could be taken. However, basically the Wagner Act stood as a monumental bulwark for the protection of American working men and women as well as for the protection of employers in the event of unlawful or unfair claims by the working man and woman.

The enemies of labor scored in 1959 during the 86th Congress. They were able to blow up a national prejudice against certain labor leaders because of unfair or unscrupulous conduct in their individual cases and that developed a national hysteria and hatred against labor and the labor movement throughout the United States. This hysteria descended on Congress through a campaign carried on by the national chamber of commerce and the National Manufacturers Association in 1959 when Congress was considering a perfectly fair and reasonable bill which was designed to regulate labor just as the banks are regulated; to regulate it with the thought in mind of improving it and with no thought of injuring the labor movement. Honest labor and labor leaders were cooperating with the Congress in an attempt to pass a fair regulatory piece of legislation.

Hysteria among the people fomented by every known media of communication caused Congress to pass the now infamous Landrum-Griffin bill which did the following things:

First. Authorized the National Labor Relations Board on a permanent basis to continue limited operation of the National Labor Relations Board and to continue to refuse to act upon those classes of cases which fell within the "no-man's land" cases. This meant that the National Labor Relations Board could permanently give up jurisdiction over management or labor grievances as was provided for in the Wagner Act. This was a repeal of the Wagner Act insofar as it affected those cases.

Second. The cases involved in the "no-man's land" dispute affected 90 percent of the employers of the United States and approximately 30 percent of the working men and women of the United States.

Third. The above constituted an emasculation of the Wagner Act and was an absolute repeal of the Wagner Act insofar as it applied to 90 percent of the employers and 30 percent of the employees of this Nation.

Fourth. The Landrum-Griffin bill requires the payment of excessive bonding fees to a chosen few insurance companies. This excessive expense will be a burden to many trade unions in this country.

Fifth. The Landrum-Griffin bill permits both unions and employers to be

sued for union or nonunion activity. One employer in my district at Whitewater, Wis., is now being sued for $1½ million because of antiunion activity. Many unions throughout the country are similarly being sued.

Sixth. Because of the removal of the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board from labor disputes involving merchants doing business in every city in this country, it has made these merchants "prey" of whatever demands James Hoffa may make upon them when he organizes them into his union. I mention this because the bill was passed for the purpose of controlling James Hoffa and, as a matter of fact, it has given to him a large field where he can work without the fear of any Federal control or intervention and beyond the veil of the National Labor Relations Board.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 23, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The Mutual Security Act, authorizing foreign aid funds for fiscal 1961, saw history simply repeating itself as the House debated and passed it this week. We heard the same arguments for and against, the same damning criticisms of waste and mismanagement in the program. Yet, the spending goes on and on. The debate pointed up once more that the program needs review and reprograming before continuation; that Congress has lost more control of the yearly military expenditures and Development Loan Fund; that dictators, government leaders, and industrialists abroad are helped while the people, nation by nation, are all too frequently overlooked; that the bureaucracy in the ICA keeps the program self-perpetuating; that mistakes are being condoned and repeated instead of corrected.

What is the cost of foreign aid yearly? Who knows? The requests which some of us have regularly made for review and study go unheeded as we rush headlong into more programs and bigger spending. According to figures submitted by Georgia's Representative J. L. PILCHER and Representative OTTO PASSMAN of Louisiana, there is already $8.1 billion in the aid "pipeline" as yet unobligated or expended. This doesn't take into account our contribution of agricultural surpluses, the total of military construction, investments in six or more international banks, foreign currencies we own, cost of the surplus excess property, or offshore procurement costs. So now we authorize another $1.3 billion in economic aid, plus $2.7 billion of military and Development Loan Fund amounts. Mind you, if we never spent another dime on foreign aid, we'd still have to get up about $3.5 billion a year just to pay the interest charges on the money we have already poured into the program.

A few mistakes or instances of waste—even more than a few—should not condemn such a program as foreign aid, but examples of error, waste, mismanagement, lack of objectives, overprograming, and underplanning in our programs is almost endless. Thus we have found ourselves often aiding potential enemies while alienating our friends. Some basic truths cannot be wished away. It remains a fact that, as a nation, we cannot spend ourselves rich nor can we buy friends. Too, however altruistic our aims and motions, we are not sufficiently rich to supply the world's material needs. If we spread ourselves too thinly trying, we can only weaken or bankrupt ourselves, and in the process appear absurdly foolish in the eyes of those we're trying to help and who look to us for leadership.

Our job then, it seems to us, is threefold: First, to help others help themselves; second, to foster and preserve institutions and governments which share our dedication to freedom; and, third, to keep ourselves economically strong. Only with such a hardheaded, realistic "aid" program can we win respect and influence people. I sincerely believe that our present foreign aid program fails basically in all these objectives and needs a thorough replanning and overhauling.

My recommendations of a year-ago on foreign aid (recounted in my newsletter then are still so timely that I repeated them in floor argument this year: (1) That our traditional generous private charity and governmental grants to relieve disaster be continued; that we encourage the expansion of our private missionary efforts; (2) that in countries which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, military assistance—for the time being—should be continued, but on a realistic basis; (3) that foreign aid which directly or indirectly promotes governments that are hostile to our constitutional concepts of government be terminated immediately; (4) that so long as governmental foreign aid is continued, the recipient should pay a part of the cost of the proposed project; that our aid should terminate when the conditions on which that request is based have been remedied; that private technical, scientific, and educational assistance be extended only to friendly peoples who seek our aid on a cash or loan basis; (5) that until foreign aid in terminated, the Congress take steps properly to exercise close supervision and control over the manner in which all foreign aid funds are being spent; that all future economic aid, plus what can be salvaged from unexpended foreign aid funds, be diverted to and handled by the Export-Import Bank (6) that the $3.9 billion requested for the fiscal year 1960 be reduced $2 billion and that each year thereafter foreign aid be substantially reduced until terminated within 3 years; and (7) that military matters be left to our military and foreign affairs be left to the State Department, and their existing organizations, so we can dismantle the huge 50,000-person foreign aid bureaucracy, and stop the duplication of efforts.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Profile of a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article paying tribute to the Honorable John J. Griffin, a distinguished citizen of the city of St. Louis, Mo. This article appeared in the Friday, March 25, 1960, issue of the St. Louis Review, official newspaper of the archdiocese of St. Louis.

Being personally acquainted with Colonel Griffin and having known him well over a period of 25 years, I am in a position to subscribe fully with the substance of this appraisal of his character and citizenry.

I personally know of the tremendous devotion Colonel Griffin has had to the task of developing good citizenship in his home community, his State, and in the Nation. He has given unselfishly of his time and effort to joining in any movement that has this as its goal. Always an outspoken foe of communism and un-American groups, I am certain that his zeal and his efforts have accomplished much good.

I feel that Colonel Griffin through his years of devoted service to this Nation fully merits the high commendation given to him in the article which is herewith presented.

The article follows:

PROFILE OF A CITIZEN

(By Glen Soellner)

Nine years ago a tall, wiry man with a shock of iron gray hair stepped to the speaker's rostrum at a meeting of the Rotary Club in De Soto, Mo., and delivered this opinion:

"The definition of a citizen that I like is the one given in Webster's: 'a person, native or naturalized, who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to protection from it.'"

He elaborated: "A good citizen is one who not only accepts the protection that the government offers to him, but realizes that with such acceptance there comes a responsibility to meet the obligation imposed by the acceptance of such blessings."

This talk was reprinted in Vital Speeches of the Day, a semimonthly publication originating in New York. Among other speeches contained in the same issue of the magazine was one made by then Secretary of State Dean Acheson dealing with the country's foreign policy.

The speaker whose words ranked—in the editor's opinion—alongside those of the Secretary of State in importance, was Col. John J. Griffin, KGCHS. Born in St. Louis, June 14, 1890, the son of Michael James Griffin and Mary Anglin, he was educated at Holy Angels parochial school, McKinley High, St. Louis University School of Law, and St. Louis Business College.

The initials affixed to the name indicate he is a Knight of the Grand Cross of the Holy Sepulcher, the highest rank obtainable in this ancient equestrial order. His wife, the former Mary Harkins, is a Lady of the Holy Sepulcher, and his son, John J. (Jack) Griffin, recently was appointed a Knight of the Holy Sepulcher by Pope John XXIII.

This would indicate that Colonel Griffin and has family have fulfilled in some degree their responsibility to their church.

The "colonel" prefixed to his name is an honorary title bestowed by four different Missouri Governors. In addition, he is an "admiral" in the Nebraska Navy, appointed by the Governor of that State.

These titles reflect in a measure the manner in which Colonel Griffin has discharged his responsibility to his country.

Colonel Griffin, nearing age 70, was and still is an outspoken foe of communism and other un-American groups. He was threatened with death on more than one occasion by the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Shirts, and the Reds.

"Thank God, they're gone and I'm still here," the colonel said, sitting relaxed and smiling opposite the reporter. His healthy complexion and upright posture, despite a coronary attack which curtailed his activities some years ago, were visual proof of his continued participation in and enjoyment of the things that make for the good life.

President and principal owner of the International Engineering & Supply Co., during his active career, Colonel Griffin also served as an officer of some six banks and loan companies. Recently he became vice president of a new bank at High Ridge.

His wartime activities included the chairmanship of the city and county draft boards; offices with the Industrial Manpower Commission, Defense Transportation, Americanism Committee, American War Dads, Greek War Relief, Home Guards, and many others.

The Catholic High School Board, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Light Opera Guild, State Eleemosynary Board, State Athletic Commission, State Board of Training Schools and scores of other civic and religious groups had the benefit of his guidance.

The House of Good Shepherd, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Council of Catholic Men, the Holy Name Society, and the Knights of Columbus are among organizations with which he is still affiliated.

Aside from his work for his church and country, the project perhaps dearest to the colonel's heart and the one upon which he now devotes the major share of his time is securing employment for the physically handicapped. He is chairman of the Missouri committee and a member of President Eisenhower's advisory council.

The Klan, the Hitlerites, the Communists, and the johnny-come-lately POAU (Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State) are all dangerous, Colonel Griffin observed. But he is opposed to suppressing such organizations.

"If they can be suppressed, so can we," he explained. "If we tell the American people the truth, their good common sense will take care of such phoney organizations as these. They hide behind patriotic motives in order to vent their hatred on other citizens. They are like termites that work in the dark—the light of day and the truth will kill them."

Colonel Griffin went into the Little Egypt area of southern Illinois when the Ku Klux Klan was rampant there and made public speeches exposing them. He attended their hooded meetings and rose to his feet to challenge their assertions. He was in Herrin engineering plans for a new Catholic church on the day that the chief klansman and the sheriff shot and killed each other in a gun duel in a hotel lobby.

The colonel made a speech at Jefferson Barracks on Decoration Day prior to World War II, when the so-called Black Shirts who espoused nazism were said to have been 25,000-strong in Missouri. He advocated closing German consulates, which he claimed were payoff agents for subversive elements.

He took up the fight against communism when Russia was America's ally and it was unpopular to speak against them. "I took the stand that it would be silly not to realize that the U.S.S.R. had helped us in the war but I also maintained that this had given them no lease on America," the colonel recalled.

The Klan and the Black Shirts sent word to Colonel Griffin that "it will be unhealthy for you to continue that kind of talk." The Communists named a committee of three to kill him.

"They would telephone my home and threaten that if I went to a certain meeting I wouldn't come back. My wife stayed home and got these calls but she never once urged me not to go. She was with me all the way."

The Communists paid for an 8-week program on a St. Louis radio station during which they described Colonel Griffin as an undesirable citizen.

The colonel endured the abuse and persisted in his efforts because he felt that "if these people were successful in their effort to destroy liberty and freedom they would also destroy the dignity of man," he said.

Colonel Griffin left his impress wherever he went. Named to the State athletic commission by Governor Stark, he immediately suspended all promoters', fighters', and officials' licenses. Police reports were obtained on all applicants for new licenses and the undesirable element was eliminated from the sport. The board headed by the colonel drew up a new set of regulations which is still used, with some modifications.

Appointed to the State eleemosynary board, he took action to have Catholic and Protestant chaplains assigned to the State mental hospitals for the first time. Moving to the State Board of Training Schools, he again had chaplains assigned and set up 1-hour courses in religion in the cottages in which the young people were confined.

"We called them courses in moral ethics," he remembered. "If we had called them religion courses the people would have screamed their heads off."

Colonel Griffin's interest in helping the physically handicapped obtain employment stemmed from his selective service experience. He found that veterans were facing difficulties in getting their jobs back after discharge.

"We formed a committee of 200 to anticipate the day when the lads would return and would have their jobs waiting for them. Our main task was to acquaint employers with their legal responsibility to their former employees. Then our thoughts turned

to those servicemen who had lost a leg or an arm. How could we get jobs for them?"

The committee drew up a program for the employment of physically handicapped veterans, and 3 years later when President Roosevelt established a national program it was patterned after the one in Missouri. Later the State program was broadened to include all handicapped persons.

Colonel Griffin went into every community in Missouri where the 31 State employment security offices are located and chose "the most influential man in the community as voluntary chairman," he said. "The roster of these volunteers could be a 'Who's Who of Missouri.'"

These chairmen formed local committees composed of a cross-section of each community and made up of chamber of commerce, veteran, employment, newspaper, radio, union, and religious representatives.

Among obstacles that were overcome was a Missouri law which held employers responsible for permanent disability damages when a person with one eye, arm, or leg lost another eye, arm, or leg in their service. This was changed so that the employer became responsible only for that portion of the injury sustained while in his employ. Other States adopted this legislation since that date.

Labor leaders were prevailed upon to issue cards to qualified handicapped persons, and personnel people were persuaded to relax their restrictions which were so stiff that men who couldn't find employment for physical reasons still were judged suitable for military service.

"The chamber of commerce was valuable in the latter respect," Colonel Griffin said. "We contacted the top brass, and orders were issued that accomplished what we were seeking."

So successful is the program that the St. Louis office alone has obtained jobs for some 25,000 handicapped persons, and an estimated 2 million now are working at full-time jobs and at the prevailing wage in the United States.

"There is no charity or sentimentality in the program," the chairman declared. "We are frank to say that if they can't do the job as well as the nonhandicapped, don't keep them."

That these people are able to do the jobs to which they are assigned is evidenced by manufacturers, unions, and employers who say that their employment has led to increased production, a decrease in absenteeism, and a decrease in accidents, he said.

An example of how handicapped people are fitted to the jobs which they are capable of performing was offered by a boiler firm which experienced difficulty with employees taking sick leave.

"Helpers who bucked rivets on the inside of the boilers got sick from the constant noises," the colonel said. Even earplugs didn't help. The firm talked to us and we sent them deaf people. They were perfect for the job. They knew it was time to quit when the vibrations stopped."

Colonel Griffin cited other instances in which deaf, dumb, blind, armless, and legless people demonstrated competency exceeding that of people without handicaps.

His committee's task is to create opportunities for employment of the handicapped, he pointed out. Actual employment is conducted through the State employment office.

Only the materialistic benefits that are realized from increased payrolls, payment of taxes, and other tangible results of the program are counted, the colonel said. "We don't add up the spiritual benefits, but we know they are there."

Why would a man stand up and be counted when he knew that he took his life in his hands by doing so?

Colonel Griffin, mellowed by the passage of the years but possessing still the undiminished zeal for the things in which he believes, answered in this fashion:

"I feel that the only salvation for the world is for our people to keep their minds and their hearts on a program for God and country."

Why would a man devote so many hours to civic tasks that are frequently thankless?

Colonel Griffin answered this qeustion in 1951 when he spoke to the Rotarians at De Soto and reminded them that a good citizen is one who realizes his responsibility to his government for the blessings he receives from it.

The West Indies Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a new nation, the first to come into being in the Western Hemisphere since the creation of Panama in 1903, is taking shape in the Caribbean Sea. The birth of the new Federation of the West Indies on January 3, 1958, was a significant day in the political history of the New World. April 22 marks the second anniversary of the inauguration of the federation's legislature. This occasion is of great significance to the people of the British West Indies, for it means the translation into reality of their greatest ideal—federation. They have come to see in this federation their hopes for the future. It marks, also, the final stage in the progress of these people to full self-government.

Geographically, the new federation is the only one of its kind in the world today, for its 3 million people do not share one territory but live in 13 islands scattered over 550,000 miles of Caribbean water. The islands forming the federation vary considerably in size, population, and the degree of economic development. For instance, Jamaica, with an area of 4,411 square miles, has more than 1½ million people, and a large number of well-established industries; while Montserrat is an island of 32 square miles in extent, with a population of some 14,000 living almost entirely on agriculture. Despite many obstacles, the federation's members are determined to guide this new nation to secure independence, within the British Commonwealth.

Welded together under a federal form of government the 13 islands can become a prosperous, vigorous political unit. They have come to realize that it is clearly impossible in the modern world to achieve and maintain full selfgovernment on their own, and be strong enough to stand against present day economic pressures.

Here in the United States, we should look forward to a mutually happy relationship with the new federation. They already look toward the "big country to the north" for understanding and support. This sentiment was clearly expressed by the Honorable Sir Grantley Adams, Prime Minister of the West Indies, not too long ago when he stated that:

The fact that we share the same language and similar forms of government with both Canada and the United States will be of immense benefit to us in future years. The United States with its massive global commitments has been fully aware that quite nearby there is a new federation with many problems. Our discussions with the United States have led to an appreciation of our varying points of views, and we feel that if we should feel the need to urge our point of view more strongly it would not occasion any abeyance of the civilized norms that we have established.

Already the United States has extended economic assistance to the federation. A new cooperative service agreement was signed in June 1959, providing for ICA technical cooperation activities throughout the federation. U.S. technicians are now studying the problems of these islands. Moreover, last March a multimillion-dollar grant was given to the West Indies Federation under our foreign aid program. Thus, with the wholehearted efforts of the British West Indians and with some expert guidance and support the West Indies Federation should be able to cope more easily with its problems and develop into an enterprising new nation.

On this day of national commemoration I want to extend to the West Indies Government and its people my best wishes and congratulations.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective local trade organizations it has been my privilege to observe in action is the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association, which has just celebrated its 75th anniversary.

To inform grocers of new products, new food store equipment, new merchandising operations, and to develop and place into effect programs benefiting both merchant and consumer, were the major purposes which brought about its formation.

More than a hundred retail grocers and meat dealers met together shortly after 10 p.m. on April 4, 1885, in the old Produce Exchange Building on Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, to form their organization, elect officers, and set up committees for future meetings and activities.

Many of the merchants were tired out from the work done during that long Saturday; hours in those days extending to 10 o'clock at night.

First president of the association was Wesley Neill, an energetic and eloquent

merchant. Other officers were H. S. Mallin and A. G. Moshier, vice presidents, F. H. Aldrich, treasurer, and E. S. Winters and L. B. Hopper, respectively, secretary and assistant secretary.

In its long and distinguished history, the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association was a leader in the fight for the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act; pioneer in State and city programs for the passage of legislation safeguarding the public health, and took an active part in the civic and business activities of the community.

The Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association is one of the oldest food trade organizations in the United States; and it played a leading role in 1893 in the formation of the National Association of Retail Grocers, and in 1897 the Retail Grocers' and General Merchants' Association of Minnesota.

During three quarters of a century the association has pioneered in working for sound progress in retail merchandising methods that have enabled our merchants in Minneapolis to provide better food to consumers under more sanitary and efficient arrangement, and with better working conditions for workers in the industry. For many years its able, effective and public-spirited executive secretary has been Mr. Edward Straus. The people of my district join me in extending congratulations to the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association for the fine work it has accomplished, and very best wishes for the years ahead.

The Washington (D.C.) Evening Star Offers a Statesmanlike Solution to Controversy Over Administration Plan To Destroy the Historic Buildings Near the White House in the Nation's Capital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, in an editorial today offers a statesmanlike solution to the controversy over the administration proposal to destroy the historic buildings on Lafayette Square across the street from the White House in the Nation's Capital.

Three new buildings are involved in a construction tieup. They are a new home for the Civil Service Commission, a joint headquarters for the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and a combined Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building.

The Evening Star editorial says in part:

> There is still time to save at least two of these buildings from being postponed for another year, however. Both Public Works Committees previously have endorsed the Civil Service and Aviation-Space buildings, so that reapproval now could be accomplished quickly, without necessity of further hearings. The court building has controversial aspects that might call for longer consideration.

On the other hand, the Washington, D.C., Post displays, in an editorial today, considerable displeasure over the action of the Members of the House of Representatives in sustaining a point of order made by an able and conscientious Member and cutting nearly $65 million from the appropriations bill for the three buildings which are not yet approved as required by a recent act of the Congress.

The Washington, D.C., Post does the just cause of replacing the unsightly and hazardous temporary buildings remaining from World Wars I and II no good by casually lumping with them the Dolly Madison House and the other historic buildings on Lafayette Square, some of which have gracefully endured for more than 150 years.

The Nation's Capital actually is faced with a situation comparable in some respects to that surrounding Carnegie Hall, the world-famous music center established in the late 1800's by Andrew Carnegie. What is missing is a Mayor Robert Wagner, a Governor Nelson Rockefeller, and a citizens' committee headed by an Isaac Stern and numbering among its members Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sol Hurok, Mrs. Marshall Field, Fritz Kreisler, Jascha Heifetz, Arthur Rubinstein, Dame Myra Hess, Marian Anderson, Leopold Stokowski, Leonard Bernstein, and Van Cliburn.

New York City has dozens of legitimate theaters, Washington, D.C., has only the National Theater and the Arena Stage now that the Shubert Theater has thoughtlessly been razed to make way for a parking lot.

The closer any historic building is to the White House the more imminent becomes its destruction. The Old State, War, Navy Building, the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, the Belasco Theater are all within a block of the White House and all are marked for early destruction.

In Philadelphia things are far different. There the Federal Government is spending during the years 1950–61 over $15 million to preserve historic buildings and has established Independnece National Historic Park to assist in these worthy preservation endeavors.

The administration is more interested in preserving the ancient treasures of the Nile Valley, than in preserving our own historic treasures right in the front yard of the White House. A new amendment to the Mutual Security Act will help save the Nile treasures—and they should be saved—which otherwise would soon be lost forever under the impounded waters of the Aswan Dam. The amendment will permit the U.S. Government to contribute up to one-third of the cost of the big international salvage program which is expected to cost as much as $90 million in all.

The great buildings fronting on Lafayette Square can serve present and future generations of Americans in many ways and, with proper administration, can advance our country's cultural development and education. Here is an opportunity, unique in our history, for the Congress to make good on its past legislative enactments to provide in the Nation's Capital a National Conservatory of Music, 1891, a School of Arts, 1860, and an American National Theater and Academy, 1935.

A letter in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of April 24, 1960, written by Dr. Frederick Fall, director, Washington Civil Opera Association, and the Washington Civic Orchestra declares:

> Progress should not exclude the saving of national treasures. Little official realization is being given to historic preservation by governmental Washington. A building is as important to save as a rare book or a manuscript of a symphony. The older cultures of Europe know this—as do millions of Americans. In fact everyone knows it but a few isolated bureaucrats in the Federal Government. * * * This is important for our Government officials to keep in mind at this time when the U.S.S.R. is spending millions to depict Americans as cultureless barbarians.

A telegram which has just reached my desk puts the importance of saving the historic buildings on Lafayette Square in these significant terms:

> We respectfully request early hearings before Public Works Committees on S. 3279, S. 3280, and S. 3403 introduced by Senators MORSE, KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, HENNINGS, GRUENING, and DOUGLAS to save historic Lafayette Square buildings including Lafayette Square Opera House, badly needed as a national home for the Performing Arts. Lafayette Square buildings among most historic in city. The old opera house is easily restorable, and, while the United States spends millions to restore opera houses abroad, it should take action to do at least a little for opera and other performing arts in our Nation's Capital.
>
> Carl Levin and O. Roy Chalk, Cochairmen, Citizens Committee for Opera; Robert Richman, President, Institute of Contemporary Arts; Virginia Hansford Russell, National Wildlife Federation and District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs; Hobert Spalding, President, Opera Society of Washington.

Senator KENNEDY (S. 3280), Senator HUMPHREY (S. 3403), and Senator MORSE (S. 3279), for himself and Senators HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and DOUGLAS, have introduced bills to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square. Related bills have been introduced by Senators MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and DOUGLAS, and by my able colleague from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] and myself in this House.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER has written a fine letter, which I would like to include at this point in my remarks, saying it is a "shame to destroy Lafayette Square."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
April 25, 1960.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Old House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your recent message, cosigned by Congressman MCDOWELL, urging that early hearings be held on S. 3280 and S. 3279, which would preserve the Dolly Madison House and other historical buildings on the east side of Lafayette Square.

I, too, am interested in this subject, and I think it is a shame to destroy Lafayette Square. As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I have asked the chairman for an opportunity to speak on this legislation before action on it is taken by the committee.

I appreciate knowing of your interest in this subject.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

There are, to my mind, some very serious doubts as to whether the location of the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, on Lafayette Square is really the bargain to the Federal Government which its proponents would have us believe.

In the first place, the Federal Government paid $400,000 for the Belasco Theater and approximately $1 million for the buildings which comprised the Cosmos Club which included the Dolly Madison House and the Benjamin Tayloe House, which would be destroyed.

Now, I have been advised by the distinguished chief judge of the U.S. Tax Court, J. E. Murdock, as recently as April 13, 1960, that the General Services Administration has been endeavoring for over 6 years to provide a courthouse at some appropriate place to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Tax Court of the United States.

The Tax Court believes that such a building, housing all three courts, as proposed in several of the bills in the Senate which are before the Senate Public Works Committee, would be the most economical and efficient solution to the problem of housing these three courts.

The very interesting question now presents itself, if the administration proposal to provide a building for only two of the courts seeking office space is accepted by the Congress, will we shortly be faced with a request by the General Services next year to provide space for the U.S. Tax Court?

I include as part of my remarks the extremely important letter I have received from Chief Judge J. E. Murdock which should be carefully studied by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1960.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The Tax Court of the United States is much interested in H.R. 11691 introduced by you and would like to be included therein along with the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The General Services Administration has been endeavoring for over 6 years to provide a courthouse at some appropriate place to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States. The Tax Court believes that such a building would be the most economical and efficient solution to the problem of housing these three courts. It has cooperated at all times with the General Services Administration in an effort to obtain such a building.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has cooperated until recently on this project. The Court of Claims, however, has always resisted being included in such a building and has endeavored to obtain a building for itself alone.

S. 3279 and S. 3280 introduced in the Senate on March 24, 1960, would provide for the building of adequate facilities to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States. I have read that Senator CHAVEZ called off the hearings on S. 3279 and S. 3280 as the result of the agreement of the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to be housed in a building to be constructed for them on the site of the Dolly Madison House on Lafayette Square. This would leave the Tax Court without housing facilities.

Both the Tax Court and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals are presently housed in the Internal Revenue Building. The General Services Administration and the Internal Revenue Service want the two courts out of that building because the space is needed for the Internal Revenue Service. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is a party respondent to every tax case coming before the Tax Court, and the independence of the court would be more apparent if it were not housed in the same building with one of its litigants, and particularly in a building named the Internal Revenue Building. The Tax Court has occupied a good part of the second floor of the Internal Revenue Building ever since it was built. It needs a little more space than it presently occupies, which is about 60,000 square feet in all.

I hope that you will see fit to amend your bill to include the Tax Court along with the other two courts, all of which need housing in this city. I would be pleased to discuss this subject with you.

Very truly yours,

J. E. MURDOCK,
Chief Judge.

The Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel which contains much food for serious thought with respect to our Reserve program:

Every physically fit young man in the United States today, as too many persons do not know, must serve actively in the armed services from 6 months up to 2 years or longer, and then must serve in the Active Reserve 1 night a week and attend a 2 weeks' reservist camp for from 2 years up to 5 years.

This is not a voluntary deal, but a compulsory one, and unfortunately in the case of many young Americans is a great financial hardship on them, in addition to being a factor that works against them from the standpoint of civilian employment.

Most employers allow the reservists to have a leave of absence without pay to attend these compulsory summer Reserve camps, which means that many young married men with families have to try to support themselves and their families during this Reserve period on what amounts to a mere pittance. They become financial hardship cases in many instances. It is an inconvenience from the standpoint of an employer offering the standard 2-week vacation.

NO VACATION FOR YEARS

If the employee takes his 2-week vacation and the 2 weeks for Reserve camp, he is off the job for 4 weeks. So many employers require the employee to take his vacation and Reserve activity together. This means that for 2 to 5 years, a lot of young Americans, needing vacations and wanting them, won't get them.

So what happens? Many young men with compulsory military service hanging over their heads are disfavored as prospective employees before they are drafted, and after they have served out their hitches, they are still suffering a disadvantage as a prospective employee for 2 to 5 years.

In addition to all this being a heavy lien on the personal liberty of hundreds of thousands of young Americans each year during a time of peace, when most of our allies are not conscripting soldiers, it also represents a questionable expenditure of taxpayer money in billions of dollars.

The only reason why there hasn't been a nationwide objection to the hold which the military has over the country is that quirk in human nature, which leads so many exservicemen to say, "I was opposed to it, but I had to go through it, so why shouldn't everyone?" It's like a man falsely arrested and thrown into jail saying, "I was the victim of an injustice, so why shouldn't everyone be the victim of a similar injustice."

RESERVISTS CAN'T COMPLAIN

It's a great thing to be a civilian in an age when millions of Americans either because of active duty or Active Reserve status are in no position to complain about anything, lest they receive punishment in one form or another for complaining.

If you were to poll all the reservists up and down the country to try getting an answer to the question, "Is the good obtained worth the cost?" you wouldn't get an honest answer, because there is fear abroad. There is fear of recrimination from the military which indeed can be rough.

It is frightening to realize that we have in the country today a system of peacetime military conscription of the sort which prompted many of our ancestors to leave Europe and come here, but which Europe today doesn't have.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the beginning of the tragedy of the Armenian people in Turkey during the First World War.

Forty-five years ago, while most of the world was in the throes of that destructive war, the Turkish Government began its work of massacring the Armenians. This was so carefully and secretly organized that the existence of such a plan became clear only on April 24 when leading Armenians in all walks of public life were suddenly arrested and sent in small batches to places for execution. Once these leaders were put out of the way, the extermination of the entire Armenian population in the country was relatively easy. During the succeeding several months more than 600,-

000 Armenians were put to death, and almost as many more saved their lives by escaping to neighboring countries.

That act of the Ottoman Turks, in their attempt to uproot the Armenians, was an act of genocide that almost succeeded, and which has been universally condemned by the civilized peoples. Today we pay tribute to the memory of the victims of that crime, the Armenian martyrs of World War I.

Cleveland International Program Welcomes 83 Foreign Youth Leaders and Social Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, again this year the city of Cleveland has opened its doors to 83 foreign guests for 4 months of study and work in the United States. These visitors are here under the auspices of the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, a voluntary enterprise undertaken by the citizens of Cleveland to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and foreign countries.

Now in its fifth year, the program has gradually expanded from 25 West German youth in 1956 to 70 participants from 17 countries in 1959. This year young people from 18 countries will have opportunity to attend classes at Western Reserve University, live in private American homes, and serve as camp counselors or group workers in social agencies, community centers, and children's camps throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, as this unusual program should be of wide interest, I include the Department of State press release on the program at this point in the RECORD:

CITY OF CLEVELAND TO WELCOME FOREIGN YOUTH LEADERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS UNDER ANNUAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The city of Cleveland will welcome 83 foreign guests on April 21 to begin the 5th consecutive year of the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers.

Representing 18 countries in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and south Asia, the visiting youth leaders and social workers will spend 4 months of study and work in the United States. The Cleveland international program is a voluntary citizens' enterprise devoted to the promotion of mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries.

The citizens of Cleveland have made financial contributions to support their program and have volunteered free hospitality, room, and board for the participants during their stay in Cleveland. The Department of State is cooperating in the program by providing for the international travel for most of the participants as well as tuition for a special 6-week course at Western Reserve University.

The visitors will spend the first 6 weeks attending classes at the School of Applied Social Sciences at Western Reserve University. The lectures will be designed to give the visitors an introduction into the dynamics of American group work with special emphasis on the diversity of cultural factors.

While attending school in Cleveland, each visitor will live in three different private homes. The host families will represent a cross section of the different social, racial, and religious groups of the United States.

After their 6 weeks of study, the youth leaders and social workers will disperse to different cities of the United States to work as camp counselors or group workers in social agencies, community centers, and children's camps. These assignments are designed to provide the visitors with close personal and professional contacts with American college students, youth leaders, and social workers, and to give them working experiences in group leadership with American children and adults.

At the end of August, the group will be reunited in Washington, D.C., at the invitation of the State Department for 2 days of discussions of their experiences and visits to Federal agencies prior to their return home.

The Cleveland international program began in 1956 with 25 visiting youth leaders from West Germany. The program has expanded since then, and in 1959 included 70 participants from 17 countries. The 18 countries represented this year are: Argentina, 2; Austria, 3; Denmark, 4; Finland, 6; France, 8; Germany, 21; Greece, 3; India, 4; Israel, 2; Italy, 3; Lebanon, 2; Mexico, 2; Netherlands, 7; Norway, 3; Sweden, 8; Syria, 2; Turkey, 2; Yugoslavia, 1.

For the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the field of health care for the elderly much heat has been generated and much confusion has been created in recent weeks.

I feel, however, that the welfare of our elder citizens is too important to allow this discussion to degenerate into an exchange of epithet and catchwords.

A recent editorial from the Waterbury Republican—Waterbury, Conn., April 17, 1960—has come as a welcome, calm, and measured contribution to the serious discussion of this vital problem and for the instruction of Members of the House I am happy to append the editorial herewith:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Apr. 17, 1960]

FOR THE ELDERLY

"We note straws in what seems on the way to becoming a prevailing wind."

There is a lot of current political advocacy of the Forand bill or something like it to ease the lot of the ailing elderly. This is belated, but we daresay appreciated, concern for an age group that could use a little more consideration than it has been getting.

Laments over inflation, for instance, in all the run it has had of recent years, have always mentioned in terms of condolence those trying to stretch a fixed income over today's high prices. That means, of course, primarily, the elderly. Steadily more rigid retirement rules at one end of their age bracket and medicine's wonders in prolonging life at the other have been adding to the number of pensioners and those living off investments. The extent to which, in modern society, we are at last beginning to think in terms of doing something besides talk about senior citizens' plight is because politicians have finally discovered that the neglected elders add up to a substantial segment of the population—all with votes.

So Congress is stirring in their behalf, and presidential hopefuls are falling over each other to show their concern. In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Bill Mauldin recently satirized this trend by showing in a cartoon several of the leading candidates lined up at respectful Boy Scout salute vying for the honor of escorting the aged female voter across the street, and this was indeed an apt commentary on this present solicitude.

The man or woman over 60, or 65, is particularly at the mercy of the price squeeze and, as recognized by the Forand bill, is also at the age when he stands more in need than his juniors of protection against impoverishment through catastrophic illness. He has deserved our concern for longer than the late awakening politicos have been willing to give it to him.

Specific proposals to do anything for the elderly conjures up unhappy memories of Townsendism and other ill-conceived grabs at the National Treasury, but in terms of simple justice instead of impractical sentiment their case is a persuasive one. On the basis of current political interest some recognition of their plight would seem to be rather plainly in the cards.

Marshall University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great training grounds for leadership in the State of West Virginia and the Nation is Marshall College at Huntington, W. Va. This outstanding mid-Ohio Valley educational center now fully deserves to enjoy a graduation of its own and become Marshall University in name as well as in fact.

Over a century and a quarter ago, Marshall College was established in 1837. Since 1930 the size of her student body enrollment has leaped from 1,059 to 4,035. More than 14,000 fully accredited degrees have been awarded to a growing army of alumni. And the college now offers more than 30 major fields of study within 3 separate colleges.

Marshall College's distinguished president, Dr. Stewart H. Smith, recently told the West Virginia State Board of Education that "Marshall College will be formally accorded university status is inevitable. The college has reached a degree of complexity and educational stature that clearly places it in the category with such institutions as Western Michigan, Bowling Green, Northern Illinois, and many other smaller universities. Unbiased observers of the progress of higher education in West Virginia will be quick to recognize that it is only through the formal designation of Marshall as a university that the institution can, through intelligent planning and orderly

development, occupy its necessarily vital role in the future of higher education in our State."

In 1957, a report made by Dr. Earl W. Anderson, chairman of the Department of Education at Ohio State University, and Dr. C. W. Kreger, provost of Miami University, recommended university status for Marshall College.

The Anderson-Kreger report stated:

It is almost certain that increases in enrollments and new demands on the part of students, prospective students, business, industry and government will necessitate changes in the administrative organization of the college. In the future there may be created such new divisions as a college of commerce, a college of applied science and greatly expanded graduate and undergraduate offerings both on and off the campus. Marshall College has now reached a degree of complexity and educational eminence that takes it out of the "college" class as an institution of higher education.

In view of this fact and in view of the impending growth which simply cannot be averted or ignored, it is strongly recommended that the West Virginia Board of Education give immediate and serious consideration to changing the institutional designation of Marshall from "college" status to "university" status by changing the name to Marshall State University.

The projected enrollment figures for Marshall show 5,500 by 1965, 7,600 by 1970 and 12,000 by 1980.

Three colleges already exist at Marshall: the Teachers College, College of Arts and Sciences, and Graduate School. Under a proposal by President Smith, a fourth college will be the College of Applied Science.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to include an able editorial from the Parthenon, Marshall College student newspaper, dated December 15, 1959:

A PLEA FOR UNIVERSITY STATUS

More than 100 years of service to the State of West Virginia.

More than 14,000 fully accredited degrees awarded to a growing army of alumni.

More than 30 major fields of study within 3 colleges—Teachers' College, College of Arts and Sciences, and Graduate School.

In 20 years Marshall College's enrollment has more than doubled; a greater increase is expected in the next two decades.

These and other reasons have forced President Stewart H. Smith to ask recognition and designation of the college as "Marshall State University."

It is a multipurpose institution. It deserves the honor that the State of West Virginia can bestow upon it.

"Too small," some special-interest groups may cry out.

But the facts are otherwise. More than 100 universities in the United States show enrollments less than Marshall's.

But why can't it be satisfied with being a good college?

Out-of-State educators, who certainly can't be accused of prejudice, came to Marshall several years ago, studied a complex of educational programs, and concluded: "Marshall College has now reached a degree of complexity and educational eminence that clearly takes it out of the 'college' class. It is strongly recommended that the West Virginia Board of Education give immediate and serious consideration to changing the institutional designation from 'college' to 'university' status."

This occurred 2 years ago. The need has grown ever greater since then.

Dr. Smith summed it up well in his recommendation:

"Unbiased observers of the progress of higher education in West Virginia will be quick to recognize that it is only through the formal designation of Marshall as a university that the institution can, through intelligent planning and orderly development, occupy its necessarily vital role in the future of higher education in our State."

And, remember, changing the name of Marshall does not change the price tag on the cost of education. Even if Marshall is denied university status, reorganization is necessary and growth is a certainty.

The Parthenon believes that the 4,000 students and thousands of alumni in West Virginia join with President Smith in asking university status. We believe that many residents in the southern part of the State share our dream.

We beseech our State legislators, grant us this honor.

We feel, as do outstanding educators, that it is inevitable—that it is a necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be in the best interest of education generally if university status could be granted to Marshall. I certainly shall do my best to work for this goal.

The United States Helps Communism in South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, recently persons in high places in the U.S. Government hav apparently felt the necessity to make statements relative to the conduct of the internal affairs of foreign governments. Much has been written and too much has been said by U.S. officials concerning those matters.

In my opinion affairs of other governments are internal matters in which the governments themselves are concerned and it is improper to say the least for officials of the U.S. Government to inject their views and their opinions. This is especially true in regard to strictly internal affairs of foreign governments.

There appeared in an April 19, 1960, issue of the Thomaston (Ga.) Free Press an editorial entitled "The United States Helps Communism in South Africa." This editorial succinctly sets forth information and facts which explain some of the difficulties being experienced by the Government of the Union of South Africa, and gives reasons for certain action which has been taken by the South African Government in its efforts to maintain order and prevent the agitation, turmoil, and strife which have been so prevalent. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of that editorial:

[From the Thomaston (Ga.) Free Press, Apr. 19, 1960]

THE UNITED STATES HELPS COMMUNISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

The racial strife in South Africa has been so coupled with the attitude taken by national news media in this country toward racial strife here that a distorted view has been given the public on the South African's trouble.

Last week the South African Government made an official statement about the passes which stirred up the trouble in South Africa and also gave facts to reveal clearly that the Communists are helping stir up that country's trouble.

What disturbs us is the fact that the radio and TV commentators, anxious to get the following of Negroes in this country by sympathizing with Negroes in South Africa, are actually aiding and abetting the cause of communism there.

See what the officials of South Africa have to say, as quoted in U.S. News & World Report, and draw your own conclusion:

Native tribesmen and white agitators, some of them Communists, have been stirring up discontent over certain legal provisions—among them the reference-book system (passes)—for some time.

Theoretical humanitarians at home and abroad, and also Communist media seeking sensation, overemphasized the incidents in order to create the impression that there was general discontent among nonwhites; these people became instruments in the spread of communism.

Two tribal organizations in South Africa fighting for favor have been using the demonstrations to further their own cause.

The result of this agitation was that the tribesmen got out of hand and attacked the police. The basic purpose of both tribal organizations is to achieve the fall of the Government and the recent demonstrations must be regarded as single steps in that direction.

The agitators threatened the tribesmen with murder, assault, and arson if their reference (pass) books were not destroyed or left at home. There was violence against nonstriking Negroes by the agitators.

To maintain law and order, the police were obligated to take action. Such action was necessary to reassure orderly and peace-loving tribesmen who were in the majority and who could not otherwise be protected from intimidation.

The situation, according to South Africa's Government, is under control now.

But in the case of the pass books, here's the truth of the matter: The pass book system was instituted in its present form in 1950. Apart from personal details—for example, name, date of birth, photograph, etc.—the pass book contains information concerning influx control, employment, and tax payment.

The intention behind the pass books was to simplify matters for the Negroes as greatly as possible, to do away with the need for carrying on his person a number of documents which very often become mutilated or stolen as he moves from place to place, as often happens. Now all relevant details are conveniently noted in the handy and durable pass book. White citizens of Africa may also be required to produce documents such as birth certificates, tax receipts, etc., but since they are more settled they are better able to hold such documents in safekeeping.

Pass books for the Negroes contains indentification useful in identifying a pensioner or the holder of a post office savings-bank account. It also is a permit to reside in a specific urban area and this is intended to protect urban Negroes and their children against uncontrolled influx of workers from rural and tribal territories. It also serves as a service contract and insures just and equitable treatment for Negro workers.

The much-maligned pass book system, in fact, serves the interest of the Negroes themselves.

These facts help to point up our interference, though unofficially, in South Africa's current trouble while we have not, in the past, had the true facts of the matter.

Extending Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written at this time on the subject of providing health insurance for the aged. There are many opinions, both pro and con, as to the necessity of this Congress to provide the means to establish health benefits for the aged, through the social security system.

In this respect, I would like to call to the attention of this Congress a statement which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, April 22, 1960, with respect to the voluntary system of health insurance for the aged.

The statement to which I refer is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1960]

EXTENDING SOCIAL SECURITY—PROVISION OF HEALTH BENEFITS FOR AGED IS FAVORED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Exactly 25 years ago, on April 20, 1935, the House of Representatives passed the bill which later that year became the Social Security Act. When that law's constitutionality was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice Cardozo declared:

"The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when journey's end is near."

The hope so eloquently expressed by Cardozo has been largely fulfilled. Social security payments are not munificent; rising prices have outrun increased benefits. There are still unmet needs, like medical care. But basically the social security system has brought both security and dignity to our retired workers in their twilight years. Can there be any question that America is a better America because of the wisdom and the foresight of the Congress 25 years ago?

It seems almost incredible to reread some of the arguments raised against the proposed law in 1935. An Ohio businessman told the Senate Finance Committee that the bill "will permanently weaken the fiber of the American people" and "the downfall of Rome started with corn laws, and legislation of that type."

OPPOSITION TO EXPANSION

Even more incredible, however, is the fact that similar arguments are being used today to defeat a natural, necessary extension of the social security program to provide health benefits for our older citizens. Again it is attacked as socialization, as vast governmental bureaucracy, as compulsion, as regimentation.

To meet these charges a number of Republican Senators, including those from New York, have introduced a so-called voluntary system of health insurance for the aged. Laudable though their objectives may be, their plan cannot do what social insurance can do. It would require Federal appropriations, from general revenues, of half a billion dollars, even greater appropriations from the States and substantial payments directly from beneficiaries except for those meeting stringent income tests. Use of private insurance carriers would mean draining off large amounts from potential benefits.

On this anniversary of the social security system it is appropriate to point out that only social insurance can really effectively meet such needs as health care for the elderly. Only through lifetime contributions by all the people can the risk be properly distributed.

Experience with retirement benefits under social security should allay all fears that a compulsory system means the end of our economic system, of the insurance industry, or of our democratic way of life. Social insurance has strengthened all of these, rather than the reverse.

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER,
Legislative Representative, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Bills To Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MORRIS, of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States bills identical to H.R. 8841 by Congressman STEED, of Oklahoma, and H.R. 10235 by Congressman PATMAN, of Texas. These bills would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The objectives of these bills are to provide assistance to small business in its struggle to overcome unfair trade practices in industry and commerce.

The hearings, which have been conducted by the House Small Business Committee's Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, have made it clear that the practice of selling dairy products at unreasonably low prices and frequently as "loss leaders" far below the level of cost, is widespread. Only a few days ago, it was reported that a large concern was selling milk in Florida at 1 cent per half gallon. Other instances have been brought to the attention of Members of Congress where milk has been retailing at less than one-quarter of the cost of producing the product. Small business concerns are much alarmed about this practice and its effect toward eliminating them and creating monopolies in this great industry. Many States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. Courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. Therefore, the need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent. It is believed that H.R. 10235 will fill this need, and, as I have stated, today I have introduced a companion bill identical to H.R. 10235.

Also, it is apparent that there is need for legislation which would provide small businessmen with immediate, effective relief from these destructive practices. H.R. 10235 will strengthen the substantive law to provide relief, but it leaves untouched the procedural law. Small businessmen need immediate, injunctive relief from these destructive practices. Therefore, one of the bills I have introduced today is identical with the provisions of H.R. 8841. It would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders while the issues under its complaint are being litigated. In this way, many small business concerns could be saved during the prolonged litigation of cases which involve sales at prices below cost.

I feel deeply that this legislation, or at least something along this line, is badly needed.

Alfred Kohlberg: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Alfred Kohlberg was a friend of mine. He was an able and wise counselor to those of us who have been engaged as members of the Un-American Activities Committee in investigating the machinations of the Communist apparatus in the United States so that we might recommend legislation to the Congress to deal with the threats to our internal security.

Alfred Kohlberg died the other day. I would like to eulogize this great American. However, Forrest Davis, the extremely capable columnist of the Cincinnati Enquirer, and George Sokolsky, who knew Alfred Kohlberg much longer and better than I, have in recent columns written about him. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD what Forrest Davis and George Sokolsky have said about Alfred Kohlberg on his passing:

A MERCHANT WHO BEGAN A CRUSADE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Alfred Kohlberg was an American merchant who traded with Nationalist China. His specialty was textiles. He joined the Institute of Pacific Relations and found therein something which contradicted his experience.

He thereupon set out to investigate the Institute of Pacific Relations not knowing especially what he would find. This one event set off a whole series of congressional investigations.

Kohlberg had stumbled on a truth, which rarely happens to any of us. He found that many private organizations with high-sounding names and headed by distinguished men, were infiltrated by Communists, on the administrative level, who formed each organization's policies and determined its goals. Kohlberg took up the fight and never stopped until he died last week.

Naturally Kohlberg was called many ugly names. These he accepted as labels of distinction, but the one that pleased him most was "China Lobby." He proclaimed himself to be the "China Lobby," and challenged all and sundry to investigate him.

A man of means and integrity, he would not have accepted a cent from Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tse-tung or anyone else to support his opinions. He was a man of strong convictions with enough cash on hand to back them up.

He was really not so much a doctrinaire anti-Communist as he was pro-American. He did not split the fine hairs of definitions; it was sufficient for him that he had wit-

neesed what the Communists did to China and he did not want them to do the same to the United States.

A Jew, he organized the American Jewish League Against Communism. He expected the entire Jewish people to rally to his organization. They did not.

This disappointed Kohlberg but until the moment he died, he continued to finance various organizations and groups in the battle against Soviet Russia. He retired from his business, but he never retired from the cause which he had made his. He was a little David fighting a world of Goliaths and he fought well.

Where does the moral strength come from which transforms a merchant into a battling leader of men in a cause to which many devote their lives?

Kohlberg reminded one of the prophets of old, the men who feared not the mighty, who rejected power, who never considered themselves. No great orator, no powerful writer, no organizer of movements, a man with a delightful sense of humor, whose wit led him into many arid fields, Kohlberg, with a profound sense of justice, developed an enormous and significant following of men and women.

He knew no divided loyalties. The United States was his country; he rejected affinity with any other. If he labored for Nationalist China, it was because he believed that was best for the United States.

And now Alfred Kohlberg is dead. But what Kohlberg started will never die. It caught the fancy of many younger men and women that truth is not a fallacy and courage is not a sin.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Apr. 15, 1960]

ALFRED KOHLBERG AND THE "CHINA LOBBY"

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—As it happened, Alfred Kohlberg's death the other evening at 73, while playing cards in his New York apartment, coincided with a minor public stir over a forthcoming book entitled "The China Lobby in American Politics." The coincidence is pat, because Alfred Kohlberg was substantially from 1944 until his death the moving spirit among those Americans who, viewing the loss of the friendly, allied Republic of China to a Communist imperium thenceforth, stretching unbrokenly across Eurasia from the Baltic to the South China Sea as a catastrophic event, accused certain individuals in Government and out of complicity.

A small, erect, rounded man with a smooth, somewhat cherubic face, and head bald as an egg, Mr. Kohlberg never denied the impeachment first brought against his activities by the New York State Communist Party. Indeed, he once pleaded guilty in a sardonic article written for the French journal of opinion, East and West, under the title, "I Am the China Lobby."

Mr. Kohlberg died on April 8. The book, wherein he figured, was withdrawn from circulation for revision by its publisher, Macmillan, according to public announcement of April 5. The reason for revision was plain. In his preface the author, Prof. Ross Y. Koen, of Humboldt State College, Arcata, Calif., uttered a rather startling slander against the Republic of China on Formosa and, by implication, a number of eminent Americans.

Dr. Koen charged the free Chinese Government of smuggling dope into the United States. I quote from an unrevised copy of the book as distributed to a bookseller:

"Few of the intricate financial dealings, the political contributions or payoffs, or the more intimate personal relations between the various participants (in the 'China Lobby') have been detailed here. The reason is the simple one that the details are either not available or cannot be sufficiently substantiated.

"There is, for example, considerable evidence that a number of Chinese officials have engaged in the illegal smuggling of narcotics into the United States with the full knowledge and connivance of the Chinese Nationalist Government. The evidence indicates that several prominent Americans have participated in these transactions. It indicates further that the narcotics business has been an important factor in the activities and permutations of the China Lobby."

What does this scurrilous language convey to the ordinary layman? First, that those later identified as members of the "China lobby" had been pursuing activities of the utmost nefariousness; secondly, that some or all of those identified had profited from running dope; and thirdly, that the "China lobby" itself had been financed by such profits.

Upon reading this baseless and infamous accusation, unreferred to in the body of Dr. Koen's improbable and polemical work, the Republic of China protested to the publisher with the utmost vigor. The principal figures among the identified members of the lobby conferred with their lawyers. Macmillan faced numerous libel actions.

The enormity of these charges, only matched in irresponsibility by the author's unfailing espousal of the Red Chinese cause and its American apologists, is readily apparent from a partial reading of those identified. They include: Henry and Clare Boothe Luce, the Reverend Msgr. G. Barry O'Toole, former rector of the Catholic University of Peiping; Roscoe Pound, retired dean of the Harvard Law School; the Reverend William R. Johnson, a former missionary to China; Dr. George A. Fitch, a onetime YMCA executive in China and his writer-wife, Geraldine; George Creel, Frederick C. McKee, a Pittsburgh industrialist and philanthropist; David Dubinsky, Gen. William J. Donovan, Methodist Bishop Herbert Welch, Charles A. Edison, former Governor of New Jersey and Secretary of the Navy; Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Adms. Charles M. Cooke, Jr., and Oscar C. Badger, a score of Members of Congress and many other names which space prohibits listing.

These were among the prominent Americans linked by inference to a wholly nonexistent narcotics traffic. Parenthetically, no opium is grown on Formosa. Red China, a principal source of the illegal narcotics trade, contemptuously refuses cooperation with the International Police (Interpol).

As for Alfred Kohlberg, the obituaries failed to do him justice. A lone citizen, he launched a movement that helped awaken his country to its peril from a Communist China. He had no private ax to grind. That I happen to know and, if challenged, can submit evidence. The Koen canard was not a new experience to him.

A Commendable Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in our concern with great issues and massive problems we sometimes neglect to take note of individual examples of courage and dedication to duty which many of our citizens display in the daily course of events. Worthy of attention is such an achievement by a member of the police force of Nutley, N.J., whose constituents I am proud to represent. I point with pride to the recent actions of Sgt. William Dietz, whose alert thinking saved the life of 15-year-old Gloria Klima on April 16. The incident is described in the following editorial in the Nutley Sun:

A FRIEND IN NEED

A 15-year-old girl, Gloria Klima, of 114 Park Avenue, collapsed suddenly as she was crossing the street last Saturday. Recently promoted Sgt. William Dietz and Patrolman Alfred Ciccone responded to the S O S.

Use of oxygen, and then mouth-to-mouth breathing failed to revive Gloria. Sergeant Dietz finally resorted to regular artificial respiration which successfully restored the victim's breathing.

Through the thoughtful and alert actions of Sergeant Dietz, a life was saved. We congratulate Sergeant Dietz for his singular achievement. It gives one a comfortable feeling to know that, should trouble visit our home, our men in blue are ever ready and able to help.

Under the able leadership of Mayor Harry W. Chenoweth, director of public safety, Nutley has developed a very fine and dedicated police and fire department of which we can all be proud.

So, if there are a few among us who sometimes wonder what we receive for our tax dollar, remember Gloria Klima. This time it was the girl next door—tomorrow it could happen to you.

Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, April 24, 1960, I had the privilege of reviewing the Americanization Day parade and of participating in the speaking program sponsored by Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Jersey City, N.J., in my congressional district, and I was much impressed by the address made to the gathering by my distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech of Congressman VAN ZANDT, as I believe my colleagues will find it most inspirational:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT AMERICANIZATION DAY PROGRAM SPONSORED BY POST NO. 132, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 24, 1960

I am greatly honored to have the privilege of representing here today Comander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who is on a world tour as part of our Government's people-to-people program designed to spread international good will. Not alone do I want to bring you greetings from Commander in Chief Feldmann, but also I wish to express his regret in being unable to take part in this program in person.

In asking me to participate in the 29th annual Americanization Day program in his

behalf, Commander Feldmann has made it possible for me to recall with much pleasure my appearance here in the early 1930's when it was my honor to serve the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as commander in chief. By going back to the early 1930's one recognizes that this Americanization Day program at that time was in its infancy for it was only 3 years of age. Back in those days the Communists had taken over May 1 and were staging annual May Day demonstrations in such prominent places as Journal Square here in Jersey City, Union Square in New York City, Rayburn Plaza in Philadelphia, the Commons in Boston, Pershing Square in Los Angeles, and the Plaza in San Francisco. As a matter of fact throughout the Nation communities large and small were confronted with similar Communist demonstrations on May 1.

Speaking frankly, the Reds had the gall of an army mule as they exhibited their ideology by parades and demonstrations. As many of you know, the centers of American towns and cities known as citadels of patriotism were converted on Red May Day into forums of un-American demonstrations.

Typical of America's war veterans and especially the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132, of Jersey City, decided to challenge the Communists through a counter demonstration in which they portrayed the ideals of the American way of life. Thus 29 years ago or in 1931 here in Jersey City this Americanization Day program was conceived by a group of patriotic red-blooded Americans. The members of the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended for accepting the Red challenge 29 years ago and for observing this program in each succeeding year. In fact, these annual programs were not only the forerunners of other communities accepting the Red challenge but served as the inspiration for the Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide observance of Loyalty Day, May 1. Therefore, I am happy to be back again in Pershing Field in the Garden State of America to assist the membership of Post No. 132 and the citizens of Jersey City in the great effort to focus attention on the ideals that are part and parcel of our American way of life.

Each year my legislative duties, my travels, my discussions with Veterans of Foreign Wars' members, and my attendance at numerous Veterans of Foreign Wars' meetings and conventions, make me more cognizant of the value of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to all America. I need not tell you the VFW is very important to me. My service as your commander in chief brought me great insight and blessed me with lasting associations. Legislation, rehabilitation, youth activities, increased membership, publication of the VFW magazine—to name a few—are of special interest to over a million veterans who are members of our organization. However, one vital phase of our program always impresses me as the "rock" upon which all else is built. That "rock" is Americanism.

The VFW is known and admired for the valor of its members in times of war. But in times of peace the VFW has pioneered in public service performed through patriotic leadership and civic activities. These activities reflect many facets of our American way of life. They deal with the individual and his ideals and his general well-being. Recently a past commander in chief had this to say—and I quote: "Americanism and community service is a double title but actually they mean just one thing—practical application of the VFW charter pledge to foster true patriotism, preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies and to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom." In this connection, the membership of VFW Post No. 132, Jersey City, has actively supported the brand of patriotism I have just quoted. In fact, the pattern of existence you have followed had its roots in history which dates back to the days when New Jersey was one of the leaders among the Thirteen Colonies which resisted the stamp duties and taxation imposed by the British Parliament.

New Jersey's representatives were active in the sessions of the Continental Congress which led up to the Revolutionary War. This province was a battleground for several of the most important battles of the War for Independence and carried its full share of the burdens of the war.

Some may ask why do I refer to the bloody and ancient days of the American Revolution? In addition they may ask, "Isn't the memberhsip of the Veterans of Foreign Wars the outcome of more recent and modern conflicts and isn't it our purpose to help bring some semblance of peace and security to our time?" We of the VFW can respond to those questions very quickly. We are constantly endeavoring to renew our faith in American ideals. We can appropriately turn to the old quotation which tells us that a man who has no regard for the past, has no concern for the future. We place a high priority on patriotism, Americanism, and the challenges facing all groups of citizens.

However, let us go one or two steps further with this theme. We know that no simple education in American history or in civics alone can defend an individual against anti-American ideals. In other words, no simple education in American history or in civics can defend an individual against the wiles of communism. Simply knowing how this country was developed and the dates the battles were fought, and that the Supreme Court and Congress and the President have different functions which check on each other, is not going to defend anybody. But knowing the whys behind our American institutions, knowing the meaningful version of American economic and political history—which must be taught primarily in schools—these things can first defend the individual and then defend the whole Nation.

A graphic illustration of what I am attempting to say is contained in the situation of the small boy who thinks everyone in the United States acquires a refrigerator, a washing machine, or a car simply by the process of living in the United States. What the small boy does not know is that the refrigerator, the washing machine, and the car must be paid for one way or another, either ready cash or the long process of a payment thereon for the next 36 months. But a lot of small children do not know that. They do not understand it at all. They think the whole system is a reflection of a new philosophy which says, "Get anything you want, get it right away, deny yourself nothing, discipline yourself not at all. Enjoy our wonderful materialistic comforts and rest secure; our country must be invulnerable because we have the best things."

I can summarize this philosophy by quoting a man who has had some thoughts about the subject. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., who was the Commandant of the Marine Corps at the time of the Korean war, made a comment which referred especially to Communist-captured Americans who were grilled unmercifully during captivity. General Shepherd said this: "In the struggle against communism, war is no longer over when men are forced to give up. The prisoner-of-war camp is only another kind of battlefield. For they must be taught years before to carry on with the only weapons remaining to them; namely, courage and faith, and a sense of personal responsibility."

Ladies and gentlemen, the need to further the cause of our Republic will not be solved by magic formula. The best approach lies in an awakening of the consciousness of the Nation and of the individual—and that means you and me. Frankly, there is a definite need for a sense of conviction and dedication to our principles which exceeds that shown our enemy.

As some of you know, I returned from a tour of Russia's atom-research centers in the latter part of 1957. That will soon be 3 years ago, but the views that I reiterated upon my return continue to be basic and vital to the prestige of the United States. Make no mistake about it, we must face up to Russia and recognize her ability to initiate and conduct worldwide propaganda.

During my visit to Moscow there was constant boasting about the Russian satellite, Sputnik I, which has been successfully launched October 4, 1957. The Soviets hammered at the point that the satellite was produced and launched by a Communist form of government. Furthermore, they asserted it was positive proof that Russia as a form of government excelled the United States. Mark you, Soviet science did not in 1957—and does not in 1960—operate on a 40-hour week. They work around the clock.

Ladies and gentlemen, our present concern with communism results primarily from the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union in the years since the close of World War II. The cold war between two giant powers, the United States and Russia, to control the future of the world creates a moral issue. As long as Americans are loyal, vigilant, and devoted, there is less danger of communism from within. We as a people must be willing to accept the responsibilities of leadership. In the cold war there is no quick or easy solution. Our loyalty demands that the United States should act positively to meet any Communist aggression; we must exploit Communist weaknesses; we must build relations of mutual respect with the rest of the world. Neither should be underestimate the resources of any potential enemy. Neither should we, my friends, underestimate the power of our loyalty to the United States. God forbid that we should ever underestimate the harvest we can reap—for the good of all mankind—if we reglect to practice loyalty ourselves, or teach it to the younger generation.

Ladies and gentlemen, our heritage of liberty and freedom has made Americans truly free. Therefore, let us resolve that as Americans we accept the challenge of communism by dedicating ourselves to that type of patriotism which has established for all Americans a nation of free men and women.

The Nutley Optimist Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding civic groups in Nutley, N.J. is the Nutley Optimist Club, whose record of achievement is well known throughout the community. One of its many worthwhile and civic minded programs is its child safety program, which aims at saving lives by educating parents and children alike. The many facets of this invaluable project are described in the following editorial from the Nutley Sun:

CHILD SAFETY IS UP TO YOU

The Nutley Optimist Club is busy conducting its fourth annual child safety program. This is an educational program for both parents and children and is aimed at saving lives.

Over 15,000 children die each year in this country as a result of accidents caused by motor vehicles, burns, falls, poisonings, drownings and firearms. At least five times that number will be permanently crippled. Near-tragic accidents requiring the services of a physician are a common occurrence in Nutley.

Our only hope is a program of protection and education beginning in the home by parents and continued through town by the safety-conscious cooperation of all citizens.

Total protection of the infant must be gradually replaced by the awareness of the child of the many dangers surrounding him and how to avoid and control them. This safety conditioning must coincide with the normal development of locomotion and interest in the environment.

Every accident must be followed by a teaching session. The child and parent must recognize the changing circumstances of the potential accident situation throughout the growing years, from the time the child creeps until he is old enough to drive his father's car.

The Optimist Club has been doing more than its share of trying to educate the public on child safety. One of its major projects is the poison control center maintained at police headquarters. Another is the bicycle safety program conducted throughout town. That is aimed at educating the youth of our town on the do's and don't's of bike riding. It is climaxed with a safety inspection and contest.

In order to support our town safety program every member of the community plays a role. The thoughtful druggist will point out that any drug is a potential poison. The hardware store owner will emphasize the need for safe storage of flammable solvents and insecticides away from children.

The teacher, physician and nurse engage in their own plan of safety education each day.

Let each of us assume the responsibility of teaching our children to learn to protect themselves not only this month, but every month of the year.

Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to a great American, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. During the campaign months to come, much will be said, and some of it critically, about our general progress in space. I, myself, have expressed concern, and will continue to so express it, over our failure to vigorously pursue our lead over the Russians during those critical years immediately preceding 1957. I am not convinced even today that public opinion has been sufficiently mobilized in support of our overall effort to regain unchallenged leadership in the field of space technology.

I should like to make it clear, however, beyond equivocation, that nothing that I have ever said, or shall say, is in any way intended to reflect upon the outstanding service rendered by Dr. Glennan. During his relatively brief tenure of office the space program has been given an impetus and direction which, from every point of view, is encouraging and praiseworthy. He has pursued his course with unassuming, but remarkable effectiveness. His patriotic motives have imparted a uniquely high quality to all of his actions, and have deepened the respect in which he is held, and the confidence which he enjoys, by all informed Members of the Congress of the United States.

I express my own admiration for his patience in the face of the most trying circumstances. I commend him for inaugurating a 10-year program of planning within his organization, which, apart from the merits of the plans themselves, constitutes a conspicuous contribution to our governmental modus operandi. Among the many features of the Russian system which have threatened our own supremacy, one of the most significant is their ability to plan well in advance, and to hold fast to good plans, once conceived.

Dr. Glennan has seen our own need for planning. We must sustain him in his effort to bring those plans to fruition.

I feel that it would be a mistake to restrict in any way his scope of authority, or to enact legislation which might serve to clog the administrative channels through which his directives have flowed with such effectiveness.

During the campaign months ahead it may well be that I shall be called upon to comment critically upon America's apathy toward our common danger, and about our paucity of leadership in certain vital areas. I am only too glad, however, to make my record clear that no words of mine should be construed as intending to reflect other than the highest confidence in Dr. Glennan. I shall give him my full support, and urge all Americans to do likewise.

Mrs. Carlotta C. Harrison, Civic and Community Leader of Cooperstown, N.Y., Is Honored for Her Fine Work for the Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, prepared by Mr. John Lennebecker of Cooperstown, N.Y., describing a recent ceremony in this village in the center of New York State and in the heart of my congressional district, honoring one of that community's civic leaders, Mrs. Carlotta C. Harrison, for her great work in behalf of the Civil Air Patrol. The Civil Air Patrol is a most important organization, not only for the part it plays in fostering an understanding and interest in aviation and air science on the part of our young people at a time when these skills are most essential to maintaining the kind of secure defense we need against communism as well as stimulating the progress of our national economy, but also for the part that it plays in encouraging our young men and women to devote their energies and time to worthwhile and valuable pursuits rather than yield to some of the temptations which idleness so readily seems to uncover these days. We in my district are very proud of the job that Mrs. Harrison has done in this great work, and I know the article about her recent award will be of great interest to all the Members of this body, and reads as follows:

COOPERSTOWN, N.Y., March 27, 1960.—Mrs. Francis F. Harrison, of Cooperstown, N.Y., was guest of honor at a special luncheon held at the headquarters of Cooperstown Composite Squadron, Civil Air Patrol in the Cooperstown Community House recently.

Presentation of a beautiful hand-embroidered U.S. crest and certificate of recognition was made to Mrs. Harrison by Maj. John DeWitt, U.S. Air Force liaison officer for the New York Wing, Civil Air Patrol. Major DeWitt commended Mrs. Harrison for her generous contributions to the Cooperstown squadron and also told of the mission of the Civil Air Patrol which is made a great deal easier through public-spirited citizens such as Mrs. Harrison. Major DeWitt also expressed the importance of CAP training to the youth of our country and also stated that the fine work of the cadets of the Cooperstown squadron was self-evident in the fine new headquarters made available by the guest of honor.

The whole project for the Cooperstown Composite Squadron had its inception just about 2 years ago. A few short months after the squadron received its charter, they were faced with the common problem of a meeting place and headquarters for its many activities. It was thought by the organizers that an ideal place would be one that provided classroom space, drill area, radio facilities, and administration rooms. Through the efforts of Mrs. Harrison the old Universalist Church in Cooperstown was secured with the idea of not only creating a home for the Cooperstown squadron but promoting community projects and a common meeting place.

The Cooperstown Community House, as it has come to be called, was of solid construction but the interior left a lot to be desired. With a true sense of responsibility the cadets of the squadron faced the long project with determination that was unending. Under the supervision of qualified personnel the cadets of the Cooperstown squadron did well over 90 percent of all the construction work that has made the community house what it is today. The old adage "Jack of all trades" very appropriately describes the work done by the cadet unit of the squadron. Each cadet had his opportunity to try his hand with electrical wiring, plumbing, heating, carpentry, and all other necessary phases of construction. In addition to the fine aviation program of the Civil Air Patrol, the cadets have also had the opportunity of expressing themselves with the many other educational and diversified skills that this project has created.

The cadets now look back upon this undertaking with a deep sense of pride and satisfaction that has materialized through self-

expression and working together. The Community House now has a new hard-oak floor on the second floor which serves as an excellent drill floor for the Cooperstown squadron. This area is also used by the local chapter of the American Red Cross for its bloodmobiles. The Red Cross also has its administration offices on the first floor. Two offices for rental purposes have also been constructed on the first floor and will be occupied in the near future. The radio room is the real pride and joy for the cadets. At present, plans are being formulated to coordinate Red Cross, civil defense, Civil Air Patrol, police, and fire activities through this location. In addition the building has a completely modern kitchen with the facilities to serve well over 150 persons at a banquet or formal dinner. Downstairs is a new modern communications center embodying a high-frequency transceiver, very-high-frequency transceiver, aircraft unicom, AM radio, tape recorder, and complete sound system for use within the Community House, as well as a code oscillator for use in teaching new communicators. Incidentally, all members of this squadron are qualified class III radio-telephone operators with CAP and civil defense.

Mrs. Harrison's presentation came as a result of her extreme generosity in making available the Community House as a place for the community to hold many functions, which were not possible before, and because the future profits of this venture are to be used to educate the youth of this area.

Cooperstown community was an idea born in the mind of Tecwyn O. Williams, its present manager, brought to fruition through the generosity of Mrs. Harrison, and made a reality through the efforts of the cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol. It has appreciably stemmed the tide of delinquency in those who have participated, and, because of the association with adult members of the community who are dedicated to youth activities, has made a fantastic change in the academic standings of the cadets who have participated in the work.

In addition to Mrs. Harrison's presentation three cadets were given recognition of having passed all the necessary requirements of the Civil Air Patrol certificate of proficiency and promoted to the grades indicated:

Cadet 1st Lt. Robert Sinniger, Otego, N.Y. (our squadron candidate for the Air Force jet orientation course for 1960, and an alternate to the Air Force Academy for 1960).

Cadet 2d Lt. Howard C. Sherman, Cooperstown, N.Y. (our squadron candidate for the international cadet exchange program for 1960).

Cadet 2d Lt. John W. Sanford III, Cooperstown, N.Y.

Each of these cadets has shown amazing aptitude in academic fields within and without Civil Air Patrol. In the short period of 2 years we have placed two alternates to the Air Force Academy from three who have taken the entrance examinations. The third is being given the opportunity for the Merchant Marine Academy and during 1960 we will have one additional cadet taking the entrance examination. He has already won a full New York State regents scholarship. In 1961 there will be an additional three who will compete for the Academy among those now enrolled as cadets in the squadron.

In addition to their actual school curriculum they have added many aviation and space-age subjects and the involvement in many and varied crafts. The result has been, almost without exception, an increase in their school marks, high scores in the examination material in aviation subjects, and an ever-improving manner in the handiwork they have undertaken.

To those who have been privileged to work with them has come a great satisfaction and a challenge to continue a job which is never done. As long as there are children who follow in the footsteps of those of whom we speak, there is an ever-present need of mature adult participation in their programs.

Salaries for Postal Employees Should Be Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal employees, and in particular postal employees, are complaining bitterly about the failure of the U.S. Government to keep their pay schedule on a par with the cost-of-living index. Postal employees are a dedicated group. They are men who have given up the chance of larger earnings for the security that goes with Federal employment. They cannot strike. They cannot even bargain collectively. They are at the mercy of a government that should be dedicated to fair and equitable treatment of its employees. The Government, however, is taking advantage of the employees and their inability to bargain collectively or to strike, and is failing to pay the postal workers a rate that is commensurate with similar employees in municipal and private employment.

Starting in 1952 the wage rates of policemen and firemen throughout the country have gone consistently upward. The increases for postal workers has failed to keep pace with increases to firemen and policemen, and today many a postal employee's family finds that the annual salary of the breadwinner of the family falls several hundred dollars short of paying the normal costs of supporting a family. This group was shocked to find that the President did not provide additional funds for a pay increase in his budget message, or ask for an increase in the state of the Union message. Instead, double talk was used and it was suggested that a study be made of Federal wage rates. It reminds one of Nero playing the fiddle while Rome burns. This callous disregard of the immediate needs of the postal employees for a fair and adequate raise in pay cannot be understood by the postal employees or their families, or justified by the Government. It appears that a fair and adequate wage rate is sacrificed to the desire of the administration for a surplus in the budget. We all want a surplus in the budget, but not at the expense of being unfair to postal employees or to other Federal employees. It has been said that we cannot afford an adequate military defense, that we cannot afford to keep even with Russia in the missile race, that we cannot afford the money necessary to protect the health of our people through initiation of an adequate water pollution program, that we cannot afford to spend money on public works to maintain our physical plant; such as preventing flood control on the rivers of Indiana where millions of dollars in damage is caused through floods every spring, that we cannot afford housing programs or the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money for slum clearance and for urban renewal. To the above must now be added that we cannot afford to pay our own postal employees a fair day of pay for a fair day of work.

We can, however, in the thinking of the administration, afford passage of the vault cash bill, to raise the interest rate for the benefit of the bankers at a cost to the Federal Government and private enterprise of approximately $40 billion a year. We can afford to spend approximately $4 billion a year on foreign aid.

Do you not think that our Nation can afford to treat its Federal employees and, in particular the postal employees, in a just manner insofar as their wages are concerned?

The Farmer Deserves Our Consideration and Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of the House and Senate, especially those concerned with agricultural problems, will be interested in reading a short editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital. It is captioned "Grassroots Editors See 1960 as a Good Farm Year":

Many informed persons believe we are doing the Nation's farmers a disservice when we continue to parrot gloomy views about the farm problem.

The current year is not shaping up as the best farmers have ever had, but neither is it likely to be a bad one. That is the consensus of leading farm editors in every section of the United States.

A survey of their opinion discloses general optimism and favorable prospects for a good farm income. Of particular interest here are the findings of our own farm press. The Kansas Farmer's editor, Ray Gilkeson, cites excellent soil moisture and prospective big wheat yields, and the generally superior outlook for all crops in Kansas. The actual livestock count shows an 11½ percent cut in sow numbers, which in turn seems to indicate a spring pig crop likely to be no larger than 1958, which was one of the most profitable hog years farmers have ever known.

Milk production, he says, is another bright spot. A slight cut in milk cow numbers is balanced by heavier per cow production which increases in about the same proportion as the population grows. Egg prices are expected to be better than last year, and beef cattle prices are likely to go up after midsummer marketing.

A farm editor in a neighboring State estimates that farm income for 1960 will be better than 1959, although not quite so high as in 1958. The heavy moisture, he feels, is assurance of a good grass crop, which is vital to the livestock industry.

These heartening opinions are echoed by the editors in all of the Midwestern States,

and serve to discount the calamity howlers who lack faith in the ability of the farmers to prosper under any but ideal conditions.

It is, of course, true that farm income has dropped some at the same time that farm costs have increased. But let's not sell the farmer short. Let's give him credit for the ability to weather some adversity.

Viewed as a part of the whole of our society, the farmer is far better off than some of us, and suffers little by comparison with anyone. He has a large investment in his farm, which is not likely to depreciate. He has more independence than any employee of business. He is well-fed, well-educated, well-clothed, well-informed, and engaged in a pursuit that is vital to the Nation.

He is deserving of consideration and understanding, but he is not facing any immediate economic debacle. To say otherwise is a slander upon his resourcefulness and industry.

Need for Reappointment of Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed some time ago when I heard unofficially that the White House was reportedly cold to the reappointment of Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole. Mr. Connole, a young and vigorous specialist in utility regulation, was appointed to the Commission in 1955 from West Hartford, Conn., in my district, and is due to complete his term this year.

I have been aware of Mr. Connole's able work as counsel to the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission, and I have followed his career in Washington with interest. I believe he has served the public well and he has carried out his duties with a dedicated sense of the national interest.

It is my understanding that the White House supposedly advised a Member of the other body in January that it was not intended that Mr. Connole's name would be submitted for reappointment. It has become known more widely in recent weeks, and a number of responsible organizations have spoken out in his behalf. I would like to submit for publication at the conclusion of these remarks an editorial from the New York Times of today which is a representative statement of the facts in his case.

I want to call attention in particular to this sentence from the editorial:

If the rumored appointments to Mr. Connole's seat and another Power Commission vacancy are made, the Commission will have not a single member from the populous urban gas-consuming areas east of the Mississippi.

The Federal Power Commission has great authority with respect to the rules and regulations, as well as to rates, made concerning the electric power and natural gas industries. These are matters of concern not only to the rich oil and gas producing areas, but to the consuming areas and the rest of the country as well.

On March 23, the six chairmen of public utilities or public service regulating agencies in New England addressed a letter to President Eisenhower supporting Mr. Connole and urging his reappointment. I concur fully in the belief of these men that Mr. Connole, on his record, has always been independent in thought and deed and is a particular credit to the regulatory field at a time when it is being severely attacked.

I believe the argument set forth by these men, who know the work of the Commission intimately, is most persuasive, and deserves reprinting here:

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: A matter of the highest concern to the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners of the six New England States who regulate all types of utilities in New England has come to our attention; namely, the possible appointment of William R. Connole as a member of the Federal Power Commission. Naturally, coming from New England where he previously served as counsel for the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission, we have followed his career on the Federal Power Commission very closely. It is true that we are proud of him and consider him to be by far the most preeminently qualified person in New England in the field of regulation. However, our concern as to his possible reappointment arises out of concern for the consumers of this Nation and our very vital concern in the success of regulation in our modern economic society.

Mr. Connole has shown during his term the ability to grasp and isolate complex regulatory problems and relate them to the consumer whose interest he is dutybound to consider. Forthright and vigorous stands such as Mr. Connole has taken does more than anything else to give the Federal Power Commission stature in the eyes of the public. In our opinion, Mr. Connole has always been independent in thought and deed and is a particular credit to the regulatory field at a time when it is being severely criticized.

To achieve success in the regulatory field and success has to be achieved if we are to avoid the blandishments of the Socialists whose solution is Government ownership of all utilities, we must appoint strong, stanch individualists who can resist the advances of interested parties. Had we more men such as Mr. Connole, the need and necessity of statutory action presently pending before Congress would disappear.

Mr. Connole is extremely well qualified in a very technical field. For the Nation's sake, it is highly important that it have the benefit of the expertise acquired by him over the next few years. Fortune magazine in its September 1959, issue, describes Mr. Connole as "keenest of the Commissioners." Recent events and history itself teaches us the tremendous pressures that can be exerted on Commissioners. When a possible nominee possesses the expertise, the integrity and the self-confidence to resist intimidation, surely he deserves a chance to serve a new term if he so desires. Unlike Mr. Hector, who chose to resign and criticize from afar, Mr. Connole is willing to continue to serve and attempt to work out the regulatory problems which have arisen. As those of us in regulation know, this entails a certain measure of responsibility and a vigorous regulator, if he fulfills his responsibility, is often the target of personal abuse. It is men in the traditional New England sense who will provide the answer to present attacks on our regulatory system.

In conclusion, I, as chairman of the New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners, speaking for myself and for the several commissioners, as instructed, unanimously wish to urge you to reappoint William R. Connole as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The above endorsement comes from Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike and I, personally as a Republican, urge his appointment since I have the utmost confidence in him and feel that his appointment would reflect great credit to the Republican Party.

The letter is signed by Charles R. Ross, chairman of the conference and of the Vermont Public Service Commission. Members of the conference are Frederick N. Allen of Maine; Harold K. Davison, of New Hampshire; Francis X. Lang, of Massachusetts; George W. Michael, of Rhode Island; and Eugene S. Loughlin, of Connecticut, as well as Mr. Ross.

I also include at the end of these remarks a letter I received today from Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, as secretary of the U.S. mayors' committee on natural gas legislation. This letter also endorses Mr. Connole's record.

With this support, and with the compelling reasons for reappointment, I find it hard to understand why the administration has let it be known that it may not reappoint Mr. Connole. I believe it is a mistake. I hope strongly that the administration will reconsider. I have no political interest in this appointment. Mr. Connole, when he was named, was an independent, and met the qualifications that he represent other than the majority faction on the panel. It seems to me that he has spoken and argued well for all the people in his tenure on the commission.

I think, in view of Mr. Connole's record as a defender of the consumer, of the little man, during his time on the commission, that all the people have a right to be disappointed if the White House does not reconsider.

The article and letter follow:

CONNOLE OF THE FPC

It is no secret that President Eisenhower's appointments to the Federal regulatory agencies have sometimes been weak or careless. Some agencies in recent years have seemed reluctant to regulate in the public interest.

The Federal Power Commission is hardly immune from this criticism. During the last 5 years the one member of the Power Commission who has consistently sought to impose effective regulation on natural gas rates has been William R. Connole of Connecticut. His dissent was vindicated in 1954 by a unanimous Supreme Court in a case in which Justice Tom C. Clark reprimanded the Commission majority.

It now appears that Mr. Connole will be denied reappointment when his term expires on June 22. No reason is given. Mr. Connole has admitted a private visit by a litigant's attorney, Thomas G. Corcoran, but says the meeting was innocent; he will be questioned at a congressional hearing May 2. But in any case this could not have been the reason for failing to reappoint him, since the reported White House decision came before the Corcoran matter was disclosed.

If the rumored appointments to Mr. Connole's seat and another Power Commission vacancy are made, the Commission will have not a single member from the populous urban gas-consuming areas east of the Mississippi. Of course Mr. Connole is not indispensable; there doubtless are other strong-minded men with utility regulation experience. But

dropping the one power Commissioner who has fought for meaningful regulation is a poor way to inspire effective performance at the FPC or any other Federal agency. If Mr. Connole explains satisfactorily the one possible cloud on his record, the meeting with Mr. Corcoran, the President should promptly reappoint him.

U.S. MAYORS' COMMITTEE
ON NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 26, 1960.

DEAR FRIEND: I am certain that you have been reading about alleged improper actions on the part of members of the Federal Power Commission. The disclosure of closed door sessions with industry representatives, entertainment, and free airplane rides make headlines and Commissioners can rightly be criticized for the suspect actions. Nevertheless, this publicity totally misses the point, as to which the Commission can most seriously be criticized, that is, its total failure to regulate. Prices have gone up and up since the famous Phillips decision of 1945 and your constituents are faced with ever-increasing charges, but in these 6 years, the Commission has not rendered any basic decisions by which the rules of the game can be applied and prices held down. The wellhead price of natural gas has risen 56.0 percent since 1954 while all commodity prices at wholesale have risen 8.3 percent. Despite the fact that the law directs the FPC to regulate the price of gas in the consumers' interest, gas prices have gone up almost seven times as fast as the price of the average commodity.

There is one heroic exception on the five-man Commission, to the do-nothing pattern, and that is FPC Commissioner William R. Connole, of Connecticut, a political independent, and the only Commissioner from east of the Mississippi where most of the gas is consumed. He alone in the Commission has held out for effective regulation—and reports current in Washington are that the President will not reappoint Connole this June, when his term expires.

As representatives of the natural gas consumer, we have communicated with the President telling him of our support for Mr. Connole's reappointment. We hope that the President will reappoint Mr. Connole. But if another's name is sent to the Senate, we must protest the dropping of this able Commissioner. No matter how exceptional may be his suggested successor, as a newcomer, he cannot be one-tenth as effective in the post as would Mr. Connole, with his 5 years' experience in this complicated fight for consumers' rights. We from the areas of great gas consumption must also register our vigorous opposition to the dropping of the only FPC Commissioner from a major consuming State.

Very truly yours,
RICHARDSON DILWORTH,
Mayor of Philadelphia, Secretary, U.S. Mayors' Committee for Natural Gas Legislation.

Red Bloc Softens Tone of Its Berlin Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the following article Washington Post Staff Reporter Murrey Marder reports on recent Communist East German talk about the possibility of an interim agreement on West Berlin resulting from the May 16 summit conference in Paris. The interesting point which I believe important to our continuing attempts to understand the situation is Mr. Marder's report that, while this may be nothing more than a shift of tactics, it may also be taken to mean that "the West Berlin compromise under discussion at Geneva last year came close to the ultimate price the Communists can exact."

Mr. Marder's article follows:

RED BLOC SOFTENS TONE OF ITS BERLIN DEMANDS

(By Murrey Marder)

A general switch by the Soviet bloc to a "softer" phrasing of demands on Berlin, as a prelude to next month's summit conference, is now unfolding, Allied diplomats here believe.

The prime example was the publication on Sunday of East German proposals for an interim agreement on West Berlin "to alleviate the situation."

American officials who examined published versions of the plan yesterday concluded that it appeared to add nothing to the position taken by the Soviet Union in last summer's Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers. Spokesmen for West Berlin's Senate called the offer completely unacceptable.

However, the potentially significant fact is that the Communist East Germans—traditionally, the roughest, toughest talkers—now appear in the unfamiliar role of compromisers.

ONCE SULKING SKEPTICS

When Soviet diplomats in Geneva last year were deeply involved with the West in a possible compromise, the East Germans cast themselves in the role of sulking skeptics. Their propaganda position was that anything short of the original Soviet demand for outright termination of Western occupation rights in Communist encircled West Berlin was unjust and unnecessary.

For East German Communist Chief Walter Ulbricht to write an open letter to West German workers advocating compromise represents at least a major shift in tactics.

Ulbricht's plan carries all the earmarks of careful coordination with the Kremlin. The Soviet Communist Party newspaper, Pravda, in effect, telegraphed his move 3 days earlier by expressing confidence that a partial and temporary agreement on West Berlin could be reached at the May 16 summit conference in Paris. Probably the next move in the relay will be for the Soviet press, in turn, to endorse Ulbricht's move.

There are various diplomatic interpretations here of what this maneuvering means.

It could be just a change of tactics for the sake of change—often a Soviet-bloc quirk. Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and lesser lights have just gone through a new round of warnings that the Soviet Union will sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, cutting off Allied access to West Berlin, if no agreement is reached on the fate of that prewar German capital.

HOME-CONSUMPTION MOVE?

This might, however, be a conclusion that the West Berlin compromise under discussion at Geneva last year came close to the ultimate price the Communists can exact. If Khrushchev needs to produce some showing on the Berlin issue, the present moves could be preparations for home adjustment, another round of compromise negotiations at a Foreign Ministers conference following the summit talks.

Khrushchev and Ulbricht may only be playing on the nerves of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer—a favorite sport for them. Knowing that Adenauer is fearful that the West, at the summit, may be drawn into new concessions on West Berlin, the Soviet bloc might be simply attempting a new approach to try to divide the West.

What Ulbricht, as secretary of the East German Communist Party, has proposed is imprecise enough either to embrace all the difficulties of the last compromise round, or to pave the way to agreement.

The East German proposal, as an alternative to turning West Berlin into a demilitarized free city, calls for: preventing the use of Berlin as a base for sabotage, subversion, and other hostile activities aimed at the Soviet bloc; a gradual reduction of military forces and the step-by-step abolition of the allied occupation status; banning nuclear arms or rockets in West Berlin.

OPPOSE PIECEMEAL SURRENDER

State Department officials point out that the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany oppose anything that represents a piecemeal surrender of occupation rights. The West at Geneva did propose a curb on any hostile acts—but in all Berlin, not just West Berlin.

A freeze on the 11,000-man American-British-French garrisons in the city was also offered, plus possible reduction of these troops. The West also readily agreed to forego stationing nuclear or rocket weapons.

In return, the West asked guarantees for continuing western rights in the city, and access to it, as part of a 5-year stopgap agreement. But the Allies insisted that at the end of the agreement, the West must be assured its rights would be unimpaired. This was a key assurance that the Soviets refused to state. Giving it could open the way to compromise.

"Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity"—Essay by Kathy Unser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that a student from my district in Wisconsin has won fourth place in the annual essay contest sponsored by the Wisconsin Governor's committee on the employment of the physically handicapped. She is Kathy Unser, who attends Regis High School in Eau Claire, Wis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Kathy's inspirational essay in the RECORD:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPED—PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY

(By Kathy Unser, Regis High School, Eau Claire, Wis.)

I couldn't imagine what my birthday and all the holidays would be like without Uncle Ben. He was the Santa Claus of all seasons, bringing cheer into the dullest and dreariest of days.

In the hearts of all those who knew him, there was always a special place for Uncle Ben. I guess I loved him the most—not because he gave me presents or called me his favorite "kitten," but because, to me, he was Abe Lincoln, Roy Rogers, and Prince Charming—all wrapped up in one big package.

I often laughed at the surprise which registered on strangers' faces when they first were told of my uncle's blindness. Why many times I myself would forget that he lived in a world of total darkness.

Uncle Ben was amazing. He could detect differences in cloth by feeling the texture; he recognized people by their footsteps; and best of all, Uncle Ben made people unaware of his disability.

But those days are gone. Uncle Ben is gone. All I have left of him is memories and a little diary which mother gave me as a keepsake. That diary holds the key to Uncle Ben's happiness and the dexterity with which he learned to live without seeing.

In paging through that booklet, I was anxious to read the page dated April 11, 1941—that fateful day when the doctor's prophecy became manifest in Uncle Ben. Total blindness.

There it was on page 12—all the information which was necessary to understand what happens inside a man who has become handicapped for the rest of his life.

April 11: "I may as well be dead. All the beauty in life has been drained out and my hopes and dreams for the future are shattered. Oh, God, help me."

These words I found typified the following weeks in Uncle Ben's life. Through the united efforts of the doctor and Uncle Ben's family, however, he did finally find heart and proceeded on the road to rehabilitation.

Although Uncle Ben was determined to lead as normal a life as possible for a person impaired in such a way, his struggle was difficult. His family—parents, a sister, and a brother—with whom he lived, pitied him to a great extent because of his accident. Love and pity combined, constitute a force which the normal physically handicapped person will grow to detest, unless that force can be controlled.

By losing an arm or a leg, or by losing the ability to hear or see, the person concerned also loses a portion of his dignity as a man. Pity only pushes the acknowledgment of this loss deeper into the soul of the disabled individual. Unconsciously, Uncle Ben's family was rubbing salt into the already tender and sensitive wound. By helping him with the little actions that every one of us take for granted—such as going down stairs, pouring coffee, or even lighting a cigarette—they allowed the inevitable despair to envelop and control Uncle Ben.

November 20: "What a life. I look forward to sleep every night as an escape from a world in which I don't belong. Yet, I dread sleep, too, for I know I will only wake up to another monotonous and discouraging day."

Yes, Uncle Ben found no understanding from those dearest to him, and rehabilitation had slowly turned to a downward grade.

In his desperation to regain the necessary self-respect and the lost dignity of his person, Uncle Ben turned finally to his clergyman.

March 29: "Father Sulman asked the impossible of me—to get a job. I laughed and laughed even harder when he told me severely to 'cut the self-pity and do something with my life.' All I can say is that he has eyes which see."

But, apparently Uncle Ben began to realize that blindness was a poor excuse for laziness and that he had a choice to make. He could either put his talents to work and make use of what he still had, or he could sit at home with nothing to occupy his time and energy, but thoughts of his misfortune.

The following week, he set out—evidently in high spirits—to search for employment. At first it seemed that he did it only for a joke, but later he began to take the idea seriously.

April 4: "It was good to talk to people again. Why, maybe with a little luck, I might get hired by the Auto-Lite Corp."

Lady Luck came through for Uncle Ben, and the following week he left for his first day of work in 13 months. From that day on, an almost miraculous change came over Uncle Ben. Not only was this evident by the inserts in his diary, but mom also tells me that it seemed nothing outside of regaining his lost sight could have made Uncle Ben any happier than receiving that job.

April 10: "Why I hardly have time to sit down and smoke a cigarette anymore. When I'm not at work, Joe or Dan is here to play cribbage. Time flies so fast."

Uncle Ben now felt he was worth something and that he could be useful. Moral worth—that's what Uncle Ben was searching for—the effort to prove that he, as a man, was not spent, that he could be helpful and efficient without his eyes.

Dignity? Yes, Uncle Ben found it. And it was not in self-pity or in the sympathy of others. It was not even in the knowledge he himself had that to work—even if blind—was possible.

No, none of these fulfilled the needs of my blind Uncle Ben. None of these could fulfill the needs of any handicapped person. Only acceptance by others could possibly arouse the tiny flame of hope and pride and dignity, which still flickered unsteadily within the very depths of Uncle Ben's soul. Only the perception that others still looked upon him as a complete man could bring back the necessary element of Uncle's Ben's life. Only the satisfaction that he had contributed something to life, could render Uncle Ben happy.

Just before Uncle Ben's untimely and tragic death, he had time to make one more entry in his diary:

April 11: "When I think of all that has happened to me since 1941, I realize that in sorrow there is always the seed of happiness present. The only necessary element for growth is nourishment. I found my nourishment in employment. May God help others like me."

I loved Uncle Ben dearly and now I miss him. His happiness spread like sunshine upon everyone near him. I loved him for the deep understanding which he held for every human weakness; I loved him for the manner in which he helped all those in need.

Yes, Uncle Ben was a handicapped person, but he regained everything he had lost twofold. What was his secret?

April: "Faith in God has shown me the way back to a normal life; but acceptance by my fellow man has provided me with passage to that life. My job was my passport to dignity."

Crisis in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State helped the enemies of America by criticizing Syngman Rhee last week. The Secretary's untimely remarks may have lost to the free world this devoted and courageous champion of freedom. The following editorial in the Washington Evening Star several days ago warned us of the Secretary's folly:

CRISIS IN KOREA

If the State Department is trying to bring down the government of Syngman Rhee in its hour of crisis, the lecture which Mr. Herter has addressed to the South Korean Ambassador makes a certain amount of sense. If this is not the case there is a notable out-of-this-world quality about the Secretary's dissertation on what is and what is not suited to a free democracy.

Of course, there is nothing resembling a free democracy in Korea, as that term is used in this country. And we don't think there will be, in Korea or in many other Asian countries, for a long time to come.

Nevertheless, certain facts appear to be clear. One is that Mr. Rhee's Liberal Party, even assuming strong-arm tactics, won an overwhelming popular indorsement last March 15. According to the announced results, 97 percent of the eligible Korean voters cast ballots and 9.5 million of these were for Mr. Rhee. It appears that about 1.2 million ballots were marked for his opponent, who died in the United States shortly before the election. More significantly, Mr. Rhee's handpicked running mate, Lee Ki-poong, received 8.2 million votes to 1.8 million for his Democratic opponent, John Mr. Chang. Some 330,000 vice-presidential ballots were declared invalid, and presumably may have been cast for Mr. Chang.

Is this statement of the voting results, released by the Korean Election Committee, false? Our State Department makes no such claim. And if it is not false, can the one-sidedness of the outcome be attributed to strongarm tactics? We doubt it very much. The probability is that Mr. Rhee's party was chosen by a clear-cut majority.

What are the facts about the rioting, which began in less serious form a month ago? According to the Associated Press, police countermeasures at first were relatively restrained. This seemed to encourage the mobs. This week, when the heavy loss of life occurred, the mobs were on the verge of taking over Seoul. Led by high school and college students, they stormed through the streets, stoning police, burning buildings and commandeering police cars. Some 500 students swarmed over a barbed-wire barricade in front of the official residence of President Rhee. At that point the police opened fire and many members of the mob were killed or wounded.

This was deplorable. But at that stage one of two choices was available—bow to mob rule or use force. We think it was necessary to use force, and that force will continue to be necessary until order is restored. The alternative is for the Rhee government to abdicate, and we do not suppose this is what the State Department wants. Nevertheless, Mr. Herter's pronouncements will serve to encourage the rioters—a most unfortunate result, unless the State Department is in possession of justifying facts which it has not revealed.

If the issue is the alleged fraud in the election, that question is before the Korean courts. And unless the State Department also thinks these courts are corrupt, it ought to await their verdict before indulging in further dissertations on the virtues of free elections. It should also bear in mind that South Korea has just recently been through a shattering war, and that it is still very much under the Communist guns. Even today, the climate in Seoul is hardly conducive to the kind of free democracy which is able to flourish in Washington.

Kaskaskia Reservoirs Will Bring Great Boom to Illinois' Heartland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Army Engineers' flood control program for the

Kaskaskia River Valley is vital to the prosperity of Illinois. Completion of two dams and reservoirs—one at Shelbyville and the other at Carlyle—will bring an industrial boom to the heartland of our State.

I testified recently before the public works subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in support of continued Federal financial assistance for these projects. Because some opposition was expressed at the hearing, I include my testimony at this point so that the House may know that these projects have the virtually unanimous support of the people of my area:

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I appear before your committee today to make a strong appeal for the continuation of the development of the Kaskaskia Valley and, specifically, to request an appropriation of $250,000 to continue planning the proposed reservoir at Shelbyville, Ill. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has requested this amount as necessary for orderly planning of this very important project.

The development of two Kaskaskia Reservoirs, one at Carlyle and the other at Shelbyville, will, in my opinion, bring the greatest boom the heartland of Illinois has had since the advent of the railroads. The development of this great river basin with an adequate water supply will eliminate very difficult economic conditions caused by the closing of the coal mines in southern Illinois. I am confident that this great industrial boom will be associated with the completion of these projects.

For many years Illinois has had an inadequate water supply. Because most of the State is bounded by major rivers, efforts never were made to construct reservoirs and provide adequate water supplies in other areas of the State. The Kaskaskia River, which lies in the geographical center of the State and is Illinois' second largest river, has been permitted to run uncontrolled throughout the 142 years that Illinois has been a State of the Union. Ironically, the first capital of Illinois was located near the Kaskaskia River and, because of the treacherous floods, it had to be abandoned. As a matter of fact, the site of the original capital is now completely under water.

The Corps of Engineers has located two reservoirs on the Kaskaskia to control floods. They have indicated that it is essential that the double reservoir system be employed to do the proper job. I am hoping that you will continue to support this program so that this river basin can again serve a useful purpose.

It has been called to my attention that within 3 years alone, according to a report from the Agricultural Extension Service, $4 million worth of crops has been washed out in this valley to say nothing of the extensive damage to other property. However, in the same 10-year period when the floodwaters were doing this tremendous damage it has been vividly driven home that our water supply in Illinois is totally inadequate. In the last 10-year period we have had two droughts which caused nearly one-half of our cities to be without an adequate water supply. On one occasion Lake Springfield, the second largest manmade lake in our State, went dry.

I realize that this reservoir will serve many useful purposes other than flood control and water supply but these two considerations are vitally important to my constituents in Illinois. These two lakes will by far be the largest in our State and will have a tremendous recreational value. These twin projects also will help navigation in the lower Mississippi.

The Army Engineers have estimated that the lake project at Shelbyville, Ill., will cost $27,470,000. This of course is a substantial sum but it must be remembered that the Federal contribution is only $18,500,000 and nearly one-third of the cost, approximately $9 million, will be contributed by State and local agencies.

The recent floods emphasize the importance of this project. Just last week 15,000 acres of farmland were under water in Shelby and Moultrie Counties alone. Almost every year we have a repetition of this as the Kaskaskia goes on a rampage, inflicting damage on thousands of dollars' worth of crops in the valley. The crop damage in the valley came to more than $3 million in the 3 years of 1956, 1957, and 1958, not to mention the damage to other property.

The Kaskaskia Valley Association has developed enthusiastic and virtually unanimous support for this project. I want to dispel any idea that anyone might have that the people of Illinois, and especially the people of Shelby and Moultrie Counties, have any objection to this project. I have been familiar with this project for 5 years. During that time I have not had a half dozen letters in opposition to this program. The five letters I did receive were from property owners who would be forced to sell their property. They did not oppose the program but expressed some regret that they would be forced to sell their property.

I make this statement because I understand that some newly organized group is to appear and express opposition to the program. It is my understanding that they do not come from my area in Illinois and that, in fact, their membership includes not one resident of either Shelby or Moultrie County.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to testify before your committee. I want to commend you on the great job you are doing. Every dollar you appropriate for these projects which conserve our natural resources is an investment in America and, as a result, will make our great country richer.

Our Youth Must Grow to Their Full Potentialities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that the White House Conference on Children and Youth had a message for all of us is tersely reported by Mary Herrick, a teacher at Du Sable High School and chairman of the Committee on Finance and Taxation of the Chicago Teachers Union. Miss Herrick's article from the Chicago Union Teacher follows:

REPORT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(By Mary Herrick)

Seventy-six hundred people attended the 1960 Conference on Children and Youth. Five hundred of them were high school or college student, and 500 were from 73 foreign countries. They came from every State in the Union including the new ones. They represented every phase of the national life—judges, physicians, social workers, labor leaders, school people, psychologists, leaders of youth groups, and religious leaders.

Mr. Fewkes represented Senator PAUL DOUGLAS at the conference. Miss Herrick was invited to serve as a resource person.

President Eisenhower addressed the group, which had come at his invitation, on Sunday evening, March 27. President George Meany, AFL–CIO, made one of the major speeches. After listening to speakers in large groups, the entire conference was divided into 200 small discussion groups. From these small groups came 1,600 different recommendations for action to help youth.

These recommendations minced no words, but went straight to the heart not only of the problems of youth, but to those of the Nation and the world. More than half of them dealt with human relations. Definite steps to eliminate any kind of discriminations in educational opportunities, in housing, in employment, and in the exercise of the right to vote were set out in no uncertain terms. The nonviolent "sit-ins" of the Negro youth in the South were encouraged. Federal aid for education was urged as an immediate necessity not only by the conference, but by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who spoke on April 1.

Many speakers pointed out the international status of youth in our shrunken, explosive, changing world. It was pointed out that the uncertainty of our future should not deter youth from positive action to make democracy a reality in the world. This is the cause our generation has to work for, not mere security in attaining things. If our youth do not seek such causes it is partly because our ideals are taught in a vacuum where action to implement them is discouraged. Thirteen million children in the South of all racial groups are being taught one thing and watching adults do another.

George Edwards, supreme court justice of Michigan, summed up the ideas of many of the speakers in these words:

1. We must make our cities fit for children to live in.

2. We must make education really universal and more useful for each child. (He recommended a maximum classload of 25.)

2. We must cut out the ugly scar of race discrimination from the face of America.

4. We must at least give children equal opportunity to keep out of jail.

5. We must regain our belief in the importance of family life.

6. Adults must place moral values above material success if we want children to do so.

The conference was a tremendous and inspiring experience. One could not help feeling in these responsible people a sense of urgency—a sense that there was no time to waste in changing the situation in American life which are crippling the lives of millions of our children. If our youth can not grow into their full potentialities, not only they, but the Nation and our civilization may not survive.

Communist Caribbean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following is a résumé of a talk I made at the Department of Virginia, Disabled American Veterans' banquet, March 26, 1960:

The United States should revise and restate the Monroe Doctrine to include all forms of infiltration and subversion by foreign powers in Cuba, Central, and South America. Affirmative action is desperately needed.

Our present vacillating policy toward South and Central America will lead to disaster. Fidel Castro's government in Cuba is a puppet government. Cuba, under Castro, is a captive nation. Unless Castro is checked by the United States, Cuba could become a Communist missile base threatening the security of the Western Hemisphere. Castro is following the same pattern of agrarian reform inaugurated by the bloody Communists of Russia and Red China. Agrarian reform is always followed by complete military dictatorship and eventually aggression. It is a slogan to hide more sinister developments. Cuba is the Formosa and Okinawa of the Western Atlantic. Cuba is between North America and South America. Just as control of the Mississippi divided and assured military defeat of the Confederacy, Cuba in the hands of the Communists will divide the western world and cut communications between the Atlantic and Pacific by controlling entrance to the Panama Canal.

Communist strategy in the Caribbean is part of a giant Communist pincers movement aimed at the industrial heart of the United States. Communist missile and air power is being assembled in Siberia to strike through and over Alaska and the North Pole into our heartland—the other through the Near East, Northern Africa, South America, and the Caribbean.

We are in the gravest danger and therefore should strengthen our Monroe Doctrine and should greatly increase our national offensive striking power. Part of this Communist military strategy is agitation all over the world with the object in mind to make the United States spend foreign aid in the wrong places at the wrong time. American money diverted from missile power and air power to the periphery of Russia is military potential that will be bypassed or used by Russia against the United States. This agitation by Russia not only encourages excessive spending by the United States in areas close to Russia, but it also adds to inflation in the United States which cripples the U.S. defense dollar. U.S. foreign aid must be reduced and this money diverted to U.S. retaliatory striking power. This policy will not only afford the United States better protection, but is the only real defense of India, West Germany, Greece, Turkey, Malaya, and the Near East.

The Disabled American Veterans must fight in peace as you fought in war. It is just as important that we fight to prevent war as it is to win a war when once we are involved. The only way we can prevent war is through modern superior strength. Our present military policy is largely based upon concepts of the past. We have an outmoded, purely defensive foreign and military policy. We must eliminate the negative and accentuate the offensive. We should have listened to Billy Mitchell in the early 1930's. We should discard today the recommendations of "Tipperary generals" and "Pearl Harbor admirals."

The average age of our American atomic and missile scientists is 29. These men hold the key to our future military security. Of equal importance is a U.S. Intelligence Agency, second to none. If we know Russian military plans of aggression before they move, they will never move.

Summit conferences and goodwill tours are part of the Soviet blueprint for world conquest. Khrushchev's visit to the United States was the signal for an attempt to seize the Panama Canal by Communist agitators. It was the signal for agitation in Venezuela. It was the signal for frantic ravings by Castro against the United States, followed by Russian military aid to Cuba. The coming summit conference in Europe will be the signal for further Communist infiltration and aggression.

We can and must put Khrushchev on the defense by refusing to meet him anywhere until he gives the captive nations their freedom as promised in sacred treaties. We should remember Munich, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Resolutions Concerning Management of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues two resolutions adopted by the upper Mississippi Valley section, Society of American Foresters, at its meeting held in the scenic city of McGregor, Iowa, on April 1, in support of H.R. 10572 and S. 3044, to authorize the national forests to be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services:

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS, UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY SECTION—RESOLUTION CONCERNING LEGISLATIVE SANCTION OF MULTIPLE-USE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS—ADOPTED BY MEMBERSHIP VOTE APRIL 1, 1960, AT MCGREGOR, IOWA

Whereas the 180 million acres of public land within the national forests contain a significant part of the Nation's outdoor recreation, range, timber, watersheds, wildlife, and fish; and

Whereas these renewable natural resources and services within the national forests, due to increasing population and better accessibility, are rapidly growing in value to the social and economic welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas the policy of managing these resources for multiple use and sustained yield as practiced by the Forest Service will yield the maximum of products and services from these lands in the long run; and

Whereas there has been no legislative action by the Congress directing the Secretary of Agriculture to manage outdoor recreation, range, timber, watersheds, and wildlife, and fish on the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Mississippi Valley Section of the Society of American Foresters urges passage by the Congress of the multiple-use bills S. 3044 and H.R. 10572; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to appropriate committees of the Congress with the request that it be included in hearing records on the above-mentioned bills; and further

Resolved, That copies be sent to all Members of Congress from Iowa, Minnesota, and North Dakota with the request that they actively support and urge passage of these bills.

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS, UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY SECTION—RESOLUTION CONCERNING FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH—ADOPTED BY MEMBERSHIP VOTE APRIL 1, 1960, AT MCGREGOR, IOWA

Whereas the agricultural experiment stations have requested a $14 million increase in Federal grant-in-aid money for the State experiment stations to accelerate research in the fields of forestry, soil and water, marketing and utilization, and basic research, in fiscal year 1961; and

Whereas a greatly expanded research program is required to meet the needs of an expanding population for wood, forage, water, wildlife, and recreation; and

Whereas the agricultural experiment stations within the framework of the land-grant institutions already have excellent libraries, unique and often expensive laboratory equipment, and outstanding scientists qualified to undertake the needed research; and

Whereas the graduate programs of the forestry schools associated with the agricultural experiment stations are the lifeblood of research personnel needed by all agencies engaged in forest research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the upper Mississippi Valley section of the Society of American Foresters urges the appropriation of the requested Federal grant funds, including the $5 million for forestry research; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from Iowa, Minnesota, and North Dakota with the request that they actively support the appropriation; and further

Resolved, That copies also be sent the Secretary of Agriculture, and the chairmen of the House and Senate committees considering these appropriations.

One Hundred Thousand Rural Wisconsin Families Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when 400 of Wisconsin's rural electric and telephone co-op leaders were in Madison, Wis., March 28–30 for the 24th annual meeting of their statewide association, Wisconsin Electric Co-op, they adopted a series of resolutions on matters relating to the rural electrification movement. These resolutions represent the thinking of nearly 100,000 rural Wisconsin families as expressed by their official delegates to this meeting. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include eight of those resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS ON THE REA ACT

Be it resolved, That we hereby express our opposition to any and all of the proposed amendments to the REA Act in an abiding conviction that it will continue to serve the best interests of rural people, of our electric and telephone systems, and of the general public as enacted.

COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas our Nation has historically encouraged and fostered the concept that individuals and organizations can work together on a nonprofit basis to provide themselves with essential services; and

Whereas an increasing number of small independently owned businesses, including farm producers, find that joining together in sponsoring nonprofit integrated operations is their only effective means of competing with highly organized big business; and

Whereas our Nation's tax policies have always recognized the nonprofit nature of such operations, even encouraging their formation and development through the administrative agencies of Federal and State Government; and

Whereas genuine cooperatively owned businesses operating on a nonprofit basis have proved a bulwark against the inroads of unfair competition and helped offset the growing concentration of economic power in fewer and fewer hands; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering proposals recomemnded by the Secretary of the Treasury which would tax all net margins of cooperatives if equity capital is not revolved at least every third year and 4 percent interest is not paid on outstanding patronage capital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we oppose the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury as discriminatory toward cooperative business and totally destructive of cooperative enterprise and that while we are aware that a spokesman for the Treasury has stated that REA-financed cooperatives are specifically exempted from the provisions of the Treasury's recommendations, that if this proposal is enacted it would be the opening wedge in an effort to include all types of service-at-cost businesses under its provisions.

SILVER JUBILEE

Whereas the REA program celebrates its 25th anniversary in 1960 of its establishment on May 11, 1935; and

Whereas primarily as a result of this program the percentage of electrified farms in the Nation has increased from 10 percent just 25 years ago to over 96 percent today; and

Whereas the availability of quality central station electric service in our rural areas has stimulated a substantial increase in nonfarm residences, businesses and other establishments to add diversity and increased stability to our rural economy; and

Whereas almost $3.5 billion in public credit has been invested in this program under which service is being provided on a nonprofit basis, with all loan funds being repaid in full with interest under a repayment record unmatched in modern finance for its almost nonexistent delinquency rate; and

Whereas this program is benefiting the nonrural segment of our economy by generating sales of over $18 billion worth of appliances and equipment, contributing millions of dollars each year in additional tax revenue, providing employment to scores of thousands of workers; and

Whereas authoritative estimates predict that the power requirements of REA-financed system's patrons will increase fourfold during the next 15 years alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge each of our members and patron systems to carry on a concerted public information program throughout 1960 to achieve wider public understanding of the impact of the REA program in stimulating our economy through increased purchasing power, employment, lower costs of food and fiber, elimination of backbreaking chores, increasing quality and sanitary standards of food and injecting an element of competition in this largely monopolistic industry; and be it further

Resolved, That this public information program emphasize the expanding influence that our electric systems will play as the most rapidly growing segment of the power supply industry. Every citizen of the United States is increasingly sharing in the benefits generated by applying the public credit to give our rural people a powerful tool to assure adequate, low-cost electric energy in those rural areas which the commercial industry long ago abandoned as unfeasible for profitable service; and be it further

Resolved, That we dedicate this silver jubilee year to creating widespread public understanding of the yardstick our rural systems can provide in achieving great new concepts in quality electric service and development of sound new uses of electricity for better living standards and increased productivity on our farms.

BENEFITS OF OUR PROGRAM TO WISCONSIN

Whereas there prevails among too large a segment of the general public a misunderstanding as to the role of our rural electric systems perform and the fine manner in which they have carried out their responsibility; and

Whereas by direct comparison of the size, scope, and limitations under which our electric cooperatives operate there will be greater appreciation and understanding; and

Whereas too few of our public understand, for instance, that electric cooperatives are limited to service of those areas that are existing industry could not or would not serve because they were unprofitable; and

Whereas in Wisconsin electric cooperatives serve areas averaging only three patrons per mile of line constructed, while commercial utility areas average 28.8 customers per mile; and

Whereas Wisconsin's cooperatives averaged in 1958 only $340 revenue per mile of line compared to $3,500 per mile for commercial utility companies; and

Whereas electric cooperatives cannot provide retail service within communities of over 1,500 people; must serve all potential consumers within an area; must provide service on a nonprofit basis, and cannot serve any customer of another supplier; and

Whereas loan funds made available by REA must be repaid in full with interest and our Wisconsin cooperatives have not incurred a single cent in delinquency; and

Whereas electric cooperative consumers in 1960 will pay almost $1 million in taxes as part of their power bills; and

Whereas electric cooperatives of Wisconsin have created almost $1 billion in additional purchasing power to enrich our State economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we increase our efforts during this silver jubilee to call the Wisconsin citizenry's attention to the achievements of our cooperatives despite one-ninth as many consumers per mile and one-tenth the revenue per mile of commercial utilities and despite legal restrictions on our ability to expand into areas of greater economic potential; and be it further

Resolved, That we work toward greater public understanding of how every citizen of our State benefits from the employment, purchasing power, and taxes paid as the direct result of this rural improvement program, as well as by the availability of electric energy to all Wisconsin citizens.

REA ELECTRICAL LOAN APPROPRIATION

Whereas rural electric systems of the Nation must be able to meet demands for electric energy from their patrons which are expected to increase fourfold during the next 15 years; and

Whereas orderly planning and expansion must be carried on with adequate new capital funds available to achieve increased ability to serve on the most economical basis; and

Whereas scheduled and advance loan repayments and interest payments on prior loans to REA will substantially measure up to new loan capital requirements during fiscal 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to authorize and the President to approve adequate electric loan funds to meet the provident requirements of borrowers as established by the annual loan survey now being conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

REA GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas from one-third to over one-half the cost of supplying electric energy to patrons of our rural electric systems is generation and transmission of electric power to the load centers of our distribution systems; and

Whereas fundamental to maximum use of electric energy by our patrons is full assurance of adequate supply, high service standards and lower cost as consumption rises; and

Whereas many electric systems, including many WEC patrons, have found that when they lack control of their wholesale energy supply, they have faced harassment as adequate supply has been hamstrung by monopolistic control to enforce service restrictions as to size of loads served, interference with retail rate application and increasing wholesale power costs; and

Whereas almost uniformly our member systems who control their own source of power supply have been able to carry on integration steps and application of new technology for greater efficiency to the end that such control is a vital and valuable tool in their efforts to reduce costs and improve service standards; and

Whereas the availability of REA loans for the purpose of installing generation and transmission capacity where feasible and necessary has historically proven the most valuable weapon possessed by our electric systems in providing themselves with effective bargaining power for their wholesale power supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record expressing our vital concern for the continuing need for generation and transmission loans by REA whenever and wherever justified and despite the growing viciousness of attacks on this program by commercial companies seeking to block them.

REA TELEPHONE LOAN PROGRAM

Whereas under the REA telephone loan program, on January 1, 1960, loans had been approved to extend new or improved telephone service to 68,986 rural families and businesses in Wisconsin; and

Whereas under this program in Wisconsin, a total of 43 companies have either been formed, reorganized, or modernized to provide the highest quality dial service at an expenditure totaling over $30 million; and

Whereas during the past 10 years this program has made funds available on a loan basis to be repaid with interest to bring service to a very large percentage of all rural people in the Nation; and

Whereas 40 percent of our farms in the Nation and about 25 percent of our farms in Wisconsin still lack telephone service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the rural telephone loan program of REA and urge that the Congress continue to appropriate sufficient funds to make telephone service available in all rural areas of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a percentage of such funds allocated each year be definitely earmarked for use by nonprofit associations, mutually owned by the subscribers with service being rendered on a cost-of-service basis; and be it further

Resolved, That during the 1961 fiscal year a total of $50 million be earmarked for such cooperative association loans, and with the Administrator of the REA program granted discretionary power to allocate to other borrowers that part of such earmarked funds as he feels are not needed to meet the loan requirements of borrowers providing service at cost; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress recommend to the Administrator of REA that his field staff be directed to promote and encourage the formation and development of service-at-cost telephone companies in areas now lacking adequate service.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission is actively considering a proposed working

agreement with Dairyland Power Cooperative under which AEC would construct a pressurized water nuclear powerplant at Dairyland's Genoa generating station with steam from the unit being utilized in Dairyland's turbogenerator to produce power; and

Whereas if this proposal is eventually approved and the plant constructed, Dairyland would be the second of WEC's patron systems exhibiting such leadership in exploring areas of major technological improvement in the science of power production, inasmuch as Rural Cooperative Power, Elk River, Minn., is expected to be utilizing nuclear power within the year as a result of a similar agreement; and

Whereas the progressive and forwardlooking outlook of Rural Cooperative Power and Dairyland demonstrates to all America the leadership of consumer-owned power systems in their effort to further the technology and standards of service to their patrons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we congratulate the membership, directors, and management of these power cooperatives and endorse their efforts to assist the national effort to make nuclear power a vast new source of energy for the development of a better life for all mankind.

The Late Representative Russell V. Mack

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker the House of Representatives lost one of its most able Members upon the death of Representative Russell V. Mack. His zeal and diligence in serving his district, State, and Nation were not surpassed in Congress. A man of high principle and integrity, he enjoyed the sincere respect of his colleagues. His friends both in and out of Congress were legion. All were shocked at the news of his passing.

Russell Mack was one of my real friends and his death was a personal loss to me. He was most cooperative and helpful in connection with problems that confronted me, and gave generously of his time and advice. That he did the same for his other friends was understood by all. I join with them in expressing grief at the occasion of his passing and in extending deepest sympathy to his devoted wife, Laura.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my statement copies of editorials from the Tacoma News Tribune and the Seattle Times, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times]
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSELL MACK

Russell Mack was a big man, plain spoken and sincere, who hated redtape and folderol. His favorite campaign tactic was to tour his third district in a door-to-door, grassroots appeal. He would walk into a store, his cigar leveled at the world like a cannon, offer a huge hand and say, "I'm Russell Mack, I'm running for Congress and I'd sure appreciate your vote."

In Congress Representative Mack again preferred the direct line of attack. He was an outspoken critic of the import of seafoods from foreign countries. He was equally concerned with programs to encourage the lumbering industry, a mainstay in the economy of his Grays Harbor constituency and the State of Washington.

Russell Mack was a firm supporter of bipartisan foreign policy. He also pushed hard for the development of natural resources in this State. He served six terms in Congress, after winning a special election to that office in 1947. He was named Republican whip for the 16 Western States in 1955 and was a member of the Republican Party's 20-man policy board.

The State of Washington and the Third Congressional District have good reason to mourn the loss of this big, bluff man who had a talent for getting things done.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune]
MR. MACK'S DEATH GREAT LOSS

Representative Russell V. Mack was a man who served his country and his southwest Washington congressional district with distinction and with a zeal not surpassed in Congress. His death on the floor of the House of Representatives is a great loss to his district, to our State, and the Nation.

Mr. Mack loved his country and he loved to work for good government. Politics, which is only the science of government, interested him intensely and he entered into his congressional office back in 1947 with a zest that one seldom encounters in public life. He was a strong campaigner and a great fighter, and his district has been helped tremendously by those qualities.

The Congressman was a high-ranking member of the House Public Works Committee, a committee so important to the southwest Washington area because improvement of rivers and harbors is in its domain. He worked tirelessly for improvement of the twin harbors, for rivers, for the Westport fishing base. A strong believer in promoting local industry, he fought the import of Russian crab and Japanese tuna and resisted the shipment of lumber to Japan to be manufactured into finished products. He battled for U.S. salmon fishermen's rights—in fact, Russell Mack was a stalwart defender of American industry and the men who work in the mills, the factories, or with the nets.

He wanted an America that is financially sound and therefore worked in behalf of balanced budgets and against the waste of public funds.

His shoes will be most difficult to fill. It would be wonderful if his district should, in a forthcoming special election, find another man such as he.

"MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL V. MACK

"In recognition of his outstanding contribution to the civic, business, and political development of the State of Washington, and the Pacific Northwest, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce pays tribute to the memory of Russell V. Mack who passed away on the 23th day of March 1960.

"Always he gave willingly and generously of his time, thought, and energy to the welfare and advancement of his State and Nation. The earnestness and leadership he brought to any cause that he espoused and his unselfish devotion to things worth while gives him a lasting place in the memory of all whose privilege it was to know him and to serve with him: Accordingly, it is

"*Resolved*, That the members of the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce adopt this tribute to the memory of Russell V. Mack and, making permanent record of this expression of respect and esteem, convey their sincere and heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family."

Dated this 7th day of April 1960.

SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JACK GEOPFROY, *Secretary*.

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged: XVIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, I repeatedly called the attention of this House to the unemployment situation in my State of West Virginia. I introduced, supported, and voted for many measures designed to help West Virginia move forward and achieve industrial progress.

In addition, I brought to the attention of my colleagues on numerous occasions the shocking discrimination against West Virginia by certain Government departments, specifically, the Departments of Commerce and Defense. I pointed out that this State, suffering the burden of chronic unemployment, ranked dead last among the 50 States in Department of Defense spending and Department of Commerce activities in proportion to population .

Far from asking for a handout or a dole for West Virginia, I merely championed the cause of democracy and fair play, urging that West Virginia—sorely beset by economic problems—deserved at least to be given its just share of governmental activities.

West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployed of any State in the Union, yet the lowest number of Department of Commerce employees per capital. West Virginia had the highest number of its young men per capital in the Nation who were killed and wounded in the Korean conflict, yet she is last among the States in defense expenditures in relation to population.

Now I must bring to the attention of the House another disturbing example of the way West Virginia is not getting its fair portion of Government activities—and I regret to say that this falls in an area where real help could be afforded to help our State's economy.

The Small Business Administration was set up a few years ago in a commendable effort to help the Nation's small businessmen and industrialists to cope with competition from growing supercorporations and monolithic industrial empires. The SBA was created to keep our economy diversified and strong, resting on a broad, general base.

The SBA's basic effort is to keep small businesses and employers in such competitive position that they are not swallowed by larger corporations, and to maintain industrial production over a wide area of the Nation.

The need for the services which the SBA should provide is very great in West Virginia, where most of our businesses are small.

Small manufacturers seeking to utilize the labor surplus which exists in every sector of the State could well use SBA assistance to expand plants and provide new jobs.

Other manufacturers, seeking to expand employment, could use SBA assistance to create product diversification or expansion into new market territories.

Still other firms might want to transfer their primary production into other lines, with SBA assistance.

There are innumerable other situations and examples that I could list to show how the Small Business Administration could provide aid—at no cost to the taxpayer other than administrative expenses—which would have a positive effect in stimulating West Virginia's economy.

West Virginia, then, should be at or near the top in the list of State participation in SBA loan activities.

However, I regret to say, this is not true.

Instead, in proportion to population West Virginia ranks 45th among the 50 States in SBA participation, very near the bottom.

Of the States below it, three—New York, New Jersey, and Illinois—are the heartland of the Nation's financial institutions, where many diversified lending and financing services already are available, and where small businesses can find private, outside help more readily.

Only two of the States below West Virginia in SBA participation—North Carolina and Maryland—can be fairly compared.

If there is an obvious need for additional SBA activity in an area such as West Virginia, then why has participation been so small?

The answer must lie in one of two areas: Either the Small Business Act is being administered in a way that precludes the businesses which could provide needed jobs in our State from obtaining SBA loans; or, the law itself is set up in such a way that these firms cannot obtain financial aid.

I suspect that a combination of these causes is at the root of this hopeless inadequacy of SBA to meet the needs it was created to meet in the areas where such assistance is most needed.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to introduce a bill which I hope will mean steps forward in remedying both these defects.

As my colleagues all know quite well, the Small Business Act contains provisions which offers special forms of loans and assistance to area stricken by drought, flood, hurricane or other natural disasters. Thus, the Federal Government recognizes that areas reeling under the onslaught of an act of God deserve and need particular types of help until their economies can adjust to the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that chronic unemployment, shutdown plants, declining payrolls caused by mechanization, diminishing markets and other causes, are just as much a catastrophe as any flood, hurricane, or drought that ever smote this Nation.

I plan, therefore, to introduce a bill which would define clearly the intent of the Small Business Act to provide such special forms of aid to depressed areas, and would direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide aid to a chronically depressed area—under definitions clearly spelled out in the act—just as he would be required to do for areas hit by natural disasters.

This is not an attempt to seek a handout from the Government. It is merely a realistic approach to a growing national problem, one which will afflict more and more sections of the economy and regions of the Nation as the advancing age of automation strides forward, in the same spirit of helpfulness, neighborliness and sympathy that inspires us to help the unfortunate victims of other catastrophes.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD statistics bearing out the fact that West Virginia is being shortchanged in the activities of the Small Business Administration:

State	Cumulative Small Business Administration loans, approved Sept. 29, 1953, to June 30, 1959	Total amount approved	Population, 1950	Ranking basis: Population per each SBA loan granted
1. Alaska	132	6,420,255	128,643	975
2. Kansas	874	26,155,485	1,905,299	2,179
3. Montana	202	9,180,930	591,024	2,926
4. Nebraska	351	14,347,054	1,315,510	3,806
5. Idaho	144	7,607,006	588,637	4,089
6. Rhode Island	166	4,658,147	791,896	4,770
7. Arkansas	383	13,858,533	1,909,511	4,985
8. Nevada	32	1,900,802	160,083	5,003
9. Arizona	149	7,047,010	749,587	5,031
10. Vermont	70	2,860,780	377,747	5,396
11. New Hampshire	93	4,727,800	533,242	5,733
12. Iowa	437	16,342,891	2,621,073	5,998
13. Washington	389	17,195,001	2,378,962	6,193
14. Maine	143	6,674,257	913,774	6,390
15. Minnesota	458	18,023,040	2,982,483	6,512
16. Oregon	234	11,838,065	1,521,341	6,629
17. Texas	1,140	52,592,049	7,711,194	6,764
18. South Dakota	96	3,850,925	652,740	6,798
19. Colorado	194	5,473,897	1,325,089	6,830
20. Utah	96	5,101,050	688,862	7,174
21. Georgia	469	22,209,212	3,444,578	7,344
22. Missouri	535	21,010,257	3,954,653	7,373
23. North Dakota	84	3,250,525	619,636	7,377
24. Florida	368	20,800,453	2,771,305	7,531
25. Wyoming	38	1,581,000	290,529	7,646
26. New Mexico	86	4,924,000	681,187	7,921
27. Tennessee	350	15,068,776	3,291,718	9,405
28. Oklahoma	237	9,324,781	2,233,351	9,424
29. California	1,088	52,373,239	10,586,223	9,666
30. Massachusetts	471	20,323,188	4,690,514	9,958
31. Wisconsin	322	17,051,903	3,434,575	10,666
32. Mississippi	194	11,202,529	2,178,914	11,231
33. Alabama	271	1,303,484	3,061,743	11,298
34. Hawaii	42	2,811,475	499,794	11,899
35. Indiana	324	16,971,027	3,934,224	12,143
36. Delaware	26	1,138,800	318,085	12,262
37. Kentucky	232	10,266,293	2,944,806	12,694
38. Louisiana	176	11,208,567	2,683,516	15,247
39. Virginia	206	14,074,706	3,318,680	16,110
40. Michigan	373	26,706,076	6,371,766	17,083
41. Connecticut	116	6,833,713	2,007,280	17,304
42. Ohio	439	31,482,733	7,946,627	18,102
43. South Carolina	111	4,907,585	2,117,027	19,072
44. Pennsylvania	531	34,946,554	10,498,012	19,772
45. West Virginia	96	5,233,667	2,005,553	20,891
46. North Carolina	194	10,130,689	4,061,929	20,989
47. Maryland	111	6,433,929	2,343,001	21,109
48. New Jersey	229	11,882,719	4,836,329	21,159
49. Illinois	371	19,120,856	8,712,176	23,486
50. New York	257	16,049,634	14,830,192	57,705

Israel's 12th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, once again we celebrate the anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. This year the anniversary occurs on May 2. Time marches on rapidly for only yesterday, it seems, we witnessed those great historical events connected with the restoration of Israel to statehood—and now we suddenly realize that 12 full years have elapsed since then.

The people of Israel, as well as the Jewish community in the United States, must surely experience a great sense of pride as they look back over these past 12 years and recount the notable achievements in building up Israel as an independent and democratic state. We in this country share in that pride because the American people have not only aided Israel from its very inception to attain its marvelous progress in every human endeavor, but we are particularly proud that Israel looks to our country for guidance, it is shaping its way of life and its concept of society in the image of America, and it has throughout the entire period of its existence become one of our best and most dependable allies.

The visit to the United States by Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion in March of this year further helped to cement strong bonds of friendship and understanding between this country and Israel. His talks with President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Herter, and other top leaders of our Government certainly served

to clear up possible misunderstandings and miscalculations rearding the situation in the Middle East, and Israel's views in particular.

Today, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that Israel is here to stay and that she is truly an outpost of democracy and a bulwark for freedom in that part of the world. But more than that is clear now to all right-thinking people. It is now generally recognized that Israel is vitally interested in maintaining peace in the strategic area of the Middle East of which she is a part. She is interested in the economic development of the area for the benefit of all people. She is desirous of settling regional problems, including the Arab refugee problem, in a peaceful manner. Furthermore, Israel is not planning to embark on any expansionist adventures, as is falsely maintained in certain Arab quarters, because such adventures would only lead to war and chaos.

I am very pleased that the House of Representatives saw fit to include in this year's mutual security bill a statement of policy expressing the sense of Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations. I was glad to support that statement.

Specifically, we had in mind the unilateral and irresponsible action of Egyptian Dictator Nasser in barring Israeli shipping from transit through the Suez Canal. We also had in mind the boycott being waged against Israel by the Arab countries, which is hurting them as much as Israel not only in dollars and cents, but in moral and political prestige, in world condemnation, and by the fact that it keeps the area in a constant state of turmoil. Such acts are very frustrating to the efforts of the United States and the United Nations to help bring about a greater degree of political and economic stability in the area and a higher standard of living for all the people.

In the statement of policy mentioned above it is specifically emphasized that "the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways."

One can only express deep regret that at a crucial period in human events, when mankind is faced with a struggle for survival against a ruthless tyranny, so much energy and effort are wasted in the Middle East in spreading hatred and distrust among the nations which only serves to weaken the area and to render it ripe for a Communist invasion. Instead of cooperating to build up the area economically, develop its human and natural resources, raise its standard of living, improve the standards of health and education, the nations of the Middle East are busy with plots and counterplots, with boycotts and blockades, with spreading hatred of their neighbors, and with pursuing a costly arms race which can only spell their own doom and endanger the peace of the whole world.

Unfortunately, in their blindness, the Arab leaders refuse to recognize facts or to consider reasons. Nasser does not seem to understand that hatred begets hatred, and that boycotts will bring forth counterboycotts. If he did not know it before, he should certainly know it now. For the past 2 weeks the Seafarers International Union which is headed by one of the ablest union leaders in this country and my good friend, Paul Hall, is conducting a counterboycott against the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra*, now stranded in a New York pier. Actually, the dockworkers in New York refuse to unload the cargo from the Egyptian vessel because of Nasser's treatment of American ships and seamen.

It is axiomatic that the insatiable desires of a dictator know no limits. Nasser only proves the old axiom once more. Because he has been able until now to get away with some of his irresponsible exploits against Israel, he believes he can also impose restrictions against American vessels and American seamen who use the international waterways of the Suez Canal or stop at Egyptian ports. He sees nothing wrong in practicing boycotts and blockades against others, but he resents it when the same practices are applied against him. He is resorting to all sorts of dire threats against American shipping, but does not stop to think of the consequences to Egyptian shipping, to the economy of his nation and the effect on his people. He is running true to form—a dictator never thinks about the welfare of his country and its people.

What Nasser fails to realize is that American seamen are freemen in a free country who are determined to protect their rights and interests. No rantings or threats by Nasser will deter them. Organized labor and American public opinion support their action. It is my belief that the Seafarers Union is performing a great service for the free world in teaching the Egyptian dictator a lesson in American democracy. I congratulate the leaders and the members of the Seafarers Union for upholding the standard of free labor in a free country.

In the light of these and other events in the Middle East, Israel seems to be the only levelheaded nation in the area. It knows what it wants and it is determined that the hostile acts of its Arab neighbors shall not deter it from its course. And that course is set in one direction—toward the attainment of a lasting peace in the Middle East. For this reason alone the people of Israel deserve our undiminished moral, political, and economic support.

On this occasion, the 12th anniversary of Israel's independence, I wish to extend my sincerest wishes to the leaders and the people of Israel. Together with these wishes go my prayers that they will soon realize their goals—lasting peace, economic independence, and a happy nation.

Amsterdam, N.Y., Chamber of Commerce Completes 75 Years of Distinguished Service to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other evening in the city of Amsterdam, N.Y., in my district, one of the centers of the carpet-manufacturing industry in our Nation, there was held a banquet commemorating the 75th anniversary of the chamber of commerce in the city of Amsterdam. It was my honor and pleasure to be in attendance at this banquet, and to extend my congratulations to the chamber for the fine job which they are doing and to the outgoing and incoming officers for the key role that they have played and will play in keeping the economic life of this great community moving ahead. I mentioned in particular the fact that the job which the city of Amsterday is doing in helping to promote its own economic growth and survival stands out across the country as a brilliant and shining example for other communities in similar situations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of April 21 expressing the appreciation of the community to this great organization for the work they have accomplished:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, Apr. 21, 1960]

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE

With the annual dinner dance Saturday night at the Columbian Community Center, Amsterdam's Chamber of Commerce will be commemorating 75 years of service to the community.

What has been accomplished in three-quarters of a century by the chamber reflects not only energetic leadership, but a willingness on the part of members to come to grips with community problems.

Where is the Amsterdam Chamber of Commerce going from here? That is the important question as Philip Spencer assumes the responsibilities that go with the presidency. While the task he faces will not be easy, we have every confidence that the general manager of radio station WCSS will prove equal to the challenge. But in the final analysis, the answer to that question will be provided by the measure of support forthcoming from the entire community.

The new head of the chamber, like his predecessor, Barthold K. Schotte, is typical of a long list of civic leaders who through the years have given much of their personal time and effort to the service of the community. The same can be said for the newly-elected board of directors.

As it begins its 76th year of community achievement, our chamber of commerce has many impressive plans for the future. But unless they can be put into effect for the best interest of the entire community such plans will mean little or nothing.

We owe it to ourselves to support the new president and his officers as they embark on one of the most difficult, and too often one of the most thankless, tasks in any community.

They cannot and should not be expected to do the job alone. They are deserving of the wholehearted support and encouragement of those they will be trying to help, and that includes all of us.

Youth of the Year a Student at Integrated High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the House of a significant recognition of the quality in character and in achievement of the youth of the district of real brotherhood that I have the honor to represent in this body.

Annually the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization presents its award of Youth of the Year to the youth representing the highest type of Americanism and democratic citizenship as exemplified by the good neighbor. In 1957 the award went to John Williams, Jr., a student at Hyde Park High School in the Second District of Illinois. This year the Youth of the Year Award has been given to Richard Grant, also of Hyde Park High School. I know of no greater honor, or one more highly evaluated or appreciated by the people of our district, than this.

It is heartening to us to have this evidence that the youth of our district, where all races and all faiths work together in the spirit of brotherhood, are reaching for and gaining high goals in scholarly effort and in human relationships. Hyde Park is an integrated high school.

My heartiest congratulations and expression of appreciation of their good work in the cause of democratic citizenship go to the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, to Dr. Milton A. Saffir, the chairman of the "youth of the year" committee, to the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Kelly, director of the CYO, who joined in the presentation of the award, and to the faculty and students of the Hyde Park High School.

Needless to say, our district is very proud not only of Richard Grant but also of two other students at Hyde Park High School who were among the five finalists, Joan Lazarus and Richard Tani. That three out of five finalists, including the winner, in a citywide competition were students at Hyde Park, an integrated school, is worthy of national notice.

The sketches of the youth of the year and the two others from Hyde Park High School who finished among the five finalists follow:

RICHARD GRANT, YOUTH OF THE YEAR, NOMINATED BY HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Richard Grant is chairman of human relations committee of the student council. Currently vice president of the student council. Helped to found the youth commission on human relations. Chaired a seminar held in his community. Has worked with Catholic interracial council, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Illinois Commission on Human Relations. Was chairman of a PTA regional board discussion group "on leadership in brotherhood."

Was his high school delegate to the annual bill-of-rights celebration luncheon. Delegate to the annual high school intergroup relations conference. Participated in "youth march for integrated schools in Washington, D.C."

Has been a member of the ROTC for seven semesters, now a cadet sergeant.

Has high scholastic rating. Is taking accelerated work, including Russian and Latin. Will represent his high school in the district Latin contest.

JOAN LAZARUS, HONORABLE MENTION, NOMINATED BY HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Joan Lazarus is student advisor to the PTA. Has acted as liaison with parents of feeder schools. Has been leader in better racial understanding program. Organized a "Jewish life" display for her temple youth groups. Was presented to neighborhood church youth groups. Member of debate team, participating in brotherhood leadership program. Recipient of four high school civic awards.

Organized and directed interracial neighborhood play club for 20 to 25 children, ages 2 to 8.

Very active in leadership position in her temple youth group. Organized discussion groups, leadership programs, etc. Was chief organizer of the first schoolwide integrated dance held at her school.

She is valedictorian of her graduating class. Has had a perfect "S" record for 4 years. She is president of Junior Math Honor and secretary of Senior Math Honor, editor of school newspaper.

She has been captain of volley ball team, member of her class baseball team, is a white cap swimmer.

Has been assistant instructor in modern dance. Has studied piano for 11 years.

Selected by members of girls' athletic association and as nominee for State street council queen.

RICHARD TANI, HONORABLE MENTION, NOMINATED BY HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Richard Tani is an Explorer and Arrow leader in Scout work. Has held many positions in Scout work. Interested and active in many volunteer organizations, promoting brotherhood and human relations. Has appeared as speaker before several civic organizations. He is active in his interracial church group.

Has won major and minor athletic awards as member of high school swimming team for 4 years.

Scholastically he is an E–S student. He is a member of the Sigma Epsilon Honor Society. He is taking extra work because of his high grades.

He has helped organize four Scouting units in interracial areas. Has served as a faculty member of boy leader training course.

OTHER FINALISTS

The two finalists, not residents of the Second Congressional District, were Jack Greenberg, nominated by the B'nai B'rith organization, and Glenn Edward Michelson, nominated by Foreman High School.

Mr. Greenberg lives at 6215 North Rockwell Street, Chicago, and Mr. Michelson at 3319 North Karlov Avenue. Although they are not from the Second District it is only fair that a recital of their achievements should be included as a further stimulus to the youth of America. The sketches follow:

Jack Greenberg, 17, is a student at De Paul University. He was elected chairman of the youth advisory board of Mayor Daley's Chicago Youth Commission. Was chairman of several meetings of youth representatives who made recommendations to the adult board of the Chicago Youth Commission. Was service fund chairman of Robert Golden Memorial Foundation, raising funds for polio. President of Chicago region AZA. Directed citywide campaigns—helped raise many thousands of dollars for La Rabida Children's Hospital, Rest Haven, Cancer Society, and several scholarship programs. Chairman of his high school election commitee, conducted senior class officer elections. Was chairman of brotherhood assembly program. Represented Anti-Defamation League at Catholic interracial council youth study day program. Participant in organized athletic programs. Graduated in top 10 of his high school. Was semifinalist in Illinois State high school scholarship program. Was member of junior honor society. He has appeared on several radio programs. Active in Boy Scout work—patrol leader—vice president of district No. 6 (midwest AZA) and international chairman of B'nai B'rith community relations. Helped conduct AZA–BBG Institute of Judaism program at Northwestern Hillel Foundation. Was valedictorian of his Hebrew school graduating class. He was the BBYO "Youth of the Month" winner in the junior association of commerce and industry program. Has been designated as the outstanding AZA member of this area.

Glenn Edward Michelson is a charter member and officer of Key Club and works with the Kiwanis Club on behalf of his school and his community. He produced a 16-page booklet "Keynotes for Freshman," which is distributed to new students during their first few days in high school. Has taught himself braille in order to work with blind students. He reads to them and works with them. He is chairman of the tutoring committee of Future Teachers of America and assists in the school's tutoring program. He ranks first in his graduating class—is a member of the National Honor Society and Mu Alpha Theta, math honor club—finalist in the Illinois State scholarship competition and received a letter of commendation from the National Merit Scholarship corporation. He is currently attending the Mathematics Institute at Illinois Institute of Technology on Saturdays with a scholarship from the National Science Foundation. He is editor of the school yearbook. Has been chairman of various assemblies. Was a contestant in the Chicago Spanish oratorical contest. He holds the rank of first lieutenant in ROTC. Represented his school at Premier Boys State (American Legion). Extremely well thought of by faculty and students.

Better Try Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, sparked by the activities of the veterans of World War I, interest in pensions for our older veterans continues to grow throughout the country. The commander of Barracks No. 1178 of that organization, which is located in Brazil, Ind., has sent me an editorial taken from the January 21, 1960, issue of the Plainfield, Ind., Messenger.

The editorial follows:

[From the Plainfield (Ind.) Messenger, Jan. 21, 1960]

BETTER TRY AGAIN

With Congress in session again, World War I veterans are bringing some facts before them which they hope will be sufficient to get a pension bill on the statutes which will give these aging members of our citizenry a little compensation for the service which they rendered in the 1917–18 war. Ten thousand of them are dying every month—360 every day, 15 every hour, 1 every 4 minutes.

It is high time that the Government begin easing the last few months, days, hours, and minutes of this vanishing army which performed so gloriously at Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, Mount Faulcon, in the Meuse Argonne, and on other fronts in those days 43 years ago. These men are now from 60 to 75 years of age and have never had any financial recognition for their services.

Strange as it may seem, veterans of World War II and the Korean war, who have had so much from the Government, are foes of a plan to pension the World War I veterans "because of the prohibitive cost." We'd like to ask just one question: Who has been paying the cost of their education, their pensions, their GI loans, and other benefits? If you stop to think, you'll realize it has been, for the most part, the veterans of World War I.

With the death rate among the World War I veterans as high as it is today, the cost of pensioning them will go down about 6 percent the first, 12 percent the second, and therefore, by 1976 only 6 percent of these men will be living, and the cost of the proposed pension will have been reduced by 94 percent.

Barracks No. 1178, Brazil, through its commander, Harold E. Stearley, is doing everything in its power to bring the matter before the attention of the present Congress. Every veteran of 1917 should write his Congressman urging support of a pension bill for the long-forgotten men of World War I.

Is Present Foreign Aid Achieving Mutual Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I realize as the leader of the free world, America has an obligation to assist in maintaining the economic stability of other freedom-loving nations in a common defense against world communism. However, I am one of those who seriously questions whether the foreign aid program as presently constituted and administered is actually achieving mutual security—the objective we all so earnestly seek.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that we can't buy friendship with dollars, but that we could gain the good will and cooperation of the people in underdeveloped nations of the world by adopting the humanitarian, Christian manner with which we treat our neighbors next door—by sharing with them our blessings of abundance in food and fiber.

I believe the time is not far away when the American people, whose concern for the less fortunate in the world has been demonstratively generous in the past, will refuse to support the multi-billion-dollar appropriations for foreign aid unless we make greater progress in shifting from a program of giveaways to technical self-help projects—and unless we reverse the current policies which indicate that we can afford to be wasteful and extravagant in pouring billions into the hands of politicians in foreign lands, but cannot afford to meet the needs of just plain folks at home.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. W. E. Coffman, president of the Novelty Advertising Co., one of my constituents in Coshocton County, Ohio, the contents of which I believe are worthy of consideration by my colleagues:

THE NOVELTY ADVERTISING CO.,
Coshocton, Ohio, April 25, 1960.

Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEVERING: Thank you very much for your response to my letter concerning the Scripto decision in the Supreme Court. It may interest you to know that today Senator YOUNG seemed to concur in the opinion that some legislation should be enacted to settle this problem once and for all. He suggested that he was going to discuss it with his colleagues on the finance commission and that the efforts may bear fruit.

However, in today's mail it was particularly interesting to have your bulletin of April 20 concerning the Mutual Security Act of 1960 and your thoughts on foreign aid. May I add my nickel's worth? As you may know we just completed a tour of the Mediterranean area covering 14 or so nations starting at Casablanca, going clear around the Mediterranean, up to the Black Sea to Constantsa, Odessa, and Yalta and returning by the way of Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal. I am quite mindful of the taxpayers' burdens in this country and how I have complained bitterly about the unfair tax structure. At one time you may recall that I proposed to Harry McGregor or to you that anyone traveling abroad should be permitted to deduct that money spent in those countries against our foreign aid program and take it from his income tax. This made sense to me because the taxpayer himself can give foreign aid directly and put it where he wants it and see where it goes, and with every dollar spent abroad by an American tourist reconciling with his income tax return can be that much contribution to foreign aid. That's the type of foreign aid they want—they do not want charity. They want the opportunity to work for a living by their crafts and to sell their products. Most nations are proud just as most people are proud in not accepting charity and your comments about too much money is well taken.

As you might suspect, I questioned everywhere I could concerning American relations with the countries we visited, talking with the people (or those with whom I could talk) trying to feel how our foreign policy is accepted. I must admit in my own humble opinion if war were to break out in any of the countries we visited through the Mideast and around the Mediterranean we would have trouble finding an ally. We certainly have not made friends with our money. Sometime when you are here, I should be very happy to give you some of these thoughts which would take too long in a letter but succinctly I have stated the impression that I gained from our recent 2 months' cruise.

Furthermore, it makes it pretty tough on American tourists because there is the false impression that every American is a millionaire and they purposely raise prices as soon as they see a Yankee face. Certainly I believe "I am my brother's keeper" but there is nothing that says forever, and so long as we pour our dollars over there and are stupid enough to do it, they are not coming on the floor of Congress to tell us to stop foreign aid.

Another paradox: Our Nation is a great advertising nation. We can advertise our products and sell impossible articles to impossible people but we don't seem to be able to sell America to the Europeans and while every foreigner will recognize an American dollar and accept it, that is about as far as it goes. They have no conception of our tax structure and how hard people do work in this country to create wealth and keep that dollar and I am sometimes fearful that the people in Congress have about the same attitude. I firmly convinced that our foreign aid policy should be completely revamped, that a very thorough practical study should be made in this type of expenditure and sift out the actual need from the open palm. I have a peculiar impression that many of the people in Europe are better off than the people in the United States. Since I was there in 1953, the contrast is remarkable. Most of the people seem happy, well clothed, well fed and industrious; except for northern Africa and Egypt there was no visual evidence of want in any of these countries. With things progressing as they are it wouldn't surprise me any day that the United States will need some foreign aid. Certainly I would welcome some tax relief right now.

Let's think about U.S. citizen aid first. We aren't the wealthiest nation in the world and I dare say you would be willing to trade our national debt with any other nation in the world. I don't know why people think America is so rich. I must admit we certainly have some cock-eyed thinking going on in our country today. Do you agree?

With kind best wishes,

W. E. COFFMAN,
President.

P.S. Nothing thrilled me more than to see signs in countries where we had given relief reading "go home Yankee." I should make a speech some time.

East Faces Prospect of Losing Representation on the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by reports that the administration will soon make two new appointments to the Federal Power Commission that will have the effect of stripping the gas-consuming and industrial East and Northeast from representation on that important regulatory agency.

The New York Times in an excellent editorial today points out that if Commissioner William R. Connole, of Connecticut, is replaced by the President, the Federal Power Commission "will have not

single member from the populous urban gas-consuming areas east of the Mississippi."

I think that Members of the House and the Senate from the States east of the Mississippi should be concerned about the possibility of having a Federal Power Commission not composed of proper regional representation.

The natural gas transmission line companies have already received several rate increases. Any prospect of further increases can have damaging economic effects upon the already hard pressed industrial sections of the Northeast, where both consumer and manufacturer will in the end wind up paying higher gas rates to the local utilities. All of the rates increases in the past have been passed on to the ultimate consumer.

The Farmers Will Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Indianola, Iowa, Tribune. The editorial was reprinted in the Tuesday, April 19, 1960, edition of the Algona Upper Des Moines, Algona, Iowa. Entitled "The Farmers Will Remember," this editorial comments on the recent past history of farm legislation and cites statistics evidencing the drastic downtrend in the general farm economy.

The editorial follows:

THE FARMERS WILL REMEMBER

If the tone set by GOP national chairman, THRUSTON B. MORTON, at his speech in Des Moines recently is echoed throughout the rest of the election year by his fellow Republicans, Democratic victory in the Midwest will be a great deal easier than even the most ardent Democratic supporters would believe possible. Mr. MORTON is not only the chairman of the Republican Party, but he is also a Senator from the State of Kentucky, and as such he should be pretty well aware of the legislative history, past and present, of the farm problem.

Indications are that the GOP will make every effort to shackle the Democratic Party with complete responsibility for the tangled shape of farm affairs. Mr. MORTON did this by pointing out that the Democratic Party has controlled Congress since 1955, and that it is Congress that must write any farm legislation. What was not pointed out was that the Congress of 1955 through 1958 followed, to a large extent, the programs and recommendations of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and President Eisenhower. It was not until the last couple of years that Congress, under Democratic leadership, took off in its own direction in an effort to come up with a solution to falling farm income and growing grain surpluses, and then five of their efforts met with Presidential veto. In spite of the fact that both Houses of Congress have been under Democratic control for the past 6 years, it is impossible for the Republican chairman to repudiate responsibility for lack of progress toward a workable farm policy. Lack of administrative leadership, plus the ever-present threat of the veto, has been of little help to the miscalculations of the Bensonites. In choosing to stand by Benson, instead of searching for new leadership in the farm field, the GOP has accepted responsibility it cannot easily shed for election-year convenience.

The Midwest voters in 1960 will remember GOP election year promises of 4 and 8 years ago. They will remember that the GOP promised farmers parity—up to 100 percent—and prosperity. The Republican Party, according to its platform, "is committed to a program for agriculture which creates the widest possible markets and highest attainable income for our farm and ranch families." The voters will recall these things under the knowledge that now, after almost 8 Eisenhower years, there are an estimated 8 million people in farm families currently living below the accepted poverty line. Over 3 million people have been driven off farms in the last 7 years. Millions of other farmers are struggling to keep their heads above water in a losing battle between lower prices for farm products and higher farm costs. Ezra Benson has spent $33.3 billion on farm programs in 7 years, compared with $12.5 billion spent for farm programs under President Truman. From 1952 to 1959 farm prices were down 20 percent, farm income was down 34 percent, parity ratios dropped 23 percent and the farmers' share of the food dollar decreased 19 percent. During that same period of time farm distress sales increased 27 percent, farm surpluses rose 636 percent, farm production expenses increased 15 percent and farm debt was up 43 percent. The farmers have a lot to remember.

In this election year the Democrats will be proposing some sort of a farm bill. It may work or it may not. It may be acceptable or it may not. But there will be a proposal of some kind, one that the voters may study. Against this it appears that the Republicans will be content to defend Benson and his program, and attempt to cast blame for present poor farm conditions upon the Democrats. If such is the case, it is not hard to know where the farmers' votes will go in November.

Wisconsin Electric Cooperative Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD eight resolutions adopted by the delegates to Wisconsin Electric Cooperative's 24th annual meeting, at which I spoke on March 28 in Madison, Wis.:

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE RESOLUTIONS

TAX LIABILITY OF PATRONAGE REFUNDS

Whereas it was the intent of Congress in passage of the Internal Revenue Act of 1951, to provide that cooperative associations distributing to their patrons margins over and above the cost of rendering service in the form of cash or noncash patronage credits, should be taxable to the patron to the degree that they constitute taxable income, at par in the year received; and

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service has seen fit to abide by lower court decisions holding that patronage refunds in a form other than cash is not income to the recipient unless shown to have a definite market value: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to adopt or enact appropriate resolution or legislation declaring it the sense of the Congress that the original intent of the Internal Revenue Act of 1951 regarding the tax liability of all patronage credits of cooperative associations be abided by, so that such credits constituting taxable income be taxable to the recipient at par in the year received.

POWER SUPPLY

Whereas production and transmission expense is the largest single increment in the delivered price of electric energy to the ultimate consumer, representing from one-third to over one-half of the expense of supplying electric power; and

Whereas the technology of producing and transmitting electric power lends itself most economically to large, integrated operation; and

Whereas long experience has shown that an independent distributor of power has very limited bargaining power in seeking the most favorable rate in purchasing wholesale power due to unavailability of competitive potential sources; and

Whereas there is ample evidence that independent distributors can join together to combine their bargaining power either for the purpose of seeking the most favorable possible wholesale power rate, or to pool their requirements to feasibly produce and transmit their individual power requirements jointly; and

Whereas in the State of Wisconsin, Dairyland Power Cooperative provides demonstrative evidence of the great benefits to the ultimate consumer achieved through joint control of energy source; and

Whereas also in the State of Wisconsin the Badger Power Cooperative provides demonstrative evidence of the great benefits to the ultimate consumer actually achieved through joint bargaining to achieve the most favorable possible wholesale power rate; and

Whereas the advancing technology of power production and transmission is melting away handicaps imposed by distance between load centers of cooperating power distributors to increase the feasibility of even greater degree of joint cooperative effort to the ultimate advantage of our consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates recognize the increasing importance of joint cooperation in this field among our respective distribution cooperatives to the advantage of ultimate consumers, that we commend Dairyland Power Cooperative and Badger Power Cooperative organizations as vital to the future of the program in this State, and that we urge even greater effort on the part of directors and management of these organizations to maximize their effectiveness in behalf of our program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge each of our member systems to actively affiliate in joint effort for this purpose with a continuing program of research and study, and where feasible, in actual bargaining, as representing the best long-range approach in the interests of our rural electric patrons.

ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Whereas it is our firm conviction that the rural electric and telephone programs in Wisconsin have benefited greatly from the assistance of a number of general cooperative associations in their efforts to broaden public and patron understanding of the fundamental objectives and achievement of cooperative action; and

Whereas by working closely and in joint membership with other cooperative groups in these associations, we can contribute substantially to their effectiveness and en-

hance their ability to promote the objectives of the electric and telephone programs; and

Whereas we particularly are cognizant of the contribution of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., and its Executive Secretary Jerry Voorhis for its work nationally and of the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives and its executive secretary J. K. Kyle; and

Whereas Wisconsin Electric Cooperative is a regional member of the Cooperative League, and WEC and each of its member electric cooperatives is a member of the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates take official cognizance of the effective representation and activities of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. and of the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives and their effort in behalf of cooperative action, and that we commend their management for their close cooperation in behalf of our specific objectives in the rural electric and telephone programs.

JOB TRAINING

Whereas skilled employees operating under the discipline of strictly enforced safety rules to provide safest possible working conditions in a continuing job training program are essential to the well-being of electric and telephone cooperatives both in terms of quality of service and in the well-being of our employees and their families; and

Whereas we recognize that the greater an employee's understanding of what and why he is doing, the more satisfied and skilled is his performance; and

Whereas any accident can and will be avoided where the cooperative provides as a basic part of its program specific rules to enforce, and incentives to promote, the use of safety hats, rubber gloves, protective grounding and pole inspection; and where good working habits are continuously encouraged; and

Whereas it is estimated that the direct accident cost for the rural electric cooperatives in the Nation each year amount to $2,400,000 plus such indirect or uninsured costs as disruptions of service, adverse local publicity, possible reflections of managerial capabilities and others; and

Whereas with the valued cooperation of the Wisconsin Department of Vocational and Adult Education, our Wisconsin REA job training and safety committee has developed for our Wisconsin systems an excellent training and safety program for our employees, but that this is only a foundation upon which well-trained employees working under safest possible working conditions must be developed under local management policies which recognize the vital importance of this effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the Wisconsin REA job training committee and the department of vocational and adult education for their effective efforts in this field and that we urge their continuing reappraisal of this program with the aim of securing near-perfect cooperation from the board of directors and management of each participating system, with the aim of seeking continuing improvement in the program, and for the purpose of maintaining a constant awareness and vigilance on the part of employees, directors, management and patrons of the inherent dangers of even momentarily letting down our guard; and be it further

Resolved, That we recognize the very great improvement during 1959 in our overall State safety record as a result of increased effectiveness and cooperation, and that we urge even greater effort in 1960 to further reduce and eliminate those elements which lead to accidents.

AGRICULTURAL BARGAINING POWER

Whereas rural electric and telephone cooperatives serve in but one of the essential areas where rural people must work together to achieve a sounder local economy, more control over cost of production, increased efficiency, higher net income, lower prices for consumers and a more stable national economy; and

Whereas the stability of our service organizations is irrevocably bound to achieving these objectives to maximize productive use of our services; and

Whereas we deplore a marked and growing deterioration in the economic stability of agriculture and the resulting effects on our memberships; and

Whereas until farmer-owned cooperatives are sufficiently developed to represent combined bargaining power over broadly integrated areas sufficient to meet individual needs for credit and other essentials requisite to production, and sufficient control over marketing steps to effectively influence prices received for his efforts through ability to regulate supply with demand, he cannot and will not be able to fairly compete in an economy where other segments have achieved infinitely more refined organization, directly and indirectly as a result of governmental sponsorship or tolerance. Presently such competitive bargaining power is committed against the agricultural producer to siphon off a growing share of the fruits of the farmers' investment in labor and capital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor a new approach to solving the problems of agriculture encouraging on a much broader scale the formation and development of producer-owned cooperative associations, patterned after the REA method of making available the credit, technical management assistance and good will of the Federal Government, aimed at maximizing the integration of agricultural bargaining power; and we further favor enabling legislation in order that agricultural producers may effectively control the marketing of their produce to avoid uneconomic surpluses or to dispose of them in a manner which will minimize their effect on market prices in recognition that an adequate and fair return on capital and labor of the farmer is necessary to stimulate new investment and new methods to increase quality and lower unit prices; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn national administrative policies which artificially stimulate high interest rates, we are opposed to punitive tax measures aimed at weakening or even destroying cooperative enterprise, and we deplore the wasteful expenditure of Federal revenue in unrealistic production control programs which can only serve to aggravate, rather than solve, problems of surplus production.

PUBLIC RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas we consider it a prudent and attainable goal to seek abundant supply of electric energy at vastly reduced rates to stimulate full use by our citizens of an increasing number of adaptations of electric power to increase efficiency and living standards; and

Whereas the rate at which our population is able to adapt energy to more uses will dictate, more than anything else, the maximum development of all segments of our economy; and

Whereas the inclusion in multipurpose development of our natural resources the harnessing of the resulting hydropower potential in such vast quantity that it can be made available for public use at the very lowest feasible rate while amortizing the full use of public credit is in the national welfare; and

Whereas the Hoover Dam is a typical demonstration of the validity of this point as illustrated by the recent announcement that while the Federal Government has invested $175 million in it, gross receipts already have reached $7½ million in excess of the investment; and

Whereas the Nation's commercial power companies have illegally utilized "captive funds" of their customers in a misguided and misleading multi-million-dollar advertising campaign aimed at maximizing their profits by achieving exclusive and rigid control of all the Nation's power production facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby reiterate our support for a vigorous program of prudent and well-planned resource development and we deplore any compromise of such a policy dictated by the self-interest of any special group; and be it further

Resolved, That we support full enforcement and compliance with rules and regulations of Federal and State regulatory agencies which prohibit commercial power companies from charging the expense of misguided and misleading advertising campaigns which are, in fact, aimed at influencing legislation and, therefore, cannot be considered legitimate expenses incident to the conduct of their business, and properly should be paid for by stockholders.

EXCISE TAX ON LOCAL AND LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALLS

Whereas as an emergency source of additional revenue during the Korean war the Congress enacted a 10-percent excise tax on local and long distance telephone calls;

Whereas President Eisenhower has recommended that the Congress reconsider legislation enacted last year eliminating this tax on local service effective June 30; and

Whereas in voting to discontinue this tax the Congress recognized that telephone service today is not a luxury, but a necessity, particularly in our rural areas; and in recognition that it is a regressive tax due to its ad valorem nature because cost of service is higher in rural areas of least density and greatest exposure to the elements, consequently subjecting subscribers in areas where good telephone service is most important and most costly to greater tax burden: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we congratulate the Congress on its action in eliminating this tax and express our conviction that it should be permanently discontinued.

TAX POSITION OF WISCONSIN'S RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Whereas both the Milwaukee Journal and the Wisconsin State Journal have seen fit in the past week to print editorial attacks on the tax position of Wisconsin's rural electric cooperatives; and

Whereas an untrue picture of total power sales at retail to our membership is achieved by combining sales at wholesale with sales at retail to achieve a stated gross revenue figure far in excess of actual sales to ultimate consumers; and

Whereas the picture is further distorted by deducting approximately a quarter million dollars paid by our cooperatives' purchasing power at wholesale from commercial suppliers, and crediting these tax payments to the commercial utilities even though they are a definite increment in taxes paid by electric cooperatives' patrons; and

Whereas in neither case do these publications reveal to their readers the obvious facts proven by studies of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission that commercial utilities average more than 10 times as much revenue per mile of line constructed, and that commercial utilities in Wisconsin serve nine times as many consumers per mile of line constructed, and that over half of all utility revenue is realized from power sales to industrial and commercial customers in areas where electric cooperatives are forbidden by law from serving; and

Whereas based on any fair comparison, our electric cooperatives pay a full share of taxes to the State tax units, and that our taxes are based on a formula which increases their

total at a rate which has caused, and continues to cause them to double at least every decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates reiterate our position that our electric cooperatives by any fair appraisal are meeting their full responsibility in regard to providing necessary revenue revenue to Government; that our electric cooperatives are serving exclusively in areas where existing industry refused or could not serve because potential revenue wasn't considered adequate to make service a profitable investment, and that our electric cooperatives are meeting a need in areas where the alternative was that a very substantial percentage of our rural people would otherwise have been forced to continue to live in darkness.

Pollution of San Francisco Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years the regional water pollution control board in San Francisco, Calif., has been conducting a drive in cooperation with communities around San Francisco Bay to halt pollution of this major body of water. However, the Federal Government has not yet moved to halt the dumping of raw sewage directly into the bay from military bases at Benicia and Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands.

In the Military Construction Acts of 1959 and 1960, the House of Representatives has seen fit to authorize sewage treatment facilities at both Benicia Arsenal and Treasure Island Naval Station through amendments which I myself authored. Now the question of appropriations for these two all-important projects is about to be taken up by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction.

So that all Members of Congress may be advised of the interest in these projects which exists in the State of California, I submit for the RECORD the following joint resolution of the Assembly of the State of California:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 5

Joint resolution relating to pollution of San Francisco Bay waters by Federal installations

Whereas two military bases in the San Francisco Bay area, the Benicia Arsenal and Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands, are still dumping raw untreated sewage and waste directly into Bay waters, which is causing pollution of these waters; and

Whereas the regional water pollution control board for the San Francisco Bay region and other agencies have attempted to bring about correction of this problem since 1951; and

Whereas the Benicia Arsenal problem could be solved by the arsenal connecting with the sewage treatment plant built by the city of Benicia, which was built far in excess of the needs of that city and designed to provide treatment capacity for sewage from the Benicia Arsenal; and

Whereas this treatment facility was financed by general obligation bonds of the city of Benicia in the amount of $877,000, which was accepted by the citizens of that city as their obligation in the protection of the bay waters; and

Whereas under Public Law 660, 84th Congress, 2d session, $250,000 was granted to the city of Benicia by the U.S. Government to aid in the construction of this sewage treatment plant, yet the necessary funds to connect the Benicia Arsenal have not been made available; and

Whereas approximately $320,000 is the estimated cost of connecting the Benicia Arsenal to the city system, which is the most economical method of combating this pollution problem; and

Whereas the other installation causing pollution in San Francisco Bay is the naval installation on Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands, which is discharging 850,000 gallons of raw sewage into the bay every 24 hours; and

Whereas this problem has also been under consideration by the regional water pollution control board since 1951 and was declared a condition of pollution and nuisance October 21, 1954, in the regional board's resolution No. 161; and

Whereas approximately $700,000 is necessary for the construction of a sewage treatment plant for this installation; and

Whereas the construction of these facilities would be in accordance with and in furtherance of Executive Order No. 10014, dated November 3, 1948, which directed all Federal agencies to cooperate with State and local authorities in preventing pollution of surface and underground waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds to correct the condition of pollution being created by the Benicia Arsenal and the Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands installation, with such appropriation specifically designated for such purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Overabundance of Food and Starving People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague from our great new State of Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE, has only been in Congress a short time, but he has already proven his excellent leadership ability. His record is adequate proof of the good judgment both of the people of Hawaii in sending him to Washington, and the Members of Congress in voting statehood for Hawaii.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the excellent speech just given by this fine new Congressman. The subject has been well handled on the item of food and hungry people:

OVERABUNDANCE OF FOOD AND STARVING PEOPLE

(Speech by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, before the Cooperative Food Distributors of America convention, Washington, D.C., April 25, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, the subject I am about to discuss is not a very pleasant one. Originally, I had thought of telling you about the most beautiful islands in the Pacific—the new and sovereign State of Hawaii. This would have been a very pleasant subject to discuss. However, noting that this is a convention of food distributors, I decided to spend a few moments this afternoon discussing something about overabundance of food and starving people.

About a decade and a half ago, while serving with the Armed Forces in Europe, I observed literally thousands of human beings crawling to the lowest depths imaginable, because they were hungry. I saw women offering themselves for a slice of bread. I saw husbands selling their wives in order to feed their children. I saw children soliciting for their mothers for a chocolate bar. One day, a group of people came to our campsite to offer their services for any menial or dirty job, such as cleaning our kitchens and latrines. Upon being asked what compensation they required for this work, the leader of the group replied simply, "We want your garbage." Assuming that they needed the garbage to feed their livestock, we accepted their services. A few days later, we found out that they were taking the garbage home to their small village for distribution among their people for human consumption. These people were working for the privilege of eating our garbage.

After the cessation of hostilities, I pictured our world entering into a new and glorious age of peace and plenty. I must confess that even after experiencing the horrors of war, I was still naively idealistic.

Today, while our Nation is complaining about overabundance and food surpluses, there are millions of people in our world who are actually starving. In the United States, garbage disposals and garbage pails are selling like hotcakes because of the over abundance of wasted and leftover food. While millions of dollars are being spent in the United States for reducing and diet pills, most of the world has yet to hear of these miracle pills.

Those of us who have had the privilege of traveling in the Far East know that hunger is a real problem. The hunger that I speak of is not merely the nutritional deficiency type but the deep belly type that makes children cry. I have seen thin, scrawny children covered with sores. I have seen men, women, and children beg for food. I have seen waiters set aside our leftover morsels to be sold to others in the dark alleys that evening.

We, who are gathered here today, should pause for a few moments this evening to give a prayer of thanksgiving for the abundance we are blessed with. We should be very grateful for our bountiful gifts. We should be grateful to associations, such as the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, for making this abundant food available to our households at low-cost methods of distribution. I am grateful. I hope you are.

The daily per capita calorie consumption in most parts of Asia is about a thousand calories. Most of our distinguished nutritionists state that it takes about 2,500 to 3,000 calories per day for an average person to carry on his daily activities. It should be noted that people who cannot get above the average of a thousand calories a day have little energy to build schools, to build railroads, to construct communications facilities, to work on their farms, and to defend themselves.

For example, the great nation of India has always been suffering from food shortage. Any disaster, flood, or drought, which would reduce the food supply even slightly, creates serious trouble for the Indian Government.

About a year ago, a very distinguished Member of Congress stated that "The Indians are proud people. At times they seem to us to be exasperatingly indifferent to the obvious dangers in communism. But India is a democratic government which is struggling to provide a decent standard of living for its millions of people. Economic and political unrest, caused by a widespread and persistent shortage of food, greatly complicates the difficulties of the government and could conceivably tie up the scales against freedom there.

"Whether we like it or not, there is a struggle now underway between India and Communist China. India is trying through democratic procedures to create jobs and give her people greater economic independence—the same thing China is trying to achieve through the harsh, repressive procedures of communism.

"If India fails, and China succeeds, there will be nothing to stem the spread of communism in Asia. Our surplus foods can be a significant weapon in this life or death struggle."

The world is crying for leadership and most of the people throughout this world look to our Nation for this leadership. And whether we like it or not we will not be able to escape this role of leadership in our free world. Enlightened self-interest demands that we do all we can to help other nations to become economically stronger. People who are convinced that their economic self-interest will best be served under a democratic form of government will add little, if any, sympathy for Communist propaganda.

Food has a universal language. Even the smallest child knows the meaning of food although he may have no understanding of some of the other things we are now attempting to do to retain and to win new friends at this time of danger. Military assistance alone will not stem the Communist tide. Blessed with overabundance, we should now speak this universal language of food to bring about a better living for the unfortunate and for the rest of the world.

Today there is before the Congress of the United States, H.R. 6681, a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace by the more effective use of U.S. argicultural commodities for the relief of human hunger and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies, introduced by the distinguished Congressman from the second district of Iowa, the Honorable LEONARD WOLF. This food for peace program as set forth in the bill provides for the distribution of some of our surplus foods through the agencies of the United Nations. The cost of this program is infinitesimal as compared to our military assistance program. All Americans who have any warmth in their hearts and who have any sense of enlightened self-interest should support this measure. Please bear in mind that it is most difficult to preach democracy to hungry people.

I hope I may live to see the day when all people will be blessed with plenty and all nations will be blessed with associations such as yours.

Aloha.

Our Economic Armament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of April 22, 1960, entitled, "Our Economic Armament":

OUR ECONOMIC ARMAMENT

Convinced that Sino-Soviet imperialism will continue to drive for world domination irrespective of the outcome of next month's summit meeting, the Western nations are stepping up efforts to supplement their military power with a new economic arm to meet the Communist economic challenge.

This new economic arm is to be the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, comprising the United States, Canada, and 18 free European nations, including some which, for practical or traditional reasons, are militarily neutral. It is to provide on a world-wide scale the same stimulation, coordination and direction of both the economic development of its members and aid to under-developed areas that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation provided for Europe's recovery during the Marshall era. Now, however, it will be on a cost-sharing basis.

A convention for this organization just completed in Paris by four "wise men," including American Ambassador Burgess, will be submitted for approval to the 20 nations with the hope that it will became a functioning reality next year. The broad framework for it was outlined by Under Secretary Dillon—whose name is being attached to the new era—in his New York speech, in which he emphasized that the West is determined to stand firm on Germany and Berlin but also stressed that this alone is not enough. Our "program of victory," he declared, must include both our own sustained economic growth and a victory over desperate proverty everywhere to show that freedom works better than Communist slavery.

To that end the new organization is to advance both free-world economy and free-world trade on a liberal, multilateral and nondiscriminatory basis to provide high levels of employment without inflation, and at the same time bridge the gap between the two European economic blocs now in danger of a trade war. To the same end it is to enlist now prosperous European nations in a cordinated move to supply development capital to the economically less advanced areas.

The aim is to provide such capital mainly by loans, both "hard" and "soft," to stimulate industrial development and to enable the peasant to own his land and keep him free from being reduced to a serf in state-owned collectives, as in Soviet Russia, Communist China, East Germany, and now Cuba. The comparatively minor cuts in the House and Senate thus far in our own mutual security program indicate that Congress is fully aware of the challenge and how to meet it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

"A Milestone Measuring the Betterment of Human Relations," Is Topic of Address by Representative John M. Slack, Jr., at Mayor's Commission Anniversary Dinner, Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of the most significant events in recent West Virginia history occurred last night in the State's capital city, Charleston, where the first annual dinner meeting of the mayor's commission on human relations was held.

That important and helpful commission was created by the late Mayor John T. Copenhaver in an executive order signed June 7, 1959. Under this commission the late Mayor Copenhaver envisioned a better city wherein all its citizens might live in harmony and brotherhood, enjoying the fruits of citizenship without regard to race, creed, or national origin.

More than 40 civic, business, and professional, and religious organizations are cosponsors of the Commission on Human Relations in Charleston, and its officers and members are L. Leo Kohlbecker, chairman; Dr. James H. Walker, vice chairman; Mrs. Irenee May, secretary; John D. Smallridge, treasurer; and Willard Brown, G. E. Ferguson, Mrs. Andrew Gardner, Dewey E. S. Kuhns, William L. Lonesome, Rev. Moses Newsome, Miles C. Stanley, A. S. Thomas, Jr., Rabbi Samuel Volkman, and Houston G. Young, members.

Master of ceremonies for the April 26, 1960 event, held in Charleston's spacious civic center, was Mayor John A. Shanklin, assisted by the chairman of the commission, Mr. Kohlbecker. The invocation was by Rev. F. Elwyn Peace, President of the Charleston Ministerial Association; the prayer of the evening was by Very Rev. Claude Vogel, O.F.M.; and the benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Samuel Volkman, D.D., of the Virginia Street Temple.

Principal guest speaker for the occasion was the venerable statesman of the sports world, Branch Rickey, president of the Continental Baseball League, while other speakers included Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, Hon. John A. Field, Jr., U.S. district judge for the southern district of West Virginia, and Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., of the Sixth West Virginia District. The senior Senator from West Virginia likewise was privileged to be a guest of the commission and a participant.

Mr. Rickey, the baseball executive who first sponsored a member of the Negro race as a player in organized professional baseball, still aggressive and mentally alert at the advanced age of 79 years, spoke strongly against prejudice and expressed the belief that three major forces are working against it; namely, proximity, as exemplified by Jackie Robinson's short 6 months of proximity as a minor league player before becoming a major league regular; second, individual accomplishments by members of minority groups; and the third, religion.

Governor Underwood expressed the hope that the commission's first annual dinner meeting would be repeated each year as an event to which the people of Charleston, Kanawha County, and West Virginia would look forward with pride and satisfaction.

Judge Field spoke of the paradox inherent in the fact that a meeting is held to discuss the rights of minority groups even though it is so historically well documented that such groups have made great contributions to America.

Mayor Shanklin gave public expression to his appreciation for the accomplishments of the commission and gave assurance that its members have his wholehearted support for the manner in which they have approached the problem of how to engender good human relations.

Representative SLACK, a native of Charleston and the Member of Congress from the district which includes Charleston and Kanawha County, likewise presented enlightened remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks the text of the well-considered speech by my capable colleague, Representative SLACK.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MILESTONE MEASURING THE BETTERMENT OF HUMAN RELATIONS

(Speech by Hon. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., a Representative from West Virginia, at first annual dinner meeting of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960)

This meeting of the mayor's commission on human relations comes at a critical point in our national history, and the work of this group carries a growing significance. In simple language, what you are trying to do is to establish greater mutual understanding and trust among several population elements of this community * * * to establish it by friendly persuasion and personal example. Very few human undertakings are more important to the fulfillment of our national objectives today.

There are some relationships among human beings which simply cannot be created and maintained by law, or imposed from the top down. They must be initiated and allowed to grow strong and secure from the grassroots up—in all such relationships the key to success lies in work undertaken at the community level.

Most of us, I am sure, are familiar with the phrase "equal justice under law" which is carved in stone over the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court. That statement constitutes a guarantee of formal, legal justice for all Americans.

MORE THAN LEGAL JUSTICE

The privilege of full American citizenship, however, contemplates a gerat deal more than just legal justice. The American ideal, the way of life which has revitalized the thinking of all mankind since 1776, is based on political and social justice. When our Founding Fathers endorsed the famous statement: "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal * * * that they are endowed by their Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" they were not simply striking out at the tyranny of a king. They were sweeping aside in one tremendous statement of belief the 3,000 years of repression and accumulated tyranny which had distorted human relationships throughout the Old World. This was a New World, as Christopher Columbus had told his Queen and they were building on new ground, with a new set of guarantees based on new values for human beings.

As might be expected, there are persons who give only lipservice to the American ideal. They stand on the legal guarantee of "equal justice under law," and strike an attitude of tolerance toward those who would translate social and political guarantees into action. I say to you that tolerance is not enough. For example, organized religion is tolerated today in the Soviet Union. Tolerance alone is personified in the sneering answer of Cain to the voice of Almighty God. "Am I my brother's keeper?" asked Cain.

WE MUST BE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPERS

The cycle of history in which we move today supplies the answer to Cain. We must indeed be our brother's keepers. If we show no interest in our brother's problems, then there is another philosophy which will gladly take over our function—an alien philosophy, dedicated to suppression of all individual freedom, to atheism, to denial of all human values except those that serve the state. The international competition to convince the uncommitted millions of the world's population grows more fierce every year. We cannot win this competition in the long run unless our service to the full range of the American ideal is wholehearted and complete, and we are unified in our march across the pages of history.

Make no mistake about it the cold war may last a century or more because the price of a hot war is now too high to pay and if it does last a century, the determining factor in the choice of philosophies by hundreds of millions of human beings will not be pronouncements by our State Department or laws passed by the Congress.

It will be the tangible results of work at the community level, whereby it becomes known to all nations that an American of any kind or degree walks proudly down the streets of an American community, and bows to no man.

A few years ago the city of Little Rock became world famous for events which cast a long shadow on the American ideal. One day another American community will become equally famous for its leadership in

the realm of finding solutions to human problems that arise among neighbors. It could be the city of Charleston, through the work of this Commission. If such recognition should come to pass, I say to you that nothing would give me greater pride in my home city and the people I have known all my life.

A century ago Abraham Lincoln told us that our country was engaged in a struggle to determine whether or not we could survive half slave and half free. Today that struggle has been expanded to a worldwide competition. For we are in a new era of empire building, and we must outclass the Soviet system before the eyes of the entire world, not only in economic efficiency and in the race through outer space, but in the creation of ever newer and stronger guarantees of human equality for our citizens.

COMMISSION'S TASK NOT EASY

The members of this Commission do not have an easy task, but when you meet difficulties, you may find some comfort in the thought that your obstacles were anticipated almost 200 years ago. Speaking of American liberties, Thomas Jefferson wrote what must be the most violent statement ever recorded by a famous American.

These are the words of Jefferson:

"What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, to pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

These were the convictions of a man whoes leadership pointed our young country toward realization of what had been only a dream for centuries—government of the people, by the people and for the people. Today we believe it is possible to settle our domestic problems without bloodshed. Yet, we must not forget that tyranny is always waiting offstage in one form or another, waiting its cue to enter and offer its solution to cure injustices.

Only eternal vigilance and fearless leadership can ward off tyranny, whether at the national or local level, and no matter whether the issue be economic, social, or political. The work of this Commission, then, contributes to the strength and stature of our community, our State and our Nation.

I join you with great pride in marking your first anniversary. I extend to you my warmest felicitations, and I look forward to the coming years with full confidence that your efforts will one day be recognized as a milestone measuring the betterment of relationships among all residents of this community, no matter what their race, color, or creed.

I thank you.

Senator Randolph Delivers Forthright Address at Charleston, W. Va., on First Anniversary of Commission on Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a most eloquent and significant address by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] on the subject of human relations deserves the attention of the entire Senate. The occasion for the remarks of our able colleague was the first annual dinner of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, at Charleston, W. Va., April 26.

As Senator RANDOLPH pointed out, the people of Charleston and their political leaders deserve the acclaim of thoughtful citizens everywhere for their endeavor to advance the values of citizenship and to establish a more just and equitable basis for human relations.

The notable event was honored also by the presence of Branch Rickey, president of the new Continental Baseball League, and the man who broke down the racial barriers in the major leagues with the signing of Jackie Robinson for the then Brooklyn Dodgers. Mr. Rickey described Senator RANDOLPH'S speech as an appealing and vigorous advocacy of human rights.

Because of its timeliness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech by Senator RANDOLPH.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE FIRST ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS, CHARLESTON CIVIC CENTER, CHARLESTON, W. VA., APRIL 26, 1960

Governor Underwood, Representative Slack, Judge Field, Mayor Shanklin, and our honor guest speaker, Branch Rickey, members of the mayor's commission on human relations and ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to join with the citizens and leaders of Charleston in this endeavor to advance the values of citizenship and to establish a more just and equitable basis for human relations.

As you know, during much of the present session of Congress, a number of my colleagues and I have been engaged on another front of this common endeavor, our task being to strengthen the guarantees of certain fundamental rights. I had hoped that we might have done more. These two separate but interdependent aspects—the preservation of civil rights and the betterment of human relations—embody two centrol questions which our era presents for answer.

The first of these, expressed in part in the term "civil rights," is how to govern in a radically new world in which distance is no longer measured by a man's walking, nor time by a man's sleeping and waking. The other is how to teach men to live in this new world which is rich with novel possibilities of both creation and destruction.

BARRIERS OF TIME AND SPACE GONE

The old barriers of time and space have been torn away. The problem is no longer a local, a regional, nor even a national one. Therefore, the work that you have done and are doing in Charleston is a significant part of the larger struggle to give substance to American ideals, and to extend these ideals to the reach of people everywhere. And, just as we have learned that there will be no neutrals in the next war—if there is to be another major conflict—we have learned also that there can be no neutrals in the continuing efforts of citizens to achieve the full humanity of man.

We are often inclined to view the question of human relations in terms of a greater need for mutual respect and the need for tolerance of racial or religious or cultural diversity. But forbearance too often means mere toleration, and at best it is sometimes but a passive and a negative status. Nor does the quality of tolerance solve the moral problem confronting the understanding man when he is faced with riotous intolerence and rampant brutality.

Toleration, I believe, is not enough.

Again, we are often inclined to address the issue of human relations in terms of better group understanding. But the problem of human relations is not that of the relations of men and women as members of a group or a religious belief, but as individuals.

If a man is hurt or wounded, he is pained and he bleeds as an individual human being, not as a member of a group.

The quality of human relations is often no better between members of the same racial, religious, or cultural group than it is between members of different groups, and for the same reason.

ISSUES ARE NOT OF COLLECTIVE CONFLICT

Today the issues joined in the advancement of human relations are not those of collective conflict, but of friction between the fundamental ideas that men have about man. The overall divisions within the world have always been based upon the ideas and ideals for which men will live and die. And the great wars of the civilized world have been fought, first, over the ideas and aspirations of the church and, later, over the ideas and aspirations of the national state.

The challenge of our time is not wholly concerned with our ideas of the church nor of the national state, but about our belief in man. And this is the area where the problems of human rights and human relations are joined—where the arts of government and education are tested. or this is a struggle not only between nations, but within nations, within communities, and often even within the heart of the single individual.

To paraphrase one of America's leading poets, it is necessary to believe in man, not only as the Christians and Jews believe in man—out of love—but also as the Greeks believe in man—out of pride.

WHAT MAN IS NOW IMPORTANT

The objective viewpoint is that of believing not only in what man may become in this life or another, but in what he is now; in his fundamental worth and dignity and in the place he occupies in this world.

It is the lack of faith in the essential value of man that corrupts and weakens democracy.

It is doubt in the worth and dignity of man that opens the way to tyranny.

And it is contempt for man that causes subjugation and slavery.

Thus, the question of human relations is not primarily an issue of race relations or group relations, but, rather, is a question of the response we make to the proposition that man, merely because he is the child of our Creator, has a fundamental worth and value. Today this proposition, unfortunately, is questioned or qualified by some in the United States largely in terms of race or in terms of religion.

But this has not always been so. In times past, it was qualified by some in relation to one's national origin—Irish, Italian, Polish, et cetera—or whichever was the most recent immigrant group. Earlier, the qualification had reference to the form of worship which one professed. Roger Williams, history will verify, removed himself to the wilderness of Rhode Island in order freely to assert the fundamental right of every man to his own form of worship.

The history of the American ideal has thus been to advance the fundamental belief that man—as man—is a creature of worth and dignity and that all men—as men—partake of these qualities.

The essential human characteristics which we cherish are in all men and women, and

we can no more create an aristocracy of human dignity than we can create an aristocracy of human love or human imagination or any of the other essential human characteristics.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, the challenge of bettering human relations is one of instilling in our hearts a renewed belief in the humanness of all mankind.

Distinguished Service Award to Hon. A. L. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, with real personal pleasure I am happy to report to my colleagues that the Department of the Interior has just recently given splendid and richly deserved recognition of a long and outstanding career of public service compiled by a former Member of the House of Representatives.

For 16 years Dr. A. L. Miller ably represented the Fourth Congressional District of my home State of Nebraska. He is now serving with distinction in a difficult and challenging assignment as Director of the Office of Saline Water. In well-deserved recognition of his leadership, example, and administrative accomplishments to successfully expedite and accelerate this vital program, he has received Interior's highest honor, its Distinguished Service Award.

I know that all the Members of the House of Representatives, his many friends and acquaintances, join with me in congratulating Dr. Miller.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the citation which accompanied the award:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE—ARTHUR L. MILLER

In recognition of more than 20 years of public service, and for outstanding administrative accomplishments as Director of the Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior.

Dr. Miller was appointed Director of the Office of Saline Water in February 1959. In this position he is directing, under the supervision of the Secretary, a vitally important research and demonstration plant program for the development of low-cost processes for converting saline water, both sea and brackish, to fresh water. Through his leadership he provided the program with a new sense of purpose and direction, accelerated the pace of research and development, instilled enthusiasm among the staff, obtained the cooperation of public and private organizations, and created an improved understanding and appreciation for the program objectives in the public mind. Dr. Miller streamlined the administrative procedures for the program and effected a reorganization of the Office to carry on the basic research program and meet the demands of the recently enacted demonstration plant phase of operations. On the basis of his recommendation, the selection of processes for saline water conversion demonstration plants was completed by the Secretary ahead of a severe schedule set forth by the Congress in the authorizing legislation. Site selections have also been accelerated under conditions of utmost priority and widespread competition among the States and communities. Dr. Miller was instrumental in obtaining cooperative agreements with several States and concluded an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for a joint nuclear reactor-saline water conversion project. Prior to his appointment as Director, he served with the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature, and as the Nebraska State health director. On November 3, 1942, Dr. Miller was elected to the 78th Congress of the United States and was reelected for seven additional terms. He served on the Public Lands Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House. In recognition of his splendid contributions to the Office of Saline Water and to the Department of the Interior through his leadership, example, and enthusiasm, Dr. Miller is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Navy Subchaser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there have been many great stories written about the heroic exploits of the U.S. Navy in World War II. Now a new book has been added to that lengthy list. In my opinion, it is one of the greatest.

This book was written by William Edward Syers, a very good friend, a great Texan and a true citizen.

As a former executive officer of a subchaser, Ed Syers has written of things he knows and loves—ships and the sea and the U.S. Navy. Specifically, he has brought to the reader in vivid words an unforgettable picture of life in combat aboard a World War II subchaser.

In recognition of this book's assuming its rightful place among the great publications chronicling the history of World War II, I ask unanimous consent that a review of the book, "The 'Seven': Navy Subchaser," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "SEVEN": NAVY SUBCHASER

(By Don MacCracken)

This is the story of the World War II navy subchasers and the men who manned them, an almost forgotten breed, according to the author, William Edward Syers. Mr. Syers has combined experiences, some personal and some secondhand, to come up with an honest, interesting, highly readable and oftentimes exciting yarn.

The story line concerns Lt. (jg.) Samuel D. Chance, who leaves his family to become the executive officer of a subchaser, shortly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. His first assignment is in the Caribbean and subsequent assignments take him, the crew, and the ship, to and beyond Pearl Harbor and through hurricanes, U-boats and a fight to the finish with the Japanese on a Pacific atoll.

The people and their emotions are real and, for the most part, the incidents are recorded in actual accounts of the war.

It is during the episode with the Japanese in the Pacific that the book reaches its peak in excitement and suspense. Although humorous incidents help ease the tension, anyone who has read a book or seen a movie of this type will find Mr. Syers' descriptions just a little more realistic and exciting than any of the others.

A pursued Japanese submarine seeks refuge in a lagoon, the *Seven*, trying to kill her, runs aground. There are Japanese troops on both sides of the narrow inlet, armed with mortars. In the still of the night, after the crew of the chaser have jettisoned everything, including most of their fuel, in order to lighten the ship, the Japs begin to sneak out in small boats and canoes. The unorthodox methods used by the crew to repel the invaders as they begin to board the ship is an example of truth being stranger than fiction.

Not necessary to this story of men fighting a common enemy, the sea, while trying to destroy each other, is the standard "other woman" gambit. The romance seems mechanical; indeed it is the only part that reads like fiction. Hasn't Sam Chance enough to worry about without a beautiful woman, not his wife, who chases him from New Orleans to Honolulu, thus depriving him of "a woman in every port"? This episode, unfortunately, has become a cliche in Navy books. The book could well get along without the tragic love affair. But when Hollywood buys it for the movies, and it probably will, canned romance becomes a necessity.

In summing up: a good, honest book about a little-known part of the Navy. Highly readable with plenty of excitement toward the end. Mr. Syers is proud of the Navy subchasers he knows so well—and he doesn't hesitate to reveal this in his writing. Tends to make you proud of them too.

America's Rendezvous With Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a fine young man from Eveleth, Minn., Patrick McDonough, delivered an excellent address entitled, "Our Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution" to take first prize in the region 9 contest of the 1960 American Legion high school oratorical competition.

This is sharp competition and to be the winner is an honor. We are very proud of Patrick McDonough and I respectfully suggest that my colleagues read this fine speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this prize-winning speech be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Patrick McDonough, Eveleth, Minn.)

"To some generations, much is given. From some generations, much is expected.

This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

These stirring words by Franklin Delano Roosevelt were not spoken of our generations. They were spoken of our fathers, many of whom fought, and some of whom died, to preserve the rights and privileges given to us in our Constitution.

But they might have been said of us, not because we shall be called upon to die on foreign soil, we earnestly pray that that will not be true, but because we have a responsibility toward our Constitution, as grave and as important as any that our fathers faced.

Most of us know the rights granted to us under our Constitution. We learn them in every history and civics class. We see them demonstrated as free people go to vote. Our forefathers were very generous in delegating and very careful in protecting the rights of American citizens of all time. These are the privileges given to us. But, along with these rights and privileges goes another quality, the quality of responsibility toward the Constitution and all that the Constitution represents.

It is a sad thing that many of us ignore or neglect these responsibilities. And the worst thing about that indictment is that it is not only the professedly bad citizen who is guilty of it. It is millions of our good and respected citizens. It is all of us who neglect to vote, or to take interest in the affairs of our community, our State, and our Country.

In a Democracy, people get exactly the type of government they demand. If we take no interest, if we demand no pledge of integrity from our candidates, no proof that these candidates love, respect, and hold up the ideals of the Constitution, we stand in danger of forfeiting the rights which our forefathers willed to us.

If, on the other hand, we demand from our public officials honesty and love of our country with its guiding document, we will get just that. To make these demands is one of our responsibilities to our Constitution. But this responsibility, shared by voters, has to be taught and learned. It has to be taught to future citizens while they are in the impressionable stage. It has to be learned at home.

I believe that most of our high school citizens fully intend to live up to our responsibilities as future adult men and women. We're burning with desire to cast our votes in the way which to us best aids our Government. It is only after we become mature men and women that this desire may lessen and pall, as it has lessened and palled for our elders. We hope this will never be true, but, unless school and home and the high school citizens, themselves, understand and respect the Constitution, there is danger.

Let me give some examples of this danger. In 1959, 350,000 students in high schools throughout the United States indicated by long, strenuous hours of work that they believed in our Constitution, that they cherished its rights and accepted its responsibilities. But, occasionally, someone came up with a very different idea than the 350,000. For instance, a boy of our community walked into the same high school classroom in which I prepared this talk, with the same purpose in mind, that is, a speech on the Constitution of the United States.

As I have indicated, his idea was different, however. He thought that the Constitution of the United States had outlived its usefulness, that it was old-fashioned, outmoded, and should be abolished. It was his idea that there was nothing in the Constitution of value to the modern world. It was his idea that a new order should replace the ideals of our Constitution.

When the instructor showed some amazement at his attitude, and said, "Why, Bob, you don't mean that you'd like to see our Constitution abolished, do you?" he answered with a sneer, "If you want someone to praise this 150-year-old antique, you'll have to get yourself another boy."

Bob did not realize that in answering as he did he was practicing one of the basic rights given him under the very document at which he was sneering, the right of free speech. He did not stop to think what would have happened to him had he dared to express himself in such a way under the ideology he was upholding. He did not understand that he was using the right given to him by the careful framers of the Constitution to try to destroy the very source from which the right came. He did not analyze the fact that he was accepting the privilege but rejecting the responsibility to protect that right and to pass it on to future generations.

Now, since Bob had been subjected to the same education as the rest of the 350,000 of us, it would seem that there must have been something about his home environment which did not teach respect for our Constitution and our way of life.

In the Soviet Union, we find democracy and liberty sneered at in school; perhaps, in the secret of the home, some parents may teach their children to strike for freedom, if the opportunity ever comes. In the United States of America we find democracy and liberty taught in school; perhaps, in the secret of some homes, parents may teach their children to strike at the Constitution, if the opportunity ever comes. We must constantly be on the alert for this danger.

Then there are others of us whose defiance does not run as deep as to threaten the Constitution, but who defy it, nonetheless—we Bobs who demand so many rights in school and accept none of the responsibilities. "You can't prove I did it. And, as long as you can't prove it, you can't do anything to me. I know my rights."

This, in the student's way, is hiding behind the privileges granted in our Constitution: "A man is innocent until he is proved guilty."

And it is not only students who do this. We are all well aware of the abuses of the Bill of Rights practiced by criminals and acknowledged Communists. "I will not answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me. I invoke the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States." The situation has gone to such lengths that even the comic strips are trying to point out the dangers. The criminal, or the acknowledged Communist, of course, will not change. But, perhaps, the Bobs of our high schools will, if their understanding is deepened.

Then there are other "Bobs" among us, we "Bobs" who cause so much useless slaughter on the highways, and when the law comes toward us, claim our "rights as juveniles," never thinking of our responsibilities as law-abiding minors. There are the "Bobs" among us who destroy property and call it a boyish prank.

In contrast to the Bobs among us, let's discuss for a moment or two the Joes among us. Joe has graduated from high school just a few months ago, and is serving the U.S. Army in Korea. It's pretty miserable in Korea during this time of year. While we sit at home watching the late show, Joe may be standing guard duty in the bitterly cold Korean night. And just who is he guarding?

That which meets the eye certainly isn't very impressive: a foxhole, made just a little more comfortable by 6½ years of post-truce occupation, one of those craggy Korean ridges which seem to disappear into a mire of rice paddies. This is what we see with a young American soldier taking the responsibility of defending it.

But there are some things we don't see. Somewhere on those frozen paddies is another sentry. He is watching, too. He is watching Joe—watching for Joe to show some sign of inattention, of drowsiness, watching and waiting for a chance to kill. For although the fighting in Korea has stalemated, the war is far from over.

Why is Joe engaged in this silent duel of death?

His mother will give you a very realistic reason: "He was drafted." His commanding officer will tell you it's because we must not lose another yard of free world soil. Joe, himself, may dismiss the whole question by saying it was his turn for duty.

In their various ways, all of these people, Joe's mother, Joe's commanding officer, and Joe, himself, are saying the same thing: "We must take seriously our obligation of responsibility toward our Constitution and its guaarntee of liberty and justice for all."

Is the vast majority among our generation going to "Bobs" or are we going to be "Joes"? If we are going to be "Bobs," then somehow our home environment is wrong, our high schools are failing, our churches are not meeting their challenge; we are heading for complete terrorism.

But I believe that most of us are "Joes" willing to stand guard in Korea or Lebanon or Quemoy.

And the "Joes" who are in the majority must convince the "Bobs" who are in the minority that we must assume our responsibility toward the Constitution as well as to demand our rights from it.

How can we do that?

Certainly, not by loud arguments. Surely, not by fist fights in the school halls. Such tactics would only make irresponsibility and resentment worse.

We must prove it by becoming the leaders rather than the followers. We must prove it by being examples of living resistance to the ideas of the irresponsible. We must prove it by making irresponsibility socially unacceptable.

Yes, the fight for the principles of our Constitution goes on everywhere—in school and outside of school—all the time. It will continue to go on, abroad and at home, for it will be fought not by force of arms but by example and conviction.

Our example and our conviction will not be wasted, if they are zealous enough. For, if our example is good enough and our conviction strong enough, the thought will grow and develop in the minds of the "Bobs" among us.

Once the idea is there, it can never be driven out, not by evil propaganda, not by tyranny, not by the threat of oppression. For no good principle can ever be killed by force. No worthy and honest ideal can ever be murdered. The truth of this was demonstrated by the cold, hungry army at Valley Forge who inched forward on their bare and bleeding feet toward the goal of liberty. It was proved by young Nathan Hale, who, at 19, said, "My only regret is that I have but one life to give for my country."

It was attested by by the fervor of the French underground. These brave people believed in the same principles of liberty which our Constitution gives us; they felt their responsibilities toward those principles; and they were ready to fight for them. Even when they were cold and hungry and hunted, they were ready to fight for them. Even when their members were caught and executed, their ideals lived on.

I do not believe that America will ever need to decline if we, America's high school people, are "Joes" instead of "Bobs." That is, and must remain, the great challenge of American youth.

The Founding Fathers believed that "Bob" had the right to freedom of speech. For him and for all of us they made the Constitution a living, vital document, ready to serve the needs of liberty. But, they also believed that "Bob" must accept his honest role, along with "Joe," in defending and improving our heritage.

The whole world is watching the two ideologies, watching as that sentry watches "Joe"—watching for some sign of inattention on "Joe's" part that may give "Bob" his unthinking way. "Bob" must not destroy this 150-year-old antique.

Let them not find that sign of inattention. "Joe" defends our Constitution abroad. We must defend it at home and in school. We must defend it against irresponsibility. We must defend its rights.

"This generation has a rendezvous with destiny." The destiny is now. The rendezvous is important. The generation is ours.

The Air Force Manual

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that—

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,

As you can see from this, one of the fundamental principles of the U.S. Government is freedom of religion, without interference of the State.

I would like to add a few comments on this issue of the manuals. Reserve personnel have access to the same news media that all other citizens have access to and are quite capable, I believe, of making up their own minds concerning the validity of any statement which they may hear from the pulpits of churches which they may attend.

I am sorry that the issue was ever raised and am proud to state that the leaders of the National Council of Churches that I have known have been fine exemplary men. I am glad that the Air Force Manual in question has been withdrawn.

At this point I would like to include the letter of the executive secretary of the Iowa Council of Churches, Mr. J .O. Nelson, a letter from James P. Gable, district superintendent of the North Iowa Conference of the Methodist Church, and a letter from the Reverend Thomas Applebee, of the Community Congregational Church, Manchester, Iowa:

IOWA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 12, 1960.

Representative L. G. WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: My purpose in writing is to urge you to do all in your power to help keep the American pulpit a free pulpit and that the Government cease to print, publish, and distribute unvalidated material that reflects against the pulpit and the clergy. I refer more particularly to the recent Air Force manual in which statements occurred slandering the clergy by calling many of them Communists. To refresh your mind look at pages 15 to 20 of the student text, Air Reserve Center Training Manual, NR 45–0050, Incr. V, volume 7, "Reserve Noncommissioned Officers Course."

I have a profound sense of outrage at the inclusion in the above-mentioned manual of discredited and absurd attacks upon the American churches and religious institutions, and especially the National Council of Churches.

If this incident can lead us to a sound procedure of promoting free speech and free asembly in our country perhaps this type of un-Americanism (guilt by association), will come to an end. I sincerely hope and pray you will take the time to understand these matters and serve the people of Iowa making it possible for all pulpits to be free to preach liberty and truth for the truth shall make us free.

Very sincerely yours,
J. O. NELSON,
Executive Secretary.

NORTH IOWA CONFERENCE,
DUBUQUE DISTRICT,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Oelwein, Iowa, March 26, 1960.

Hon. LEONARD G. WOLF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: I just want to join my voice and pen with those of thousands of others in protesting the rank injustice of those ill-founded and entirely unsupported statements of that recently withdrawn Air Force manual which insisted that the American clergy, and the National Council of Churches especially, was infiltrated by communism.

We do not deny that some of the clergy may have been as faithless as have other scattered individuals in all other walks of life, both military and civilian, but I do protest the sweeping assertion, entirely without factual evidence and proof, of the manual to which I refer.

It is difficult to do much now to compensate for damage done, but we shall expect men like yourself to make it clear that, in the future, any and all who are guilty of such an offense must themselves be on trial.

With best wishes to you, I am,
Cordially yours,
JAMES P. GABLE.

COMMUNITY CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Manchester, Iowa, March 31, 1960.

The Honorable LEONARD WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: I regret the malicious damage done by such groups as our Iowa DAR, the Air Force manual people, and others who slander all Christian churches when they allege that percentages of ministers in those churches which belong to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America are disloyal or Communist sympathizers.

I think that the discerning public everywhere have long since come to recognize the kind of poison they put on their arrows and that the net result is not as great as some would imagine. Nonetheless, this irresponsible kind of criticism forces our churches to pay a heavy price of uncertainty about an issue, which at best merely clouds other issues.

If anyone seriously wishes to challenge the right of churches and churchmen to speak on public issues, he is certainly going against the great democratic traditions of our free country and denying the whole validity of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

Sincerely yours,
REV. W. THOMAS APPLEBEE.

Death of Leo W. Kirsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I was shocked recently, as were all citizens of Decatur, Ind., to learn of the death of my good friend, Leo W. Kirsch. Leo Kirsch was an outstanding man. At the time of his death he was serving as postmaster of Decatur.

Leo Kirsch always had time to devote to worthy causes. He was an active member and officer of several civic organizations, including the Rotary and the American Red Cross. He devoted a great deal of time and effort to his church. Leo Kirsch was only 56 years of age. The State of Indiana and the community of Decatur have lost one of their finest citizens. However, the finest memorial which we can give to any individual is the rememberance of his contributions to a community. Leo Kirsch needs no memorial made out of marble. His contributions were many and will be remembered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the editorial from the Decatur Daily Democrat, which tells of Leo Kirsch's work and expresses the loss which Decatur feels over his death.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEO W. KIRSCH

The sudden, tragic and untimely death of Decatur's beloved postmaster, Leo W. Kirsch, struck the people of Decatur Thursday night and left them mute in unbelief.

As numbers of people gathered on the street, passing the information from group to group, few could really believe that it was true. More than 1,000 telephone calls were registered on the Decatur Daily Democrat-Citizens telephone company news number, 3–2171, by people verifying the fact that they had heard.

Mr. Kirsch was the son of Peter and Sophia Mutschler Kirsch. The Kirches were early settlers in Adams County, and Peter Kirsch custommade some of the first automobiles ever built.

Leo Kirsch, in the nearly 56 years of his life, the past 20 as postmaster of Decatur, has accomplished a remarkable record of achievement.

As a member of the Zion Evangelical and Reformed Church, he has served on the board of trustees of Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio, been lay representative on the Michigan and Indiana synodical council several terms, a delegate to the general synod of the church representing Indiana and Michigan, and formerly served as choirmaster, while presently a member of the choir.

He was president of Rotary in the 1942–43 season, and has been song leader for many years.

Active in Red Cross for more than 25 years, Mr. Kirsch served in 1942 as disaster chairman, was cochairman of several fund campaigns, and was active on the fund-raising committees. At the present time his name

had been submitted as a candidate for National Red Cross Board membership.

Decatur is shocked and grieved at the sudden death of one of its most active friends. The community extends its sympathy to the bereaved family.

This We Believe—The Foreign Aid Issue of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine editorial on the subject of foreign aid which appeared in the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel on Monday, April 25, 1960. The editorial, "This We Believe," follows:

THIS WE BELIEVE—THE FOREIGN AID ISSUE OF 1960

Since the end of World War II the United States has distributed around the world some $75 billion in foreign aid. Government is not a charitable institution. It has no right to spend money of its citizens except on what they decide and agree is in their own interest. So any realistic appraisal of foreign aid must be on the basis of what the people of the United States are getting for their money.

The main immediate benefit is advantage in the cold war against communism. Gifts and loans help other nations build military and economic strength to resist Communist aggression—from without or within their own borders.

Some of the recipients of this aid are joined with us in military alliance. Some are not. We feel that military aid, even to these neutralist nations, is justified if it helps them maintain their independence. If they are not formally committed to our side, at least they are not against us, as would be the case if the Communists took over.

The bulk of present U.S. aid is military aid given to support Allied armed forces against Red threats. It obviously should cost the U.S. taxpayer far less to maintain a Korean soldier in Korea, ready to defend his own soil, than it would to use a U.S. soldier for the same purpose. The same is true for Formosa, for Vietnam, for Turkey and other menaced countries around the rim of the Communist empire.

Economic aid goes for a similar end. Properly used, it improves living standards and thus fortifies the will to survive plus establishing the local revenues for self-defense.

Aside from that, we are a Nation devoted to liberty and justice for all people. For idealistic reasons, as well as in our own self-interest, we should not begrudge a measure of aid to underdeveloped new countries. Even without the Communist menace we probably would be doing some of this work if only to avoid chaos which is bad for us, Red or not.

In short the News-Sentinel favors and always has favored, foreign aid. But that does not mean we favor, or think the country should tolerate, the careless squandering of tax money in the name of foreign aid—or for any other reason.

There obviously has been a great deal of loose spending in this field, and some of it has done actual harm, building up resentment against "ugly Americans" who ostentatiously inflict their bureaucratic ways on alien cultures.

To repeated criticisms, over the years, International Cooperation Administration which administers foreign aid has paid scant attention. Now, two committees of Congress have investigated in the field, made specific suggestions and demanded a cleanup.

This newspaper had something to do with exposing this waste and inefficiency. Now, we think that before the country turns in disgust from an essentially worthy program, Congress and the administration must act.

The voter, in our opinion, should pay close attention to the attitude of the candidates on this issue—the intelligence and conviction with which they discuss it. This should weigh heavily in his decisions as to which of them he will support.

Commemorative Stamp To Honor American Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 2, a special stamp to honor American womanhood will be issued by the Post Office Department. The issuance of this special stamp is, I believe, a most merited and long warranted effort.

We realize, of course, that, historically, women have been a moving force in our progress. However, the role of women continues to expand as they are making ever-greater constructive, creative contributions in almost all walks of life. Today, there are more than 63 million adult women in the United States. Over 25 million of them are mothers of schoolchildren of pre-school-age children. About 22.5 million women—one-third of the Nation's workers—are making outstanding contributions in a wide variety of fields as teachers, librarians, lawyers, doctors, business owners and managers, farmerettes and farm managers, clerical workers, service workers, sales workers, and many others.

As members of organizations, too, they not only are serving professional or working interests, but they also are promotiong civic, cultural, educational, and other programs essential to our progress. A number of these include the League of Women Voters, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and many other fine organizations.

Unfortunately, the door of opportunity is not always open. There still lingers a prejudice against the employment of women in some capacities, even though experience may have proved them capable of doing outstanding jobs. However, I believe the Nation cannot afford to overlook this fountainhead of talent, brainpower, ingenuity and strength and genius, as we face the ever-growing challenges of the future, which require us to utilize to the utmost our manpower and womanpower.

To provide a better climate of opportunity, I believe greater effort must be made to achieve the following objectives:

First. Further eradicate the prejudice against women; no longer confine their role to so-called women's work; rather, give them ever-wider opportunity.

Second. Assure equal pay for equal work.

Third. Encourage women themselves to move farther into new fields, including science, technology, engineering, geology, physics, meteorology, and many of the other areas once thought beyond the range of feminine activities.

Fourth. Conduct further studies to help resolve the problems arising in our society out of the dual role of mother-worker.

Fifth. Encourage women's organizations to further expand efforts to improve our educational, cultural, and civic climates. As workers in such vineyards, these organizations can make ever-greater contributions in educating our people about their duties as citizens, including the responsibility of voting; in mobilizing community thinking and resources to support better schools, libraries, and public services; in utilizing their strength as organizations to inspire interest in cultural activities for the community; and in other constructive projects.

As we face the ever-growing challenges of the future, we can expect that the Nation will require, and must provide, real opportunities for the ever-expanding abilities, creativeness, and brainpower which the American woman can bring to our national life.

At this time I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles—an article entitled "Issue Stamp To Honor 'The American Woman,'" from the Milwaukee Journal of April 24, and an article entitled "Magazine Salutes Local Library Head," from the La Crosse Sunday Tribune. The latter article refers to the exemplary way in which Miss Gertrude Thurow, La Crosse's librarian, symbolizes the "new woman" in American life.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Apr. 24, 1960]

ISSUE STAMP TO HONOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN

American women will be honored by the issuance of a 4-cent stamp June 2.

According to Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell and Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, the stamp is to pay tribute to American women, who contribute so much to the home and to the community as well as the business and professional world.

Postmaster General Summerfield continued: "The accomplishments of women of the United States are not only of interest

,to our country but to the women of all nations who are achieving more acceptance in the social, economic and political life of their countries.

"There are more than 63 million adult women in the United States, and more than 25 million of them are mothers of children of preschool and school age. The more than 22 million working women make up more than a third of all workers in the country."

ANNIVERSARY NOTED

The stamp will be issued to coincide with the anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau. Robert Sivard, chief of the exhibits division, U.S. Information Agency, designed the stamp.

In the center of the stamp, against a plain background, is a sketch of a mother and a young girl with an open book before them, symbolizing women in the home. This sketch gives the appearance of being loosely pasted against a solid background. Across the top, in white Roman letters, are the words "The American Woman."

Five niches appear at the sides and bottom. Three denote contributions of women to the greatness of this Nation. To the left, in the upper portion, is a niche designated as civic affairs, featuring a building symbolizing women's voluntary organizations. There are an estimated 20 million women affiliated with 600 organizations.

PROFESSIONS HONORED

In the lower left, in another niche, denoting education, are an academic cap, a hanging diploma and books; recognizing in part the 1¼ million teachers, the principals and others in this sphere.

In the upper right, in the higher niche, indicative of arts and industry are a caduceus representing roughly a half million nurses, the skilled women doctors and medical researchers, the masks of the drama and a violin, a microscope denoting women in science and a large plant building recognizing women in industry and related positions held by women.

The denomination "4" is located in the fourth panel, to the lower right, and the wording "U.S. postage" in the final panel in the bottom center.

A total of 120 million of these stamps have been ordered in a color to be announced.

MAY SEND FOR STAMP

Collectors desiring first day cancellations of the 4-cent American woman commemorative stamp may send addressed envelopes, together with remittance to cover the cost of the stamps to be affixed, to the Postmaster, Washington 13, D.C. A close-fitting enclosure of postal card thickness should be placed in each envelope and the flap either turned in or sealed.

Envelopes submited should be of ordinary letter size and each must be properly addressed. An envelope must not be sent for the return of first-day covers and orders for covers must not include requests for uncanceled stamps. The outside envelope to the postmaster should be endorsed "first-day covers 4-cent American woman stamp."

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Sunday Tribune, Apr. 17, 1960]

MAGAZINE SALUTES LOCAL LIBRARY HEAD

"Careers Unlimited" in the April issue of National Business Woman gives this month's salute to the librarian of La Crosse Public Library, Gertrude R. Thurow. The magazine is the organ of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

The article's high point is that the La Crosse library and its two branches live right up to their name, "public."

To quote:

"Anyone who thinks libraries are dusty old mausoleums full of yellowing volumes no one bothers to read has never been to the three La Crosse, Wis., public libraries where Gertrude R. Thurow has quietly reigned as chief librarian since 1953. They reflect her basic philosophy that a library must extend its services 'beyond the walls of the library building and out into the community.'

"Her influence has been felt not only locally and in the State but at the national level as well. Because of Miss Thurow's active concern with young people, she has been appointed by the governor to work on the golden anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth in Washington, D.C., called by President Eisenhower this year. She has previously worked on three Wisconsin Governors' Committees on Children and Youth."

The article tells further that Miss Thurow has been president of the American Library Association, and in 1959 conducted a conference session on the aging at the national convention in Washington, D.C. "Outstanding contributions to understanding through books for the aged have been made by her. A bibliography, The Best Is Yet To Be, compiled for La Crosse Library use, was listed in Aging, a publication of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has been recently presented to the State Board of Wisconsin Business and Professional Women's Federation for possible reprinting and distribution to Wisconsin BPW members."

The Wisconsin Federation cosponsored with nearly 50 other State organizations, two Governors' Conferences on the Aging Population and is now preparing the third. Miss Thurow has been active in these in addition to establishing a Committee on Aging when she was president of the Wisconsin Library Association.

As the article states, Miss Thurow "feels libraries should not be hushed and dusty monuments, but live places where people find ideas, meet and formulate action" and she really lived up to her reputation when La Crosse's only TV station came into being 4 years ago. "Miss Thurow invited station officials and engineers, the Long Lines division of the telephone company and the press, to present a public program in the main library. They explained how the station would function and serve the community, and answered questions from enthusiastic townspeople. This program later won a 'John Cotton Dana Publicity Award' from the American Library Association."

The librarian's counties contacts, by which she extends the library's service, are noted further in the magazine article:

"Miss Thurow keeps her community informed of new books and interesting library events each Saturday morning on her radio program, 'Your Library Speaks.' A meeting of minds is encouraged through adult discussion groups in the library such as the one on Great Books, and others like American Heritage, and the very popular Civil War Round Table.

"This exchange of ideas for mutual understanding and informed action using the wealth that is in their libraries is one of Miss Thurow's guiding purposes.

"Miss Thurow has neglected no part of her community. Her discussion groups and community programs are nationally acclaimed as teaching examples in a chapter in Eleanor Phinney's book, 'Library Adult Education in Action,' which is used as a textbook in library schools. She has been secretary of the Adult Education Section of the American Library Association, and is now president of the Wisconsin Library Film Circuit, Inc. She is affiliated with the Adult Education Association, has been a member of the Wisconsin Governor's Committee for the White House Conference on Adult Education, and has worked closely with the Wisconsin Commission on Human Rights.

"One of her personal interests is the preservation of historical sites and she has served as a board member of the La Crosse County Historical Society and belongs to the Wisconsin State Historical Society. The La Crosse Library is a U.S. Government Document Depository.

"Because her qualities of leadership and dedication have been felt on city, State, and national levels, Miss Thurow was designated 'Wisconsin Librarian of the Year' and presented a citation and bronze placque at the 1959 annual banquet closing the State conference of the Wisconsin Library Association at the University of Wisconsin in Madison."

Alleged Burial of Certain Surplus Equipment and Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, some time ago there was considerable comment in the Washington and other papers concerning the alleged burial of certain surplus equipment and material at an isolated base in northern Canada. Because of the nature of the criticism in the press I asked the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—Hon. Perkins McGuire, to give me the full facts with respect to this incident. I think it only fair that everyone interested in this matter read the full explanation which I insert herewith:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1960.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This is in further reply to your letter of March 23 relative to the article which appeared in the Washington Post of March 19 quoting Mr. Wren with respect to the alleged burial of certain surplus equipment and materials at an isolated base in northern Canada.

As you may know, the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation (CADC), an agency of the Canadian Government, disposes of all surplus property in Canada which is generated by that government. Early in 1950 when U.S. military bases in Canada also began to generate and dispose of their surplus property, the Canadian Government approached our Department of State to arrange for agreements whereby all sales of surplus property in Canada would be effected through the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation. Subsequent negotiations resulted in the arrangement being formalized through an exchange of diplomatic notes during April 1951. Since then, all our surplus property in Canada which otherwise would have been offered for sale by U.S. military bases there, has been referred to CADC for sale by the corporation.

The newspaper article in question is silent on the basic facts and therefore is extremely misleading and erroneous. It would lead one to believe that good usable property was being disposed of in the manner indicated. Actually, the property in question consisted of scrap materials, possibly still identifiable as basic items but in a condition so as to have potential value only for use as scrap. In his statement, Mr. Wren failed to state that the items were in scrap condition. Even though he stated that he knew of no reason for the form of disposition as alleged,

he needed only to contact an agency of his own government for the facts.

This scrap material was formally referred to the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation on September 7, 1956 and accepted for sale by CADC on September 24 1956. The property was offered for sale and purchased by Harry Freeman and Co. of North Bay, Ontario. However, CADC canceled the sale on June 19, 1958 because of failure of the purchaser to pay the balance due and to remove the property. Subsequently, it was reoffered for sale and purchased by a Mr. Cecil Creco of North Bay, Ontario. This sale also was canceled by CADC on February 12, 1959 and again the reason was the same. In both instances, the purchasers forfeited their monetary deposits.

The formal disposal agreement referred to above provides that any property which cannot be sold by the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation will be referred back to the U.S. military base for other authorized means of disposal. By letter dated February 16, 1959, the CADC authorized the destruction of this property. Most of the property was destroyed on May 7, 1959 and the remainder which consisted of scrap wood was burned on August 21, 1959. Again the article is misleading in that it infers current or recent action whereas the property was destroyed during May and August of 1959. We feel that the expense to remove this property from its location must have exceeded the expected market return since both purchasers elected to forfeit their monetary deposits rather than incur additional expense to remove the property.

It is most unfortunate that the statements by Mr. Wren reflected so unfavorably on actions by our military forces. After reviewing the facts in light of all the circumstances involved, I feel that the destruction of this particular property was entirely justified and in accord with our policy. I feel also that it met the criteria for destruction as contained in section 402 of the Federal Property Act. However, if you have any further questions or desire any other information in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP LEBOUTILLIER, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

The Needs of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, how to assist our elderly in meeting their often times high medical expenses is a vexing problem of long standing. It is a problem which must be faced.

I have not at this time taken an inflexible position on any one particular plan. The appropriate congressional committees are thoroughly studying the various proposals and I am sure a constructive program will be presented.

Recently I sent a press report to the newspapers of my State commenting on many of the proposals before Congress directed toward aiding the elderly. The Charleston (Mo.) Enterprise-Courier printed an editorial challenging the validity of cost estimates for the Forand bill. I replied to the editorial and the editor of the Enterprise-Courier, Art Wallhausen, then wrote and printed a letter in reply to mine. I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate portion of my press report, the editorial "We Challenge a Senator," my letter to the editor and his letter in response be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so they will be available to other Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEEDS OF THE ELDERLY

(By Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.)

Americans are living longer and, as each year is added to the average American lifespan, the special problems of the elderly become of more concern to the entire Nation. To solve some of these problems, Congress this year is expected to make important changes in laws which apply to those older citizens who draw pensions or receive other forms of public assistance.

Medical expenses for persons drawing social security benefits would be paid in part under one plan being considered by Congress. This limited health insurance plan could be financed by an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in the current Federal payroll tax.

Removal of the age limit at which a person may be pensioned as totally and permanently disabled is also being considered. At the present time, a person must be at least 50 years old before receiving disability payments. Congress is expected to vote to remove this age restriction. If so, some 225,000 persons will benefit.

Congress is also expected to raise the minimum pension for persons drawing social security benefits. Now fixed at $33 a month, the minimum social security figure will probably be raised to about $40.

Another plan under consideration would require Federal standards for nursing homes serving the elderly. Grants-in-aid would be available to nursing homes which met these proposed standards. Another proposal would increase Federal support for housing the aged. An increase of 10,000 units a year has been suggested in public housing measures for the older person. It has also been suggested that nonprofit organizations be provided with loans for building low-cost homes for the aged. Still another suggestion calls for the creation of a U.S. Office of the Aging.

A number of pending bills would raise the ceiling on how much outside income a recipient of social security could earn. Rising living costs have been most burdensome on the elderly, and the $1,200 ceiling on earnings prevents many pensioners from working as much as they are able.

Support for revision of laws dealing with or affecting the Nation's elderly is bipartisan. Only the scope of the various programs is questioned. The aged may be sure the Congress will make every attempt to solve their particular problems.

[From the Charleston Enterprise-Courier, Feb. 25, 1960]

WE CHALLENGE A SENATOR

The current press report from Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., outlines several plans being considered by Congress to again liberalize social security coverage.

One of these foot-in-the-door plans to finance health insurance could be financed by an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in the current Federal payroll tax.

We doubt very much whether the Honorable Mr. HENNINGS has bothered to investigate the cost of a medical-aid program for the elderly and needy. We also doubt very much whether the flat statement regarding financing the program with a tax of one-half of 1 percent can be backed up by figures based on life insurance statistics. It looks and sounds more like another sop concocted during a hectic political year to attract and hold votes.

A half dozen nations with similar plans wish to high heaven that they could rid themselves of this or similar aid plans. But the good old U.S.A. insists in experimenting—especially during a political year when the scramble for votes transcends commonsense. We defy Senator HENNINGS or anyone else to come up with facts which will support the claim that this program can be financed with a levy of one-half of 1 percent.

SENATOR HENNINGS SAYS ONE-HALF OF 1 PERCENT WILL CARRY MEDICAL PROGRAM

MARCH 17, 1960.

Mr. ART L. WALLHAUSEN,
Charleston Enterprise-Courier
Charleston, Mo.

DEAR ART: The following comments are with reference to your editorial of February 25, in which you question whether the costs of medical insurance for the aged can be provided at the price estimated by sponsors of legislation to establish such a program. Let me say at the outset that congressional study of such legislation is still in the preliminary stages, although there is a wide recognition of the need of the aged for some kind of assistance with their heavy medical expenses.

You will recall that in my press report on this subject, I reported that the costs of certain limited health insurance for the aged could be financed by an increase of one-half of 1 percent of the social security payroll tax. This is the estimate of sponsors of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, which would provide limited hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for recipients of social security payments. You are quite right in pointing out that the cost estimates for such a program, which involve guesses as to the future wage levels, size of the labor force, medical prices, and utilization of medical care, are controversial. The most accurate prediction would be for the immediate year ahead. In response to a congressional request for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the feasibility of hospitalization insurance for social security beneficiaries, HEW Secretary Flemming estimated that the cost of the Forand bill in 1960 would be approximately one-half of 1 percent of the taxable payroll.

In hearing last July before the House Ways and Means Committee, the following exchange is recorded:

Mr. FORAND. Now, Mr. Secretary, do the actuaries' estimates give any justification for claims that the cost would be $2 billion to the program the first year?

Mr. FLEMMING. The answer to that is "No." Our actuary's estimates, as far as the first year costs are concerned, were $1,120 million (or 0.53 percent of taxable payroll).

However, Mr. Flemming estimated that over the period from 1960 to 2050, a higher average tax would be required: approximately four-fifths of 1 percent. Needless to say, it is important that the cost estimates be as accurate as possible, and you may be sure I shall give this question careful attention if legislation such as the Forand bill is passed by the House and forwarded to the Senate.

In the meantime, variations of the Forand bill and alternative proposals to strengthen private health insurance or State programs are being studied in the Senate. I trust you feel free to give your views on these bills as congressional consideration of them continues.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

WE REPLY TO SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Some genius several years ago (under Roosevelt) struck oil, rich oil, when he dreamed up the checkoff system of collecting taxes on payrolls.

Since that time you and all the other so-called leaders in Congress have been working overtime trying to dream up additional taxes (deductions from employers).

The Forand bill seeking medical aid for the aged is just another example.

The tax, you say, will be only one-half of 1 percent, but you must remember that this one-half of 1 percent is in addition to the 6 percent already being collected for social security, and the 2.7 percent already being collected for unemployment compensation, and the 1 to 11 percent being collected to defray the cost of workman's compensation insurance. My God man, do you really believe that this can go on and on, or is this part of a vicious scheme to drive more and more of small guys to the wall?

You might also recall that our sales tax in Missouri began as a very low one-half of 1 percent tax. Then the rate was doubled, and doubled again. It is now 2 percent—and each legislature toys with the idea of upping the rate.

The income tax (you've probably heard of it) also started out as a very low tax. In fact, it was considered a joke for many years—the rates were so low. Now my taxes start at 52 percent, and they can go to 91 percent.

England, Sweden, and several other countries have tried medical aid plans very similar to those embodied in the Forand bill—and the results have been disastrous to the national economy.

However, it is a safe assumption that Members of Congress, including yourself, do not have time to read current history. Congressmen are so all-fired busy dreaming up more vote-getting schemes that time simply does not permit boning up on history—or current events.

TOM, for goodness sake, keep at least one foot on the ground. We in business can't make it as fast as you boys are spending it, and we do not have the borrowing capacity of the Federal Treasury. We, unfortunately are required to pay our bills out of income.

Granted that some old folks do need help. In our small county of Mississippi, the welfare people are currently spending $1,800,000 per year to help old folks and others. But please also grant the fact taxpayers are also in need of some help—help and relief from any additional socialistic schemes which have discouraged initiative, and stunted expansion or new ventures. My payroll simply can't stand any more taxes, and I can cite 50 or more of my friends who are looking for a way out. They are sick to the death of congressional meddling. Most of them would gladly settle for a Mom 'n Pop roadside stand with no payroll worries, and no additional taxes.

So you believe HEW Secretary, Mr. Flemming? And who is Mr. Flemming? Is he an authority in the field of socialized medicine? Is he a recognized authority in the legitimate insurance field? On what does he base his "guesstimate"? On facts or on some figure plucked out of dry air?

The key to Mr. Flemming's testimony last July before the House Ways and Means Committee is one word. That word is "estimates." His actuaries "estimate" the cost for the first year will be 0.53 percent of taxable payroll.

Senator TOM you will have to excuse my old-fashioned, idiotic thinking, colored and prejudiced no doubt by the fact that I have spent the past 30 years in the game of balancing income against expenditures. My thinking has no doubt been influenced by such mundane things as customers and customer reaction to higher prices—prices raised to take care of higher payrolls, higher operating costs, increased taxes, and the like. Such things as buyer resistance to higher prices. They buy less, and that means that there is less money in the till come nightfall with which to pay wages, operating costs, and taxes.

In other words Senator TOM, I admit to being a blithering idiot who never expects to reach the ethereal plane of your inspired thinking or that of your advisers.

However there are other idiots like myself who find it very difficult to agree with Mr. Flemming and his cost estimate of one-half of 1 percent.

You take the old-fashioned idiots who are known as the Insurance Institute which has been in business as many years as Mr. Flemming is old. They insist that legitimate insurance administrative costs alone for similar medical-hospital programs average 3⅛ percent.

Another old line insurance firm spends 1.9 percent on administrative expenses in the field of hospitalization alone.

You take the unemployment compensation figures which certainly are available to Mr. Flemming and to yourself. Uncle Sam collects three-tenths of 1 percent for administrative costs in that very limited field.

No unemployment claims are paid out of the three-tenths of 1 percent, and yet Mr. Flemming insists that his medical aid program for the needy aged can be administered, and pay all costs out of the remaining two-tenths of 1 percent.

Only a man with the vast knowledge of a U.S. Senator could even hope to break even in that situation. Ordinary folks like myself and several million other employers know from experience that it simply will not work.

No, Senator TOM, one-half of 1 percent is merely an opener, a wedge or foot in the door. Actuarial figures which are available both to you and to Mr. Flemming, place the cost nearer 4 to 5 percent of the taxable payroll than one-half of 1 percent, or four-fifths of 1 percent.

This much is true, and in that Mr. Flemming is correct. One could start the program on a tax of one-half of 1 percent, but the program would grow and grow and grow as additional Congresses seek to garner more and more votes in the field of the needy aged.

Within a few years the rate would necessarily rise to 4 or 5 percent, rather than one-half of 1 percent to carry the vast army of freeloaders who have learned how to milk the ADC and other welfare programs.

TOM, the time has come for some of you leaders in Congress to begin to start to use your God-given commonsense.

Up to now you have not exhibited even symptoms of ordinary intelligence or horsesense.

I also dare you to print this reply to your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to let other members of your committee read it.

Nice hearing from you.

ART L. WALLHAUSEN.

New Epoch in World Trade Demands New American Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years many American industries have watched their markets become flooded with foreign goods. Nowadays, loss of sales and jobs to foreign competition is a common misfortune. In fact, so many cries of protest fill the air, it is hard to believe that, in a few short months, American negotiators will once again sit down at a conference table in Geneva to perpetrate more tariff giveaways.

One of the first industries to feel the pinch of cutrate competition from abroad was the American textile industry. Within this vast and vital industry, cotton manufacturers have been especially distressed by a combination of low-wage imports and our own Government's policy of selling American cotton abroad at a lower price than domestic mills must pay for it.

A few days ago, as many of my colleagues know, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute assembled for a major meeting in Miami, Fla. Its hundreds of members heard a long list of experts sum up the problems facing the cotton textile industry. One of these speakers was H. B. McCoy, president of the Trade Relations Council and former Chief of the Business and Defense Services Administration in the Commerce Department.

Mr. McCoy's long experience in Government as a specialist in matters of foreign commerce gives him exceptional qualifications for appraising U.S. foreign economic policy, singling out its weaknesses, and charting a sensible and effective course for reform. This he did in his speech to the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute which follows:

SPEECH BY H. B. MCCOY, PRESIDENT, TRADE RELATIONS COUNCIL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, IN MIAMI, FLA., APRIL 9, 1960

It is said that each generation is incapable of appraising its era and its events in a historical perspective. I believe this continues to be true even though the progress of civilization in this century might be described, in one way at least, as the collapse of time.

In today's world a quarter of a century—collapsed time—does offer some perspective in an economic sense. In my perspective this world has completed a full economic cycle and is now moving rapidly into another new cycle. In the new phase, time and circumstances have changed. Some older economic problems and issues remain, new and more difficult ones are arising and will continue to do so.

With the end of the economic cycle that I am selecting, the United States has reached the end of a long road in foreign economic policy. The end of the road is visible—a turnoff on the route must be made.

The points on the economic cycle to which I have reference are: First, the stable and prosperous times of the mid-1920's; and, second, roughly, the present time. The economic progress advanced between these two periods has been spectacular. The really great achievements have occurred during the past few years—a major world depression, a world war and its aftermath characterized the major part of this time cycle.

The 1930 Tariff Act, although much maligned as a deliberate economic isolation device, was really a product of the times—unemployment and business stagnation, at home and abroad.

The genesis of our current foreign economic policy was the first enactment of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934. This act has constituted the hard core of our foreign trade relations with the free world for over 25 years. Under authority of this legisla-

tion, which has been extended over the years until June 30, 1960, the executive branch has by agreement with other countries lowered U.S. import duties on a reciprocal basis with more than 30 countries. During the period 1934 to the present, U.S. import duties have been reduced by about 80 percent from the 1930 level. These trade agreement rates have been available to all free world countries without other restrictions. At the same time, many of the countries which have received the benefits of our reduced tariffs have maintained discrimination against dollar imports. These restrictions have been either for balance of payment reasons, or other forms of burdens on imports. This situation was recently described by the Under Secretary of State in a speech on February 19, 1960, as follows:

"Throughout the period of postwar reconstruction, we vigorously put forward our firm belief that liberal international trade policies are essential to free world economic progress. * * * Until fairly recently, however, ours has been a rather lonely position. The industrial nations, with few exceptions, clung to exchange controls and severe quantitative import restrictions for balance-of-payment reasons. In addition, most of them felt that a measure of protectionism would foster much needed industrial growth."

It is one of the ironies of contemporary international economic relations that the countries which have been the chief beneficiaries of our low tariff structure, and have been the chief sources of discrimination against dollar imports, have been the most articulate criticis of any proposed changes in U.S. import duties or Government procurement that might be justified under terms of law or trade agreements. In a large measure, the administration of our tariff policy has been subject to the consent and desires of those countries having the most direct interest in U.S. import trade.

In addition to its leadership in the reduction of international trade barriers on a one-sided basis, the United States fostered a number of international institutions to promote international trade. The World Bank and Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Development Association are institutions which could not have been established without the financial support of the United States.

Since 1948, our country has provided massive financial assistance to the economic rehabilitation of Western Europe. This phase of our assistance program has been completed. With U.S. financial and technical help, Western Europe and Japan are now extremely prosperous areas, with a new and highly productive industrial system.

We are now engaged in a large economic aid program on behalf of underdeveloped areas. The process for Western Europe will be repeated in these areas, although progress may be slower.

The mutual defense and economic assistance program has been for both political and economic objectives. It is difficult to determine which has been the more important, or in which we have had the most success. What has been accomplished by our tariff policy during the past 25 years, and our economic assistance to other countries during the past 12 years—and the consequences thereof—will bring about fundamental changes in the scope and character of international trade. The rise in economic strength of many countries, together with the formation of regional trade blocs, will result in significant changes and shifts in economic power and leadership. These prospective developments are of utmost importance to U.S. foreign economic policy and to American industry.

Important results of our foreign economic policy over the years are now clearly evident. I summarize these results as follows: General reduction of import duties by the countries which are members of GATT, on a reciprocal basis; economic aid and mutual security expenditures, loans, and grants for industrial development abroad, and extensive technical assistance, has been the vital ingredient in the economic recovery and current progress in Western Europe and Japan; the revival of international trade on a greatly expanded scale has been largely financed by U.S. dollars; due to balance of payment problems and protectionist measures there has been discrimination for many years against dollar imports; through the aid program and otherwise, the United tSates has financed its principal international competition; U.S. imports reached a record level in 1959, with an increasing proportion of such imports being highly manufactured goods; deficits in the U.S. balance of payments have existed for some time but reached a record level of $3.7 billion in 1959, a serious threat to the dollar, and gold reserve, if continued; foreign countries now appear to claim vested rights in U.S. tariff policy, if not in the economic aid program; domestic industry has found it almost impossible to secure any measure of relief, provided for in the Trade Agreements Act, from destructive imports.

If some of the adverse aspects of the results of our foreign economic policy were not enough, the competitive position of U.S. industry in domestic and foreign markets has deteriorated.

The inflationary effects of costs in our economy have steadily reduced the competitive margin of U.S. manufacturers. This is reflected in reduced exports which was one of the chief factors in the deficit in the balance of payments last year. Concurrently with the loss of competitive ability, U.S. industry is increasing its private investment abroad. The purpose of these investments is to regain former export markets, to participate in the expected economic growth in certain areas, especially Western Europe, and to produce for export to the United States to supplement domestic production. There is ample evidence that more and more U.S. manufacturers are considering expansion abroad as a method of increasing their competitive position in domestic markets. A continuation of our present foreign economic policy would certainly add emphasis to the internationalization of U.S. industry. While in theory the expansion of U.S. private investment abroad is desirable and not adverse to U.S. interests, the extension of private investment to displace or substitute for domestic expansion raises serious implications with respect to economic growth at home. While I do not believe that U.S. industry investment abroad is as yet having any appreciable influence on industrial expansion in the domestic section, I do believe, unless our policies are changed, the inducements for foreign investment, not only to profitably employ capital but also to increase the amount of goods the domestic corporations introduce for sale into U.S. markets, will have serious effects on our balance of payments and on our industrial employment.

The formation of the European trade blocs—the European Economic Community and the Free Trade Association—is certainly going to produce important changes in our trade relations with those areas. The nature of the two trade areas suggests that the policies and operations will result in an undetermined degree of discrimination against nonmembers, including the United States. I fully expect that the full development of a common market in Europe will further enhance the international competitive position of European industry to the disadvantage of U.S. industry in both domestic and foreign markets.

Within the time limit permitted this morning, I have been able to discuss quite superficially only the highlights of the general nature of our foreign economic policy and its effects now and in the future on our economy. For purpose of emphasis, I repeat that our policies must be changed to deal with an entirely new international economic situation. If we do not, I foresee serious adverse effects on our national economy. If our current policies are pursued without substantial change, I firmly believe that the economic decisions made in other countries will substantially control the nature and scope of further economic progress in this country.

The balance of payments deficit problem must be dealt with by positive action if the present imbalance continues as a long-term trend. Current international policy tends to maintain the situation, if not actually to expand the gap. Not long ago, Government agencies were encouraging more direct private investment abroad, presumably to reduce and replace governmental expenditures for capital investment. At the same time, no decreases in U.S. Government loans and grants were contemplated. In his state of the Union message, the President referred to the balance of payments deficit as a matter of serious import to the country and indicated that an adjustment of the trend is essential. The only proposal in this direction advanced to date is to call upon U.S. industry to put more effort into selling U.S. products abroad. This proposal adds to the controversy about U.S. industry pricing itself out of foreign markets.

Western European countries have now split into two rival trade blocs—the European Economic Community and the Free Trade Association. These two groups, although organized differently, are each dedicated to advancing the trade interests of their own members. The two blocs are competitive with each other with a distinct possibility of substantial discrimination to nonmembers. The United States might well be the chief victim of such discrimination, while at the same time, under present policy, providing nondiscriminatory treatment to all members of both trade areas.

Discussions are underway regarding the possible formation of a regional trade area or areas among Latin American countries.

It is abundantly clear that economic progress in the free world during the past few years is now producing, and will continue to produce, dramatic and far-reaching changes in the balances of economic power and consequent shifts in the sources of international trade. To deal with these fast-moving events, which are producing highly complex economic relationships with the rest of the world, the United States needs a new and revised statutory framework under which to conduct our foreign economic relations. Present laws, institutions, and policies lack cohesion, are cumbersome in operation and do not permit the establishment and achieving of clear and consistent national objectives in our economic relations with the rest of the world.

I am not prepared at this time to give precise specifications of a new and revised foreign economic policy for the years ahead. I can indicate what the principal elements and objectives should be, all of which are clearly indicated by the results and future portents of our present policy. In my judgment, our foreign trade policy should: (1) Provide opportunity for private enterprise, at home and abroad, to carry on international trade on a basis that is mutually profitable for each participating nation; (2) provide prompt and adequate remedy against dumping, or destructive selling, of materials or goods for purposes of disruption of international markets or absorption of excess production; (3) provide for effective procedures, when necessary, for safeguarding domestic employment and industrial expansion against imports from areas of substandard wages, with measures for tariff reduction incentives related to wage levels in those countries; (4) provide effective pro-

cedures for general safeguarding of domestic economic growth, and national security, from imports which cause serious dislocation of employment, adversely affect new capital investment and threaten national security; (5) provide for definite measures to deal with discrimination against imports from the United States; (6) insure flexibility in administration of foreign trade policy to cope with foreign trade blocs; (7) continue authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements; (8) reorganize Federal institutions and procedures with centralization and cohesion of administration to achieve national objectives in our foreign economic policy.

I cannot conceive of any change in our current policy during this administration. The convictions of our present policymakers will be carried out to the end of this administration. There is, of course, no chance whatever of congressional action in this session. I do not anticipate any change of attitude of the executive branch toward its past practices in administering the escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. I fully expect the administration to publish, probably within a month, an extensive list of products on which the Government will propose further reductions of U.S. tariffs. I anticipate this list will include products which have had large previous reductions which have resulted in great increases in import trade—in some cases to the extent of market domination. I think this audience should not be surprised if textile products are well represented on the bargaining list.

A major change in our foreign economic policy cannot be achieved before the June 1962 expiration date of the Trade Agreements Act. The next 2 years are crucial for those who believe that a change must be made. This is a short time to set in motion the constructive forces that will be sufficient to alter a policy that has become so well entrenched.

The advocates of the free or liberal trade policy, both within and outside Government, will make no compromise in any detail whatever with any other point of view. For them there is no middle ground. To agree with them is to be for virtue; to disagree, even on specifics, is to be for sin. To give the advocates of free trade their due, they have succeeded in establishing free trade as a fashionable economic theory. Like other fashions, particularly in the economic area, changes are rapid and drastic when they occur.

The effort to bring to business and to the public objective information about the results and future implications of our current foreign economic policy, in an endeavor to bring about a change and redirection, is going to be a large undertaking. The stakes involved are of vital importance to many industries, large and small. The opposition is highly articulate and resourceful.

Those in American industry and business who believe a change in our policy is due, or overdue, must work together and in unison. There is no other hope of success. The effort must be closely coordinated. A definite program and policy objectives should be developed and combined efforts concentrated on putting these forward for adoption. The target date is June 1962, but much vital preparatory work must be done in the interim.

I want to commend the textile industry for its courageous fight against the inequities of foreign economic policy, as it has affected this great industry. I know, from both my long Government experience and the short time I have been with the Trade Relations Council, that officers of your member firms and trade associations have spent long hours of work, done extensive traveling, and made appearances before governmental organizations, seeking relief from destructive imports. I sincerely believe that your efforts have produced important results for your industry, even though some of the relief secured is inadequate and perhaps temporary in nature. In my opinion, your industry should continue its efforts to secure proper remedial action when necessary, although you will continue to face official opposition.

I am sure your industry has, through its courageous action of challenging our foreign economic policy and the actions of the executive branch in administration of the Trade Agreements Act, brought these issues to the attention of the Congress, business, and the public more effectively than any other industry. I think your industry has provided groundwork which will be extremely valuable in the policy battle ahead.

I want to repeat, for purpose of emphasis, that centralization of effort is essential if industry is to achieve a change in our foreign economic policy. Too frequently, industry and business disperse their efforts on a variety of uncoordinated and sometimes divergent objectives. This is usually fatal for the cause, especially against a well-organized opposition. The issues are too important to U.S. industry to afford the luxury of a mistake of this kind.

Urges House Committee Approval of Cold War Veterans GI Bill; Dallas Times Herald Shows Value of College Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although the cold war veterans educational bill passed the Senate in July of last year by a vote of 57 to 31, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has recently called for additional staff studies concerning the proposal.

It is my understanding that the House committee expects to have this additional information within a period of 2 weeks.

In behalf of all of us interested in this important educational program—the veterans, their families educators, and many other individuals and groups—I respectfully urge the House Veterans' Affairs Committee membership to vote out this bill at the earliest possible date. It surely deserves consideration of the full membership of the House and the time for its passage is growing very short.

On April 22, 1960, one of Texas major circulation newspapers, the Dallas Times Herald, editorialized citing the value of a college education to young Americans, and to the value to individuals of the cold war veterans educational bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "College Make a Big Difference."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE MAKES BIG DIFFERENCE

Census figures, says Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, show that men who finish college stand to make $435,000 in their lifetime as against $258,000 for those who finish only high school.

The difference, on the average, between a high school diploma and a college sheepskin thus is about $177,000. This figure should cause many a youngster to have second thoughts about deciding against higher education.

Other statistics have been cited from time to time to show that, albeit with many exceptions, earning capacity is generally correlated with extent of education. The youngster who only finishes high school will be better off, in all likelihood, than the one who succumbs to the temptation to quit short of a diploma.

Senator YARBOROUGH's purpose in stressing the $177,000 differential was to urge passage of his so-called cold war veterans education bill. He points out that the measure is needed to enable a million veterans to attend college, many of whom otherwise will not make it through.

How much the Nation owes its veterans, both those who made sacrifices in time of war and in time of peace, is debatable. Not debatable, however, is the fact that it is to the advantage of the Nation as well as to its young people individually that higher education be made as financially accessible as possible.

If the Census Bureau's figures are correct, financing college educations is such a sound investment that it should be attracting far more venture capital from private sources than it is.

Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago there was a disclosure that the White House does not plan to submit the name of William R. Connole for reappointment to the Federal Power Commission. This was followed up by a variety of speculation as to the reasons, with general agreement that Commissioner Connole's attitude toward regulation of natural gas prices is the major factor. If true, it is most unfortunate for Commissioner Connole has been prominent in fighting for adequate and effective regulation. Perhaps, however, the White House has other reasons. These would be interesting to learn but with others mentioned by my colleague, Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, in an extension of remarks Tuesday, I would prefer and sincerely hope that Commissioner Connole is reappointed and there is no purpose for discussing reasons for his not being reappointed.

Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include an article from Time magazine of May 2, 1960, and an item from Business Week of April 23, 1960, which bear on the subject:

[From Time magazine]

THE PRICE OF DISSENT

The maverick on the Federal Power Commission is William R. Connole, 37, a Connecticut political independent. For the past 5 years Connole has built a reputation

as a dissenter from his colleagues, a defender of the consumer by urging stricter regulation of natural gas prices. He was the lone dissenter in the precedent-setting CATC case (Time, July 8, 1957), when the FPC allowed new field gas sales worth $1 billion without final approval of the rates. Connole's dissent was implicitly endorsed by the U.S. Supreme Court when it criticized the FPC decision, upholding the contention of New York State's Public Service Commission that the failure to set firm rates did not sufficiently protect the consumer. Last week the White House confirmed reports that Dissenter Connole would not be reappointed when his term expires on June 22. His likely successor: Harold I. Baynton, now chief counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee.

Keen, combative Connole is a Hartford lawyer who was appointed to the FPC in 1955 after serving as general counsel of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. When word got out that he was not to be reappointed, seven State public utility commissions protested. Unmoved, the White House said that the President decided not to reappoint Connole because he does not get along with the other commissioners, has urged greater Federal control of gas than the Administration believes is necessary. Explained a presidential aide: "There is no reason to keep a man in a job whose philosophy does not agree with that of the President."

[From Business Week, Apr. 23, 1960]

WASHINGTON OUTLOOK

The regulatory agencies pose new headaches for the administration.

New outcries about the Federal Power Commission are certain to follow official verification of the report that Eisenhower will replace Commissioner William R. Connole, whose term expires June 22. Connole has been a strong advocate of tighter regulation of natural gas prices—a fact that, his defenders suspect, contributed mightily to his downfall.

Politicians from gas-consuming States may be expected to step up demands for White House action against FPC Chairman Jerome Kuykendall and others whose social and business relations with regulated industries are undergoing dual investigation—by the Justice Department and a House investigating committee.

Gore Vidal—What Should Be a Great Political Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, occasionally a man comes into the political life of this Nation whose personality and ability are so great that the impact he makes on his country and his times is of serious and measurable significance. It is a very rare occasion indeed when these movers and shakers can be anticipated at the very outset of their career.

We seem to be on the verge of this kind of exciting discovery today. A young man of great ability has caught the imagination of the discerning throughout the country in recent months. His achievements as a dramatist include authorship of that new smash New York hit—"The Best Man," film adaptation of the number one movie box office hit, "Suddenly Last Summer," main responsibility with Christopher Fry for film writing of "Ben-Hur" which has just won 11 Oscars.

Mr. Vidal, a Democrat, has decided to enter politics under the most challenging circumstances. He is opposing the reelection of an incumbent New York Republican Representative who has been elected five times and won his last reelection, in spite of the nationwide Democratic sweep of 1958, by a whopping 2 to 1.

Recently the New Yorker magazine carried a brief interview with this phenomenal young man. It constitutes one of the most delightful scraps of political miscellany I have run across in a long time. So Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interview, edited to conform to the rules of the Senate, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Yorker, Apr. 23, 1960]

VIDAL

Nothing is easier nowadays than to get a feeling of being entirely surrounded by Gore Vidal. His political drama "The Best Man" fills the Morosco nightly. His film adaptation of Tennessee Williams' "Suddenly, Last Summer" was recently reported to be doing the best business of any movie in the country. "Ben-Hur," whose script is mainly the work of Mr. Vidal and Christopher Fry, won 11 Oscars. The movie version of his "Visit to a Small Planet"—described by him as the unauthorized version—is being offered in dozens of neighborhood houses. Stay home at night, and like as not you'll be assailed by Mr. Vidal on television. He is one of the busiest of the panelists, and a while back he appeared in his own television play "The Indestructible Mr. Gore," which dealt with the life of his grandfather, the late Senator Thomas Gore, of Oklahoma. Pick up a magazine, and if it happens to be the Reporter, you will see that Mr. Vidal is also a theater critic. Pick a newspaper, and you will find that he is a Democratic candidate for Congress in the 29th District of New York, which is composed of the counties of Dutchess, Ulster, Columbia, Greene, and Schoharie.

It is with Candidate Vidal that we are concerned at the moment, and we recently sent a man who represented himself as a seasoned political observer up to Barrytown, in Dutchess County, where Mr. Vidal lives. His home is a resplendent masterpiece of Greek revival built by John R. Livingston in 1820 and named, inevitably, Edgewater. Unlike most of the houses along the Hudson, it sits smack on the bank of the river, no more than three or four feet above water level. One of its former owners was the essayist John Jay Chapman. Its present owner acquired it 10 years ago, when he was 24. He greeted our representative on the front steps, and consented then and there to an exclusive press conference, the official verbatim transcript of which follows:

"Question. Why are you in politics?

"Answer. Because I find it exhilarating and satisfying.

"Question. Who is your opponent?

"Answer. The incumbent, J. ERNEST WHARTON, Republican, of Schoharie County.

"Question. Is he formidable?

"Answer. A foeman worthy of my steel. A five-time winner. A leading member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. A creature of infinite cunning. No sooner had I entered the race and described him as a do-nothing Congressman than he put me on the defensive by sponsoring a bill making it a Federal offense to spread false information about bombs on airplanes, buses, and the like. What could I do but applaud? Now I'm guilty of me tooism. First round to WHARTON. But I shall return.

"Question. Do you think you can win?

"Answer. Certainly. All I have to do is overcome a 2 to 1 Republican lead. I must create a new voting pattern.

"Question. How do you expect to do that?

"Answer. In the main, by superior industry. Actually, I have labored in the vineyard for almost a year now. Why do you suppose I've been turning up like a bad penny on television? And I have addressed practically every Rotary, Kiwanis, chamber of commerce, and Young Marrieds Club in the 29th District.

"Question. Have you talked politics in those places?

"Answer. Couldn't do that or I wouldn't have been asked. I've talked Hollywood, television, Broadway, what Liz Taylor is like, and that sort of thing. They've heard the name Vidal all over the district, and it's an easy one to remember. Now and then I have injected politics in a mild way. I have a little bit about my being asked to the White House to write a speech on integration for the President.

"Question. Did that happen?

"Answer. Oh, yes. Sherman Adams asked me to do it, and he liked the speech.

"Question. Did the President deliver it?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Does any machine control you?

"Answer. No. Next question, please.

"Question. Do you have a machine of your own?

"Answer. I'm lunching with Arthur Krock next week. At the Morosco, we're selling tickets for December performances.

"Question. What are the issues hereabouts? Please be commendably brief.

"Answer. The big one is schools. We need more of them. I stand foursquare for Federal aid to education. Pollution of the lordly Hudson is another, and one dear to me. As you can see, the river is a hundred feet from my door. In summer, I swim in it every day. I shall need my health to serve my people.

"Question. Can you resist lobbies?

"Answer. With the greatest of ease. I can also resist making jokes about them.

"Question. Brooks Atkinson, of Greene County, has announced in the Times that he will vote for you. Do you welcome his support?

"Answer. Cordially. Though nothing that votes is alien to me, I particularly welcome the approval of Mr. Atkinson. I am hoping for that of Mrs. Atkinson, too. There is immediate seating on my bandwagon.

"Question. Do you consider yourself a candidate for the Pulitzer Prize?

"Answer. I am running in Columbia County but not at Columbia University. I have not actively sought the prize, nor will I do so. If, however, the prize should seek the man, I would not—repeat, not—decline so signal an honor.

"Question. Do you aspire to office even higher than that of Representative from the 29th district?

"Answer. I have, since childhood, said that I would rather be President than write.

"Question. Have you a campaign slogan?

"Answer. Yes. A fine one. It's from Alfred North Whitehead: 'No code of verbal statement can ever exhaust the shifting background of presupposed fact.'

"Question. What does that mean?

"Answer. It means that questions are quite as important as answers. I lack many answers but I think I know the right questions. For example, what kind of society do we want? Only by examining presup-

positions can we approach any kind of truth. In 'The Best Man,' I have tried to raise important questions about politics and the Presidency. I would like to go to Washington and perhaps head a congressional investigation of what we mean when we speak of 'the free world.'

"Question. Have you mentioned your campaign slogan to your managers? And, if so, what do they think of it?

"Answer. To your first question the answer is yes. To the second it is that they made no audible response.

"Question. Thank you, Mr. Candidate."

Commemorative Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address which I had the pleasure to present on Saturday, April 9, 1960, to the Stamp Society, Adam Plewacki American Legion Post No. 799, Buffalo, N.Y.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guest, ladies, and gentlemen, first, I should like to say that it is a great privilege and a pleasure for me to be here tonight to take an active part in this great exhibition of philatelic material. I am further honored to be designated an honorary chairman of this event, which is an outstanding civic and community achievement that brings the praise and good wishes of our citizenry to the Plewacki Post for the foresight, planning and the diligent efforts and energy expended to insure the repeated success of this affair.

Since entering Congress, I have become extremely interested in philatelic matters and have diligently labored to obtain for our fair city of Buffalo, the honor of being designated a "first day of issue" city for a commemorative stamp. We had a strong case developed on the seaway stamp until the State Department got involved in negotiations with Canada, and the visit of the Queen, with the result that Massena, N.Y., stole the designation which I felt was rightfully ours, as the first major U.S. port on the seaway. Nevertheless, I do not discourage easily, and I have incessantly barraged Mr. Rohe Walters, special assistant to Postmaster General Summerfield on philatelic matters with Buffalo's case for this honor and have had our plea presented before the Stamp Advisory Council.

At the present time, I have written assurances that every consideration will be given to the designation of Buffalo as a first day site for a stamp in the near future. The Post Office Department is very much aware of the fact that too many stamps are placed on first day sale in Washington, D.C., and it is their sincere desire to spread these first day cover designations to encompass all of the States in accordance with the belief that our postage stamps represent and belong to the Nation. From a philatelic viewpoint, Buffalo has a strong case. Our city has not been honored by a first day of issue designation in over a quarter of a century and the only first day issues ever to emanate from this city were shared with a half dozen other cities back in the early 1930's when covers had not reached the proportion of today's importance in the philatelic hobby.

We have in our city, many fine active philatelic organizations that have indicated to me their strong support for such a designation for Buffalo, and this nucleus, combined with a strong civic and community effort, would make any such designation a noteworthy event.

I have held a series of conferences with the Post Office Department in Washington and they assure me that the Post Office recognizes that Buffalo—through circumstances of historical association—has not been honored by a first day sale in approximately a quarter of a century. They further agree with me that Buffalo, in addition to its importance as a city, is noted for its strong philatelic connotations. I can assure you here tonight, that these conferences shall continue without fail until such time as we shall be able to see the postmark of our fair city impressed upon a cachet envelope on the first day of issue of a new stamp emission.

It is significant to note that this fourth annual Plewacki Stamp Show is honoring and paying tribute to Ignace J. Paderewski. It was only this week that I had the opportunity to pay my respects at the grave of Poland's famous musical artist, statesman, soldier, and freedom fighter. It may interest some to know that he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery by special authorization of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. While standing at his final resting place, I paused to reflect and pay my own personal tribute to the life and deeds of this great and wonderful man who made such generous contributions to his beloved homeland, Poland, and of his contributions to the world in the fields of music, politics, and as an unceasing fighter for freedom in war and in peace.

In keeping with the spirit of Plewacki Post in honoring Paderewski by this fine exhibition, I have added my voice to the nationwide demand that he be honored in the special champion of liberty series as a man who ranks high in the esteem of his countrymen and freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The Post Office Department has evidently heeded this mounting crescendo of voices asking for this honor, and it is now an open secret that on November 6, 1960, Ignace Paderewski will be honored by a 4-cent and 8-cent commemorative issue in the champion of liberty series.

This stamp will not only pay just tribute to a great man, but will also pay homage to the many sons of of Poland who keep alive the fires of liberty in their own subjugated land.

To return to the subject of philately or its more common name of stamp collecting, although not a collector myself due to time limitations, I have learned a lot about your hobby and met many, many interesting people who are in it. Our Post Office issues 24 billion stamps each year, and it seems that a good number of you are dedicated to the acquisition of the entire 24 billion for your own personal collections, leaving none of the general public who may want to mail a letter or two. In my indoctrination into philately, I have visited the Philatelic Agency in Washington with its very fine exhibits and also the Smithsonian Institution, which has a stamp collection that would make any collector green with envy. I have cooperated with the many persons connected with this fine hobby and shall continue to make available the complete services of my office for the advancement of this hobby, with its accompanying educational values and expansion of knowledge of our national heritage as expressed on our postage stamps.

Who Raised the Religious Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, many things have been said and written concerning the so-called religious issue during the campaigning of Senators KENNEDY and HUMPHREY in my home State of West Virginia. There have been repeated reports that the religious question is the main issue with the voters of West Virginia and that illtermed "gang-up" forces have brought it into the open. I have maintained that this is not the case, and I was pleased recently with an editorial written by Doris Fleeson which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Washington Evening Star. This editorial is headlined, "Who Raised the Religious Issue?" and goes on to tell of a 1956 memorandum released by Senator KENNEDY's chief of staff. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO RAISED THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE?—KENNEDY AID'S 1956 MEMO RECALLED, CITING SENATOR'S EFFECT ON CATHOLIC VOTE

(By Doris Fleeson)

Any real account of the religious issue in the 1960 campaign must begin not in West Virginia or Wisconsin, but with the Democratic National Convention of 1956. It is interesting that its use there attracted no adverse comment but was accepted as a fact of political life of which sensible politicans would take note—and they did.

When Democrats began to gather at Chicago for the all but certain renomination of Adlai Stevenson, they found themselves the object of a quiet but well-organized drive upon the vice presidency by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. Among the persuaders skillfully employed was a 3,000-word memorandum prepared under the direction of Ted Sorenson, who was and still is KENNEDY's chief of staff.

This document suggested that there was a "Catholic vote" in this country and described in some detail its apparent size, location and concentration within the Democratic Party. The argument was made that this vote was drifting to the Republicans, especially President Eisenhower, but could be lured back by a Catholic candidate for Vice President.

Specifically, it cited figures to show that Catholic candidates run strongly in Catholic districts. No experienced Democratic leader showed any disposition to deny this, and many freely admitted that an apparent drift of Catholics toward the Republican Party had them worried.

Among the leaders so persuaded was Stevenson himself. The case made for KENNEDY was a factor in his decision to break with tradition and invite the convention to make its own free choice for Vice President. This seemed fair to Stevenson both as a matter of equity and good politics.

The surprising force of the 1956 KENNEDY drive upon second place at Chicago and its

near success provided that convention with its best drama. What part the Sorenson strategy played was obscured by the unexpectedly massive southern support for KENNEDY.

What the South was proving, of course, was not only that it liked Jack but that it detested ESTES KEFAUVER, the liberal Tennessee Senator it regarded as a traitor to its way of life. KEFAUVER won, largely because the delegates felt he would appeal to the farm and labor vote, areas which still are among the softer spots of the KENNEDY campaign.

The relevant point today is that the Sorenson memorandum was not a hidden persuader, clandestinely employed. It was not published, but it was openly and cleanly used to strengthen KENNEDY's case. Among those propagating it was John Bailey, Democratic State chairman, who is active in the 1960 campaign to make KENNEDY President.

It was discussed then and is still freely discussed by politicans and the press. It is threaded all through the KENNEDY strategy of achieving the nomination by the primary route. At any given moment KENNEDY aids, and the candidates too, can tell anyone the figures of Catholic strength not only in a State, but in a district or even a county.

Thus it is clearly disingenuous for KENNEDY and his aids to blame the press for raising the religious issue and for the Senator himself in his speech before the editors here to cast doubt on the existence of any Catholic bloc voting.

Goals for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following policy statement adopted by the Democratic Midwest Conference held in Detroit, Mich., on March 26, 1960. It was ably drafted by Thomas Quimby, Democratic National Committeeman from Michigan, and well reflects the thinking of Midwest Democrats regarding the goals for America and the shortcomings of the present administration in this area.

The statement follows:

GOALS FOR AMERICA—ECONOMIC GROWTH

The Eisenhower-Nixon policy of stability through stagnation has had unfortunate repercussions throughout our economy. These are reflected in the miserable trends of our total national product during the period 1953–59 contrasted with what these trends would have been if our first basic objective—optimum economic growth—had been achieved.

The Republican average annual growth rate of 2.3 percent, instead of the needed growth rate of about 5 percent, caused the deficiency in our overall national production for the 7 years 1953–59 inclusive to reach the staggering total of about $200 billion, measured in uniform 1958 dollars. Correspondingly, total employment opportunity during this 7-year period was about 15 million man-years lower than it would have been under conditions of optimum economic growth.

This dismal record cannot be hidden by the Republican efforts, at the peak of one or another of their short-lived booms, to claim that "we are higher than ever before." These misleading claims ignore the obvious fact that the performance of a roller coaster is not to be judged solely by the upswings, ignoring the declines which lie just over the humps. It is also extremely disingenuous to claim, at the peak of a short-lived boom, that we are higher than ever before in production and employment, but to ignore the fact that we are not enough higher to absorb the consistent advance in population, civilian labor force, and technology.

To illustrate this point, we have had more unemployment of plant and manpower at the peak of each short-lived Republican boom than at the peak of the immediately previous Republican boom, and we have had more unemployment of plant and manpower at the bottom of each Republican recession than at the bottom of the immediately previous Republican recession. This means that, viewing our economic performance in the longer range perspective which is so essential, the Republican economic policies have carried us—with some ups and downs—along the road of a long-term retreat from maximum employment and production. Unemployment as measured by the Census Bureau, which was less than 2 million in 1952, was 3.8 million in 1959 as a whole, and more than 3.6 million seasonally adjusted in December 1959. The true level of unemployment, including the full-time equivalent of part-time employment, which stood at 2.8 million in 1953, was 5 million in 1959, and almost 4.8 million seasonally adjusted in December 1959. The ambiguous economic developments thus far in 1960 do not indicate any sizable long-term improvement in the unemployment picture.

These overall deficits in nationwide production and employment may easily be translated into their impact upon the rate of private economic progress. During the 7-year period 1953 to 1959, inclusive, measured in uniform 1958 dollars, average American family income was $3,400 lower than it would have been under conditions of maximum prosperity and optimum economic growth. The private purchases of all American consumers, toward maintaining and improving their living standards, was about $127 billion lower than it should have been. In turn, allowing for taxes and savings, the deficiency in wages and salaries was more than $126 billion; the deficiency in farm operators' net income was more than $36 billion; and the deficiency in unincorporated business and professional income was more than $10 billion—all measured in uniform 1958 dollars.

If our urgent and unmet public needs were not so great, it might be argued by some relatively uninformed people that the stagnation in our overall economic progress and consequently in our private economic progress for a period of 7 years should not be taken too seriously, in view of our "high private standards of living." This argument, of course, neglects the vital need for private economic progress which still confronts us. More important still, public programs are paid for economically out of private production, land paid for financially in the main by taxes upon private incomes. Thus, huge deficits in private production and private incomes have a devastating impact upon public programs, and doubly so when the national administration is committed to the erroneous policy of adjusting the Federal budget downward to a repressed economy, instead of using the Federal budget to help reactivate the whole private economy and to meet our most pressing public needs.

To illustrate, if during the 7-year period, 1953 to 1959, inclusive, we had enjoyed maximum prosperity and optimum overall economic growth—instead of suffering a deficiency of $200 billion in total national production—Federal, State, and local governments would have collected about $65 billion more in revenues at existing tax rates than were actually collected. And since these additional revenue collections would have been derived from an economy producing about $200 billion more in total goods and services, the higher tax collections (without higher tax rates) would have been entirely consistent with the tremendously higher advances in private incomes and living standards already portrayed.

With these additional public revenues, Government action at all levels could have moved forward very substantially toward closing the glaring gaps in essential public programs, both domestic and international. With various portions of the $65 billion more in public revenues, we could have built 140,000 school classrooms and paid school teachers $1,000 more each year; provided for more than 360,000 additional hospital beds; increased social security payments substantially; and replaced 1.4 million slum homes with good homes. At the same time, we could have used about 20 percent of these additional public revenues to improve our national defense at the rates which most experts said we needed but which the administration said "we could not afford"; and we could have increased economic assistance to free peoples overseas by about 50 percent. And the performance of all of these essential purposes would have required only slightly more than 70 percent of the additional $65 billion in public revenues. The amount left over, almost 30 percent or about $19 billion, would have been more than enough to wipe out the net aggregate deficit in the cash Federal budget during the calendar years 1953–59.

The enormous deficits in the overall economy, as always, have hit hardest those least able to protect themselves. Because the farm sector is always vulnerable, the steadfast efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture to deflate farm income have been aided and abetted by the unsatisfactory economic conditions throughout the Nation. Because small business is not as strong as big business—whatever the reasons may be—thousands of small businesses have been liquidated by the economic climate, while big business has been at worst embarrassed. The rising level of unemployment has caused so-called marginal workers to lose their jobs first, and to stay unemployed the longest. Our "inability to afford" adequate expansion of social security and other protective programs has borne down most heavily upon those groups who at best are underprivileged, and who are frequently poverty-stricken because of their low income receipts. The process of lifting those American families living in poverty to what is called a minimum health and decency level of income, which proceeded rapidly during periods of high economic growth, has been only nominal since 1953. All this might well have been expected, because regressive and short-sighted economic policies work against both economic justice and economic progress.

It is essential to realize fully the alternative consequences of high and low overall economic growth rates during the 5-year period 1960–1964, inclusive. Projecting the optimum growth rate of about 5 percent annually, and contrasting it with a projected repetition of the 2.3-percent average registered during the past 7 years, the aggregate differences for the 5-year period 1960–1964 inclusive, measured in uniform 1958 dollars, are as follows:

The difference in total national production comes to about $350 billion. This equates with a difference in employment opportunity of about 19 million man-years.

The difference in average family income (multiple-person families) comes to about $5,200.

The difference in personal consumption expenditures, directed toward rising living standards for a growing population—based upon the difference in total personal incomes less taxes and savings—comes to about $225 billion.

The difference comes to about $165 billion for wages and salaries; about $40 billion for farm operators' net income, and about $20 billion for unincorporated professional and business income.

The difference in private investment opportunity, including net foreign investment, comes to about $55 billion.

And the difference in Federal, State, and local public revenues, at existing tax rates, comes to about $100 billion—thus leaving that much more available for meeting essential public needs, as well as for application in part to the balancing of public budgets and to some retirement of public debts if need be.

With an optimum and steady rate of overall economic growth, the vast advances in private incomes and living standards would leave ample economic and financial room for the proper servicing of our now neglected public needs. As already pointed out, during the 5-year period, 1960 to 1964, inclusive, a 5-percent rather than a 2.3-percent average annual rate of overall growth would yield in the aggregate about $350 billion more in total national production. This in itself would yield automatically under existing tax rates about $100 billion more of public revenues, Federal, State and local—or an average of about $20 billion more per year.

The preponderance of these additional public revenues—perhaps about $80 billion—would flow to the Federal Government, while the balance would accrue to the States and localities.

With this in mind, a Federal budget responsive to our needs and entirely compatible with our economic and financial capabilities might register these improvements, comparing fiscal 1960 (as of January 1960) with calendar 1964.

(1) National security and international: Major national security outlays could rise from about $45.7 billion to about $57 billion, thus reflecting the prevalent expert judgment as to basic need. This would represent an increase from $246.18 to $296.10 on a per capita basis related to the total population, but a decrease from 9.32 percent of total national production to 8.95 percent under conditions of optimum and steady overall economic growth. Meanwhile, outlays for economic and technical development overseas could rise from about $1.7 billion to about $4 billion, representing an increase from $9.24 to $20.78 on a per capita basis, and an increase from 0.35 percent to 0.63 percent of total national production.

Naturally, if we are able to achieve a workable disarmament program all of these dollars will be available for works of peace.

(2) Education: Federal outlays for education could rise from $549 million to $5 billion, from $2.96 to $25.97 on a per capita basis, and from 0.11 percent to 0.78 percent of total national production. In concert with appropriately expanding efforts at other levels, both private and public, this would lift the total educational outlays of the Nation from about $22.3 billion, or about 4.8 percent of total national production, during the most recent school year, to about $38 billion, or about 5.8 percent of total national production, by the school year 1964–65. Such progress, appropriately apportioned, could add about 521,000 classrooms to our public schools, add almost half a million public schoolteachers, increase the average pay of public schoolteachers from about $5,100 to about $7,500, and greatly increase the facilities for higher education and the volume of scholarships and loans directed toward this end.

(3) Public health: Federal outlays in this area could rise from about $850 million to about 3.3 billion, from $0.58 to $17.14 on a per capita basis, and from 0.17 percent to 0.52 percent of total national production. Combined with appropriately increased efforts at other levels both private and public, and with social security expansion in the health field which does not enter into the Federal budget, the year 1964 would find us well on the way toward adequate medical care for all American families at costs within their means.

(4) Housing: Federal outlays in this category could rise from $590 million to $2.2 billion, from $3.19 to $11.43 on a per capita basis, and from 0.12 percent to 0.35 percent of total national production. Combined with appropriate expansion of conventional private housing, new formulas to house middle-income families involving both private and public efforts, and State and local as well as Federal assistance to slum clearance and housing for low-income groups, this would result in total housing production averaging annually more than 2 million units during the years immediately ahead. With this amount of progress, the number of substandard housing units in the United States, which stood at about 12½ million in 1958, could be reduced to somewhere between 1 and 2 million units 5 years hence. Moreover, a housing effort of this size, combined with comparable programs of urban renewal, would be the most powerful single force in helping to lift our total investment and consumption outlays to the levels required for the maintenance of maximum production and employment in view of the new technology.

(5) Natural resources: Federal outlays for this purpose could rise from about $1.78 billion to about $2.5 billion, from $9.63 to about $13 on a per capita basis, and from 0.36 percent to 0.39 percent of total national production. This would help to achieve and maintain an adequate resource base for national security, industrial expansion, rapid population shifts, increases in total population, and rising living standards.

(6) Other welfare services, including labor and manpower and public assistance: In this area, Federal outlays could rise from about $2.8 billion to about $4.2 billion, mostly in the area of public assistance, from $14.97 to $21.82 on a per capita basis, and from 0.57 percent to 0.66 percent of total national production. This would enable us, as a nation, substantially to eradicate the exceptionally heavy concentration of poverty among those handicapped in various ways through no fault of their own.

Other conference statements refer to the specifics of programs for a healthy agricultural economy, for a reasonable development of our natural resources, for pleasant and productive cities, for the desirable improvement of human welfare. We here affirm that not only can we afford these programs, but that they are imperative if we are to improve the public and private sectors of our economy.

Ministers Remove Temple Swastikas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the B'nai Jacob Synagogue in Fort Wayne was recently desecrated. The Reverend Elmer E. Voelkel, pastor of Plymouth Congregational Church discovered this desecration on his way to church on Holy Saturday and called six other Protestant ministers, who immediately came to B'nai Jacob Synagogue and helped remove the swastikas in a public demonstration of their sense of outrage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune of April 18, 1960, telling of Fort Wayne's answer to bigotry.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTERS REMOVE TEMPLE SWASTIKAS

FORT WAYNE—Seven indignant Protestant ministers lent a hand Saturday to remove two red swastikas which vandals painted on the B'nai Jacob Synagogue during the night.

The volunteered "expression of brotherhood" came before the Jewish conservative congregation could take time on its Passover Sabath to assess the damage and looting inside.

"I saw the swastikas on my way to church this morning, and I called a few downtown ministers I knew would be indignant about this," said the Reverend Elmer E. Voelkel, pastor of Plymouth Congregational Church.

"It's a wonderful gesture," said Fred Tourkow, a past president of the congregation, as Voelkel and his Protestant colleagues came to clean off the red swastikas.

One of the yard-high swastikas was painted on stone at the front of the synagogue, and another was painted on a door.

"I'm shocked and amazed such a thing could happen in Fort Wayne," said Rabbi Seymour Weller. He said he knew of no reason for the vandalism.

Inside, a charity box containing an undetermined amount of cash donations was stolen, and offices were ransacked.

Also stolen were Menorah and Hannukah candelabra, sacramental goblets and other religious merchandise kept in a gift shop in the synagogue. Sacred objects in the sanctuary were not taken.

Voelkel said he made no attempt to recruit ministers outside the small group of his colleagues in the area near the downtown section and the synagogue, located on the near south side.

"We could get 20 or 30 or 40 ministers," Voelkel said.

B'nai Jacob is one of two Jewish congregations in Fort Wayne.

Voelkel was joined by ministers from Lutheran, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal churches.

OUTRAGE IN FORT WAYNE

All Hoosiers should feel a sense of outrage over the desecration of a religious temple in Fort Wayne. But they can feel encouraged also by the prompt action of Fort Wayne clergymen to endeavor to erase the shame.

Some time over last Friday night, while Christians were awaiting Easter and Jews were nearing the end of the Passover observance, burglars broke into a Hebrew synagogue. They damaged the interior, stole religious objects and $300 from a charity box. And then they painted swastikas on the front and rear of the building.

It was a shameful business, clearly the work of hoodlums. Such actions have occurred elsewhere, but it is particularly saddening to have them in our own State.

But what is intensely gratifying is the reaction by Christian clergymen of Fort Wayne. A group of them hurriedly assembled at the synagogue and gave their labors to help

remove the paint in a public demonstration of their sense of outrage.

A Congregational pastor, leader of the Protestant group, spoke for them when he said, "We're disgusted, we're angry, we're disturbed." He called for more vigorous efforts to uphold religious freedom in the community. And the bishop of the Catholic diocese deplored the outrage as "vicious and cowardly" as he condemned it publicly in the strongest possible terms.

Desecrations of religious institutions are un-American; they are a blow at all religions and should be denounced by all. We praise the quick reaction of Catholic and Protestant leaders in Fort Wayne as we express our contempt for those responsible for the outrage.

There is a lessen for all of us, however. Men of all faiths should be making greater efforts in behalf of religious freedom for all faiths. It is one of the foundations of America. It is as important as the right of free speech or free press.

Democracy Wins in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for April 26, 1960:

DEMOCRACY WINS IN KOREA

The end of the regime of President Syngman Rhee in South Korea has come in a way that helps to lay a potential base for true self-government in that Far Eastern land.

The veteran leader who has headed the Republic of Korea from its formation and brought it through the attack by Communist North Korea has at length had the wisdom to recognize that his strong man tactics plus the repressions exercised by his subordinates and the police have become deeply unpopular.

His offer to resign, to dismiss his chief lieutenant, Lee Ki Poong, and to accept a constitutional amendment for a government responsible to Parliament spares his country the prospect of further rioting and bloodshed beyond the student-led demonstrations which had cost more than a hundred lives.

The key demand of the demonstrators and of the opposition Democrats who challenged Rhee's Liberal Party was that new elections be held in place of those of March 15 which were discredited by a host of unfair practices. The President's capitulation might have meant that a new vote would be taken only for President and Vice President, but action in Parliament now has assured that new elections will extend to the replacement of the present Assembly.

It remains to be seen, of course, whether those who have brought about the downfall of the Rhee regime can erect a more competent and more truly democratic one in its place. The temptation to those who have won power by revolt is to use that power as ruthlessly against any who oppose them.

Examples of the need for resiliency in the democratic process are seen in two countries today where power has changed hands. One of these is Turkey, where the regime of Prime Minister Adnan Menderes has yet to prove that it possesses the magnanimity of former President Ismet Inonu, who permitted its peaceful displacement of his party. The other is Cuba, where Premier Fidel Castro still postpones the holding of elections after the revolution against former President Batista.

It is to the credit of the United States in this instance that under the guidance of Secretary of State Herter the administration in Washington has given no support to a situation which verged on dictatorship. On the contrary, through Ambassador Walter P. McConaughy, the State Department evidently helped impress upon Dr. Rhee the seriousness of the resentment to which his party's rule had given rise. This was the more fittingly an American function since the United States had sponsored membership for Korea in the United Nations.

One lesson that evidently needs to be learned from events of the past several months in South Korea, and it applies elsewhere, is that the police should be above party. Instead of instructing people how to vote, as was alleged, their function should be simply to see that a fair vote is held. The South Korean Army seems in this and other respects to have maintained a better standard, and this is an element of hope.

Two great necessities of democratic self-government have been illustrated in Korea: That leaders should not equate all opposition with disloyalty or subversion. And that they should allow for peaceful transition in response to the popular will.

Issuance of Masaryk Set of "Champions of Liberty" Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in 1957 the Post Office Department inaugurated a "champions of liberty" stamp series to honor foreign leaders and fighters for liberty throughout the world. Among the "champions of liberty" to be honored to date are Ramon Magsaysay, Simon Bolivar, Lajos Kossuth, Jose de San Martin, and Ernst Reuther.

On March 7 of this year the founder and first President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas G. Masaryk, was commemorated with a stamp in the "champions of liberty" series. The following day in the office of the Baltimore postmaster, William F. Laukaitis, a large group of east Baltimore's Czechoslovak colony gathered to celebrate informally the issuance of the Post Office Department's stamp and the 110th birthday of President Masaryk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article published in the Baltimore Guide of March 17 describing this memorable occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL CZECHOSLOVAK COLONY MARKS HONOR STAMP ISSUE

A large contingent of East Baltimore's Czechoslovak Colony attended an impromptu meeting on March 8, held in the main post office, on the occasion honoring the 110th birthday of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, regarded by the Czech people as their "father and champion of liberty," and President three times of Czechoslovakia before it became a Communist puppet state in 1948.

The event also featured recognition of the issuance of the Masaryk set of "Champion of Liberty" stamps in 4-cent and 8-cent denomination, which went on sale in Washington, D.C., March 7, Masaryk's birthday. The stamps are now available in more than 36,000 post offices in the United States.

It is the sixth of a series and, according to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, is the first stamp to reach so large an amount—$250,000—on its first sale day.

HONORED GUESTS

Attending the local event at the post office were: William F. Laukaitis, Baltimore postmaster; Joseph Mach, State senator, Second District; Frances Holub, member, house of delegates; Clement Prucha, city councilman; Father Thomas Kozlovsky, St. Wenceslaus Church; Joseph Bilek, past president, Bohemian Sokol Gymnastic Association; Anthony Cihlar, associate editor, Hlasatel Newspaper; Edward Stetka, instructor, Sokol gymnasts; Mrs. Anthony Peroutka, president, Augustine Herman Group of the Women's Civic League; Mrs. Agnes Svejda, president, Augustine Herman Historical Society; Mrs. Agnes Rys; Mrs. Tina Shimanek; Mrs. Bessie Rokos; Mrs. Barbara Stepan; Mrs. Angela Peleska; Mrs. Anna Tich; and little Barbara Stepan, who was photographed in colorful Czechoslovakian costume with Mr. Laukaitis.

TRIBUTE PAID

Mr. Laukaitis paid gracious tribute to the nationality groups of Baltimore, with special emphasis on the worthy contributions of the local Czechoslovakian group to the city's civic, religious, and political programs.

On the program were: James Primus, John J. Drsata, Warren M. Bloomberg, Joseph Mach, Mrs. Holub, Mr. Prucha, Mr. Cihlar, Mrs. Peroutka, and Mr. Laukaitis.

Qualified Negro Voters in Richmond, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, much has been said in the recent civil rights debate to imply that Negroes are disfranchised in the South by systematic and oppressive discrimination on the part of white persons.

With respect to my own State, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the situation in the Capital City of Richmond. An Associated Press dispatch of April 23, 1960, shows that the number of qualified Negro voters in Richmond has virtually doubled in the last 6 years, while the number of qualified white voters there has risen only slightly during this period, actually dropping by 2,500 in the past year.

This further supports the statements I have made repeatedly to the effect that Virginia's voting laws are absolutely free of racial bias, both in their language and in their application. I know of no case and have heard of no case in which a Virginia citizen of the Negro race has been intimidated, threatened,

harrassed, or prevented in any way in his efforts to register or to vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press dispatch to which I referred.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHMOND, VA., April 23.—The city of Richmond had 51,362 white and 15,641 Negro qualified voters as of April 1, reports to the State board of elections showed Saturday.

Comparable figures for a year ago showed 53,858 white and 15,364 Negro qualified voters. Thus, in the last year, there has been a decrease of about 2,500 white voters and a slight increase in Negro voting potential.

Since 1952 the number of Negroes qualified to vote in Richmond has almost doubled—from 8,737 to the present 15,641. Over the same period the number of white qualified voters has risen from 48,380.

The 1960 total of 51,362 white voters inside the city represents a decline, however, of more than 4,000 from the 55,666 reported in 1958.

City officials said the decline was caused by the movement of white voters from the city proper to the suburbs.

In contrast to Richmond, the adjacent counties of Henrico and Chesterfield have shown huge increases in the number of white voters since 1952. Henrico's white voters have increased from 12,793 to 33,246, while the number of qualified Negro voters in the county increased from 475 to 956 over the 8-year span.

In Chesterfield the April 1960 tabulation showed 12,625 white and 1,320 qualified Negro voters as against totals of 6,975 and 985 for 1952.

Retirement of Herman B. Wells, President of Indiana University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we in Indiana have been extremely proud of our excellent system of State colleges and universities. One of the best of these, for many years, has been Indiana University, whose activities have been guided for 25 years by the very able and distinguished Herman B. Wells.

Dr. Wells left the university only briefly during this period to serve his country at the request of President Truman, setting up the Marshall plan program in Greece, which has been credited with helping to keep that country free and Democratic, although under extreme Communist pressure.

Dr. Wells recently announced his retirement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent editorial of tribute to Dr. Wells by my good friend, Paul L. Feltus, editor of the Bloomington (Ind.) Star-Courier, a longtime trustee of Indiana University.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bloomington (Ind.) Star-Courier, Apr. 14, 1960]

PRESIDENT WELLS' RETIREMENT

Announcement of the retirement in 2 years of Herman B. Wells, president of Indiana University, came as a shock to the general public.

As a matter of fact, however, Dr. Wells' retirement after 25 years' service had been a tacit agreement for several years. Only the approval of the board of trustees to their president's retirement as an official act was necessary.

Those close to Indiana University affairs regard the president's retirement as a part of the "Wells Master Plan" in the course of his years of distinguished service.

After his retirement on July 1, 1962, during the year in which Dr. Wells will have reached the age of 60, his services will not be altogether lost to the university. At that time it is planned that Dr. Wells devote his efforts to the further development of the research division of the Indiana University Foundation, a capacity in which, as he pointed out, "affords an opportunity to help make a great university greater."

This is an area of the university to which President Wells has always had a great devotion, and only a dreamer of dreams can forecast what great achievements he may bring to fruition there.

In the matter of choosing a successor to President Wells, the board of trustees has had ample notice in which to proceed in an orderly manner.

There will be speculation, especially among many educators, as to whether a great administrator like Dr. Wells will be selected, or whether greater emphasis may be placed on a man of high scholarly reputation.

It is unlikely that any educator could have exceeded the accomplishments of President Wells in building up a scholarly faculty.

University business is big business. And President Wells' achievements as a great administrator have never lost sight of the need for scholars of distinction. It has been a part of the business of a great university.

Description of Blood Bank of Delaware, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I am very proud to serve as a director of the Blood Bank of Delaware, Inc.

The blood bank is a "neighbor-to-neighbor" nonprofit blood procurement program, which assures its subscribers of all the blood replacement they may need to supply cooperating hospitals a two-for-one pint replacement of blood given members.

The basic strength of the blood bank plan is that it transfers responsibility from the few to the many. It is in the best tradition of our country where neighbor helps neighbor in time of greatest need.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of the Blood Bank of Delaware, Inc., made available to me by its president, Mr. James F. McCloskey, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLOOD BANK OF DELAWARE, INC., WILMINGTON, DEL.

The Blood Bank of Delaware, Inc., is not, accurately speaking, a blood bank. It is a "neighbor help neighbor" nonprofit blood procurement program, which assures its subscribers of all the blood replacements they may need to supply cooperating hospitals a 2-for-1 pint replacement of blood given members.

Before the plan was established, the nine community hospitals in Delaware obtained blood supplies in the usual manner; by getting relatives and friends of patients to make replacements for blood used; by purchasing from professional donors; by purchasing from blood banks situated in large cities in nearby States.

Because these methods failed to maintain a reasonable supply of blood at all times, a better method was sought. The result was the opening on May 16, 1955, of the Blood Bank of Delaware, Inc. Since then this plan has grown from the original 14 subscribers to the current total of 45,000 (April 15, 1960), who take their turns providing blood to the nine hospitals. In nearly 5 years of operation, the plan has met all its obligations to hospitals and subscribers. Also, it has built up and maintains an adequate reserve supply of blood at the participating hospitals.

THE SUBSCRIBER

The membership requirements are simple: the head of a family, as a subscriber, agrees to pay a $1 initiation fee, plus $1 a year in dues. He also agrees to supply 1 pint of medically acceptable blood (meets National Institute of Health Standards) when called upon to do so.

His first call to donate blood is determined by a name drawing similar to a lottery, from the list of subscribers who have yet to donate. Once he donates his pint he is not called upon again until every other subscriber in the plan has met his obligation. Thus, under normal circumstances and with the present enrollment, a subscriber will be called upon only once in 7 or 8 years.

However, the regulations provide that a subscriber may be called upon to donate one pint of blood in any one year. This is intended to cover blood needed in an officially designated disaster, local or national, or in the event of war. At such times, blood over and above the needs of the plan members may, by decision of the plan's board of directors, be given to or through accredited agencies in the State or Nation.

SUBSCRIBER'S BENEFITS

In return for assuming the obligations of membership, a subscriber and his dependents (those shown on his Federal Income Tax return) are entitled to receive blood replacements without charge for any blood transfusions given in any of the nine participating hospitals. No limit is placed on the number of pints they may receive. Incidentally, the dependents are not required to donate blood to the plan, only the subscriber.

The blood is replaced in the hospitals at a two-for-one rate by the donations of the plan's subscribers.

In addition, subscribers and dependents are covered by the plan while out of State on business or vacation trips anywhere in North America. In these emergency cases, the plan replaces or pays for blood at the rate of one-pint-for-one. The plan will not provide benefits at this time to persons who go to out-of-State hospitals for planned surgical operations or planned hospitalization. This last type of coverage is expected to be offered within the next several months, either by some method of cooperation with other State programs or through payment by

the plan. If the plan cannot afford to pay for all blood used in such cases, it may agree to pay for part of it.

An out-of-State resident employed in Delaware may join the plan under a restricted contract, (initiation fee, annual dues and blood obligation are the same as those for Delaware residents) by which he and his dependents may receive blood replacements for blood transfusions given in any Delaware hospital. The contract is restricted in that under no circumstances does it provide any out-of-State benefits.

Once a year the subscriber is billed for his family membership dues of $1. Failure to pay the dues in the month in which it falls due subjects the subscriber to a penalty of 50 cents, and unless the dues and penalty are paid within 30 days the contract is canceled. To be readmitted he must apply as a new member. The fact that he may have given a blood donation does not alter the situation.

No one is refused membership. There are no religious, racial, health, or age requirements. People over 60 years of age are welcome. Persons afflicted with chronic blood diseases are accepted without question, even cases known to require large quantities of blood. Helping these unfortunates does not appreciably shorten the period (7 to 8 years) between calls on donors. Besides, subscribers realize that one day they, too, may want the help that they now provide for others.

The plan works closely with the hospitals. No donor gives blood unless a hospital requests it. When a request is received, the plan contacts the prospective donor, who has been notified previously that he must stand ready to make a donation. Working with the hospital, the plan office arranges an appointment for the subscriber. If, for any reason, the subscriber is not accepted by the hospital, he is given time to provide a substitute donor or, if he prefers, he may send $25 to the plan office in lieu of a blood donation (this sum may be paid in installments). Failure to fulfill his obligation automatically cancels a subscriber's contract, and he is denied benefits for himself and his dependents. Even though he later applies for reinstatement, he will not be accepted until he fulfills the blood obligation, and must then wait for 30 days before he or his dependents are again eligible for benefits.

The plan's 45,000 subscribers with their dependents number approximately 150,000 persons, one-third of the State's population. It is anticipated that this year the plan will save its members a total of $100,000.

Since its beginning, the plan has supplied 12,000 pints of blood at the established rate of 2 pints for 1. It has filled all requests from the participating hospitals and has paid for all blood required by subscribers in out-of-state emergencies. It has demonstrated not only that it can maintain a constant reserve supply of blood in hospitals, but at the same time, can provide blood in large quantities within a short period after a hospital request is received.

THE HOSPITALS

The plan does not pay for cross-matching or the administration of blood. Charges for these are made by the hospital.

Under normal circumstances, the plan provides blood only to replace that given members. Once blood is donated, it becomes the property of the hospital.

The plan is not obligated to give the hospitals any specific type of blood. The hospital, under its contract with the plan, is responsible for supplying a plan member with the specific type blood he needs. This is one reason why the two pints for one replacement is not regarded as excessive at this time. However, when the donor is accepted by the hospital, his blood type becomes known and is passed on to the plan for future reference. Since no subscriber is called upon to donate twice until every other subscriber has met his obligation once, the plan eventually will have a complete file on donors' blood types, and then the plan will be able to supply the specific type of blood needed.

THE ORGANIZATION

The corporation's board of directors is composed of approximately 75 prominent citizens of Delaware with the Governor of the State as honorary chairman. Board members include our U.S. Senators, Congressman, Secretary of State, an ex-Governor, some city, county, and State officials, as well as representatives of industry, labor, medical, hospital, civic, fraternal, patriotic, religious, and racial groups.

The Blood Bank of Delaware's staff has grown as the plan has grown. At the present, it includes seven full-time members headed by an executive director, whose duties consist of speaking before groups, calling on employers, arranging for distribution of applications, arranging publicity for radio stations and newspapers throughout the State. The office manager coordinates the many activities of the plan's busy office. One employee is responsible for receiving membership applications and renewals, and for prompt handling of all mail pertaining to this phase of operations. Two employees make arrangements for subscribers to donate blood. They send out notices cautioning the subscriber that he may expect a telephone call in the near future, when arrangements will be made for him to go to a hospital. One employee is in charge of files, plus the printing and folding of applications. Another employee has charge of making addressograph plates and using them in preparing the pieces of mail sent out. Occasionally, the plan uses some part-time or volunteer help, but tries to confine its work to its own staff.

Expenses at present average about $40,000 annually. Our goal is 125,000 subscribers in the next few years. Income from such a number could create a surplus. The cost of handling the larger membership would be another $10,000 to $25,000. This would make possible a second office in the lower part of Delaware to assure members there of first-class service. Income over and above present and future needs has been thought of as a fund that may be used for: (1) the establishment of a centralized State blood bank, (2) the purchase of a headquarters building or buildings, (3) blood research.

The money received from subscribers in lieu of blood donations goes into a fund for purchase of blood needed by members in out-of-State emergencies. When this fund reaches a sufficient amount, it also will be used to defray the cost of out-of-State surgery and hospitalization. From time to time the plan has borrowed from this fund to buy office equipment, or to help meet operating costs. It may be of interest to know that the plan has paid for over $18,000 worth of office equipment.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The plan has sought and enjoys excellent cooperation from doctors, hospitals, radio stations, newspapers and its members. Even so, the staff still finds that many people are reluctant to join because they do not like the thought of being called upon to give blood. But because encouraging reports from those subscribers who have given blood are constantly circulating this fear is gradually disappearing. This, together with the word-of-mouth commendations of those who have benefited from the plan makes the task grow easier each month.

The subscribers who have made donations are the plan's most loyal members. Merely by paying their dollar in dues each year they and their dependents are assured of help for 7 to 8 years in normal times. They have a vested interest of which they become very proud.

To reach the public, all media of communications are used. The plan distributed over 60,000 applications last year to the public, private, and parochial schools. Students were instructed to take the applications home to their parents. Again this year, the plan has the complete cooperation of school officials in placing applications in the hands of new students. Many radio programs, full- and part-page newspaper advertisements, and roadside billboards have been used throughout the State. Clergymen of all faiths have assisted by informing their congregations of the plan's benefits.

Many employers pay for their employee's memberships. Some labor unions cover their members. This type of cooperation assists the plan greatly because it means one-time billing for entire groups. The employer is learning that the $1 in dues per person is one of the best investments he can make. However, the plan urges the employer not to use pressure on an employee to join, because the employee must be responsible for his blood donation when called. In some cases, the plan has suggested the employee pay the $1 enrollment fee while the employer provides the annual dues.

The plan's low operating cost in its 5 years demonstrates that large sums of money are not a necessity in any community where there is a hospital and a group of good people who are willing to devote time to such a worthwhile enterprise. At times during the growth period the plan has been poor financially, but it has always been rich in available blood for its members.

One important benefit of the plan is that it assures a much better supply of blood for holidays and at other times when people are less likely to give. This does away with the frantic appeals for blood by newspapers, radio and television that occur in so many areas of our country at such times. It could be of incalculable value for civil defense in time of need.

The cost of membership is so low that few can say they are too poor to pay the dues—and few so friendless that they cannot find someone to act as a substitute donor if they are unable to provide their required pint of acceptable blood.

The plan saves blood because hospitals are assured a more dependable supply through this system than through most voluntary donor programs.

The plan's basic strength is that it transfers responsibility from the few to the many, and, like all tasks so shared, makes the difficult easy. It is in the best tradition of our country where neighbor helps neighbor in time of greatest need. Our plan strives to do the greatest good for the greatest number at the least possible cost.

War by Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able associate editor of the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, has written a very excellent article entitled "War by Subversion," which appeared in both the News and

Courier and in the magazine U.S.A. This article stresses the need and importance of countering the war techniques of communism, and as such merits the attention of the Congress and our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article as printed in the magazine U.S.A., on April 22, 1960, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR BY SUBVERSION

(By Anthony Harrigan)

The United States is prepared to fight a war with missiles and ships, but it is unprepared to fight war by subversion. That's the kind of war that world communism is waging against the American people.

When the Communists launched a "Save Chessman" campaign in Uruguay, they engaged in war by subversion. The United States was unprepared to counter the "Save Chessman" move. It was calculated to make the United States look bad on the eve of President Eisenhower's visit to South America. The State Department reaction was defensive and infuriating to the people at home.

If the United States were prepared to fight the Communists with weapons the Reds understand, the Chessman movement in Uruguay would have been squelched. A group in Uruguay would have been busy stirring the people of that nation to anger against Red imperialism. Prominent Uruguayan intellectuals would have condemned Mikoyan's visit to Cuba. Mass rallies would have been held, protesting the loss of press freedom in Cuba.

But the United States hasn't the apparatus for staging counterrallies, enlisting writers and public figures on our side, or launching protest groups against communism. Therefore, the United States is enormously handicapped in dealing with the Communists.

The billions that the United States spends for missiles, nuclear submarines, manned aircraft and ground forces provide a deterrent against Soviet military attack. But the U.S. Armed Forces, as now organized, are not a deterrent in vital areas.

To win friends and influence people, the United States spends money through foreign aid. But the money is not spent on strategic political projects. Instead of subsidizing writers and influencing newspapers and magazines, as the enemy does so effectively, the United States builds roads and dams abroad, for which Red politicians later take credit.

The Soviet Union depends neither on military power nor vast aid programs to achieve its programs in this hemisphere. Before long, Soviet missiles may be based on Cuban soil. But it won't cost a single Russian soldier or the loss of a ship or plane. The trade pact the Soviet Union signed with Cuba is basically a barter deal, an inexpensive arrangement for any big nation.

The Soviets are getting results in Cuba because they have spent money judiciously on political subversion. They have fed money to people who are operating in all departments of the Cuban Government. They have concentrated on the essentials of war by subversion—propaganda, infiltration of the Government and the universities, subsidizing friends and manipulating mobs.

Few Americans have even considered that the United States might adopt the same war techniques. When it is suggested, many Americans hold up their hands in horror at the idea.

"We don't play that way" is the prevailing American reaction.

Well, what's taking place in Latin America isn't play; it is war, though the guns are silent. A country that refuses in wartime to adopt winning tactics is a country destined for defeat.

What the United States is buying in the Central Intelligence Agency is not clear. Judging from the lack of results in Latin America, the CIA confines itself to sleuthing and preparation of intelligence estimates.

The United States should get more for its money out of the CIA. It should get a countersubversion operation against world communism.

What does that mean? It means a concerted and continuing program of secret activities to undermine enemy operations. In Latin America, for example, it means the secret organization and supply of anti-Castro groups and parachuting them into Cuba.

"But we couldn't do that," some people may say. "We maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba."

While not many persons may know it, the United States has recruited intelligence agents in this country and dropped them behind the Iron Curtain. If U.S. agents can be parachuted into Hungary, they can be dropped into Cuba.

This sort of warfare is something new to Americans. But the necessity for fighting fire with fire becomes apparent as communism gains strength in this hemisphere. In meeting the challenge of Soviet war by subversion, in which weapons and campaigns are unconventional, the defense must also be unconventional.

It is not enough for the United States to be ringed with ships and guarded by missiles. The United States must be prepared to bring its power to bear in government ministries, newsrooms, editorial offices of intellectual journals, radio and TV stations, university classrooms, and at mass protest rallies. Power that cannot be brought to bear in decisive situations is wasted power.

Without much delay, the United States must learn how to use its power secretly and from inside a nation, adopting all the political techniques that American ingenuity can devise.

The Student Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most thoughtful and well-reasoned article by our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. In this article the Senator from Minnesota analyzes with both historical and philosophical understanding the case against the inclusion of special loyalty oaths in educational legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUESTIONABLE TREND—THE STUDENT LOYALTY OATH

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY)

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 requires a loyalty oath from those who apply for loans and an affidavit disclaiming belief in any organization which advocates overthrowing the Government by unconstitutional means, or their support of any such organization. A proposal to modify the loyalty oath provision of the act is again moving through the committees of Congress.

Last year Senator KENNEDY brought to the floor of the Senate an amendment which would have repealed both the oath and the affidavit. Speaking for his committee, he accepted on the floor of the Senate an amendment restoring the affirmative loyalty oath. However, even this modified proposal was rejected by the Senate.

Now again the opposing lines are being drawn. On the one side are various veterans' groups, patriotic societies, and individuals who argue that no one should hesitate to take a positive oath of allegiance to the country, and that no loyal young American should hesitate to declare his anticommunism. On the other hand, there are those opposed, including some spokesmen for the administration, presidents of colleges and universities, professors, and others who argue that both the oath and affidavit are unnecessary, ineffective, or discriminatory. The middle ground between these two positions is also occupied. In this area are those who for the most part are willing to accept the positive oath of allegiance, but are strongly opposed to the disclaimer affidavit.

To me the central issue in this controversy seems to be not one of loyalty or of security, but rather one of propriety.

No one can seriously believe that the basic security of the Nation will be drastically affected either by the continuation of the oath and disclaimer, by modification of them, or by removing them completely from the law. Certainly, no convinced Communist would hesitate to swear falsely. On the other hand, no one can prove that the integrity of the academic community will be destroyed if the oath and disclaimer are retained in the law. Our educational system is strong; students and educators are resilient; students have demonstrated that they can stand effectively against faculties; faculties seem to survive despite administrations; administrations seem to survive despite the regents, as in the case of State universities; boards of regents seem to survive despite State legislatures. All have had to put up with many difficult and disagreeable things.

What is called for in this matter is judgment on the part of Congress as to whether or not the general welfare of the country has been protected or advanced by the inclusion of the oath or affidavit in the National Defense Education Act. There are several general principles which must be considered here.

First, it is important that the history of the nature of oath taking be considered. The taking of an oath in Western civilization has always been considered as important. It has been an act of great religious as well as civil significance, and the use of the oath has generally been restricted to serious decisions.

Traditionally, oath taking has been surrounded with formal ritual, reflecting the solemnity of the occasion and the importance of the act both to the individual who took the oath and also to the community in the service of which it was taken. The oath taken by the President, the Vice President, the Members of Congress, the judges of the courts, members of the armed services, is a sign and public manifestation that they are making a serious decision; that they are performing a very special kind of act of dedication to the public welfare. It shows that they are taking up vital work of the community. The oath is a reminder to them of the importance of their responsibility, and it is also a public declaration to the people of the country that they are accepting these very special responsibilities.

The fundamental sanction of the oath is the name of God. It is not an unrelated declaration to say that no man should take the name of the Lord in vain.

Oath taking loses something of its significance and of its dignity and, I think, too, something of its effectiveness if it is used commonly or lightly, without preparation, without due cause, without adequate ceremony. The dignity of the oath is lowered when an oath is used in a routine manner, as a mere step in the paperwork of making a loan. The oath should not be taken without reflection, without identification with public service. We should go slowly in extending oath taking to cover minor relationships of the state and its citizens. But making a loan to a student to enable him to go to college is essentially a personal financial contract. It is my opinion that such action taken alone does not merit the dignity of an oath such as is now required in the National Defense Education Act. This proposal comes very close to putting a cash value on patriotism.

The second principle which has bearing on this decision is fundamental to democratic society and democratic government. Democracy implies an affirmation of confidence in the integrity and responsibility of the individual person. In a democracy it is assumed that an individual is innocent of crime unless he is proven guilty. As far as his general acts as a citizen are concerned, it should be assumed that he is loyal until he has been proved to be other than loyal.

Democratic government acknowledges that the individual has personal responsibilities; that he has certain unalienable rights inherent in his nature as a man, and because of this nature, he must be given a measure of freedom and also a measure of responsibility for self-discipline which is outside the power of any group or any institution, including the state. There is a place for loyalty oaths and for oaths of allegiance in democratic society, but such an oath should not be presented ordinarily in a negative context, but rather as a proud and public affirmation of dedication to duty.

The record of history shows quite clearly that it has been the tyrannies—the tyrannical governments, the absolute monarchs, the totalitarian states—those governments which were most uncertain of themselves or which were on the verge of collapse that have made oath taking a rigid, common, if not universal, requirement. In our own generation we need go back only to the Nazi period in Germany. Under that regime every time a citizen of Germany met another citizens on the street, he was expected to raise his hand in salute and say, "Heil Hitler." This was an oath of allegiance or at least a declaration of his allegiance to Hitler and to the Nazi movement. Certainly this was not evidence of a vital living society, of a society made up of free men, but rather it was a sign of uncertainty, of hesitation, and of fear.

Basically, these are the considerations that are involved in the current debate; not in the same degree, of course, but certainly in substance. For the absolute monarch and for the tyrant, oath taking becomes a device to harass, to threaten, and to control citizens. Loyalty oaths of this kind are no real contribution to the security of a nation of free men, but rather a manifestation of insecurity reflecting a fear of Government officials and others who seek to intimidate and frighten others and thus to reassure themselves.

I do not suggest that the loyalty oath in the National Defense Education Act is of this order. If it could be isolated, it might well be said to be insignificant, but there is danger that it will establish a trend which will not do honor to democracy or to the traditions of the United States. To extend a requirement for loyalty oaths to more and more relationships which are relatively unimportant or which are personal or which are socially insignificant is to run the danger of undermining our traditions and at the same time of destroying confidence in democratic government and in democratic institutions.

This danger was recognized in the very beginning of our Nation. I am sure that Thomas Jefferson would not have been happy at the prospect of imposing loyalty oaths on students seeking loans to enter the University of Virginia when that institution was established, for he said that he regarded it as "based on the inimitable freedom of the human mind. For here," he said, "we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it." And following the Revolution, even the conservative Alexander Hamilton opposed the expurgatory oath which was designed to weed out the Tories in New York. Hamilton said that this oath would have the following effect: "To excite the honest and conscientious and to hold out a bribe to perjury. * * * Nothing could be more repugnant to the true genius of the common law than such an inquisition * * * in the conscience of men."

There is an interesting report on the matter of oath taking in Clarendon's "The Rebellion and Civil Wars in England." According to this history, in the year 1639 when King Charles was proceeding against the Scots, it was proposed that all members of the English nobility make a special protestation of their loyalty and obedience to the King and disclaim and renounce any intelligence or correspondence with the rebels. Two members of the English nobility, Lord Say and Lord Brook, refused to profess their loyalty to the King. They said, "If the king suspected their loyalty, he might proceed against them as he thought fit; but that it was against the law to impose any oath or protestation upon them which were not enjoined by the law; and, in that respect, that they might not betray the common liberty, they would not submit to it."

Finally, I think the decision on this question should take into account the principle that professional groups generally should govern their own members. Just as we assume that in a democracy every citizen will be loyal, so too we expect each profession to determine its own goals and to adopt its own procedures and rules for disciplining its own members. Sound democracy reserves the authority of government intervention only to those cases in which the common good is clearly threatened by failures by other groups or institutions.

We expect, for example, that the American Medical Association will promote medicine without government threat and that its members will abide by the Hippocratic oath and the other standards of the profession. It is common practice to permit the bar association to determine rules for admission and rules for practice and to discipline its own members. Each one who is admitted to the practice of medicine or of the law or to the other professions pledges faithful performance of his duties; indeed, the word "profession" itself is drawn from the action of professing or of taking an oath publicly.

The academic profession in turn has its own goals and its own responsibilities. Colleges and universities have a common purpose; namely, to help students seek and acquire truth. Each institution has its unique traditions and objectives. A student when he enters a college or university makes an implicit pledge of fidelity to the purpose of the university. If he does not adhere to its standards, he is likely either to withdraw or he is subject to expulsion. As a student, his professional responsibility is the concern of the college, and college authorities are expected to keep him alined through a variety of efforts not excluding an appeal for loyalty to the "crimson," or to the "blue," or to the "maroon and gold," as the case may be.

Of course, it might be well if the very act of entering upon the work of gaining a college education were made an occasion of great public significance, and a public declaration of dedication called for. It might be desirable that all students who enter college take such an oath to remind them of the special social significance and social responsibility that go with education and to stir them to more solemn dedication to the fulfillment of the responsibilities that go with learning. But this is not the loyalty oath of the National Defense Education Act.

For the Government to intervene in the professional controls now exercised in our colleges and to take steps which purport to guarantee loyalty of students requires substantial evidence that the colleges have failed in self-discipline. I do not believe that the proponents of the loyalty oath have seriously questioned the loyalty of the academic community, faculty or students, nor do they declare that in fact any pattern of disloyalty actually exists. To my mind, the available evidence argues for continued confidence in the ability and integrity of teachers and administrations and also of American college students. I firmly believe that the basic issue here is really one of the propriety of oath-taking, of respect for the traditions of this Nation, and of the fundamental demands of democracy.

Development of Rural Areas Through Industrialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a very distinguished resident of Arkansas addressed the annual convention of the American Bankers Association, at Miami Beach, Fla., in October of last year. It was a well-thought-out speech, relating to a well-thought-out program.

I call the attention of the Senate to the address made by Mr. Winthrop Rockefeller, chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that his splendid address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS THROUGH INDUSTRIALIZATION

(Address by Winthrop Rockefeller, chairman, the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission)

Gentlemen, I must warn you.

I am an honest but nonetheless eager broker for Arkansas.

For the past 5 years I have spent a good part of my time telling business people about the rewards of investing in Arkansas.

Now such an opportunity as this—a roomful of bankers—is rare (more than any broker could hope for) and I am compelled from occupational habit as well as deep conviction to talk a little about Arkansas. Therefore, I shall begin and end my remarks by asking each of you to keep Arkansas in mind, especially when you weigh investments for manufacturing plants in the South and Southwest.

I have learned firsthand that Arkansas offers many real advantages to the investor. But before I spell out some of these advantages, I must explain that they are rooted

in serious problems common to all low-income rural regions. These problems are the very ones which are of so much concern to our industrial commission and to those engaged in national rural development.

THE SOUTH'S MAIN PROBLEM

Everyone knows that low income is the South's main problem. But not everyone knows that this low-income problem consists basically of having too many people for too few jobs, and too meager an income opportunity within the existing farming system.

The South has more than its share of the Nation's youth and more than its share of the older people. This can only mean that each person of working age must support more than his share of dependents. To make matters worse, the South has less than its share of employment opportunities. Those employment opportunities which exist are concentrated mostly in farming, and farm incomes nationally are must lower on the average than nonfarm incomes. Even among Southern States, Arkansas falls below the average in income per farm.

AIMS OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

It is this surplus of people and this shortage of jobs which has caused the people of Arkansas to look at industrial development as a panacea. I think their view is substantially correct. However, I would not want to leave the impression that our industrial commission believes that industry alone can solve all problems of rural areas. We give hardy assent to the other aim of the national rural development program. We believe that a particular wisdom outlined its threefold aims of: (1) Strengthening industry in low-income areas and widening the range of off-farm job opportunities; (2) helping families who want to stay in farming gain the tools, land, and information that will permit them to farm successfully; (3) helping all people in these areas arm themselves with adequate training and good health.

On the first objective—strengthening industry—I shall make several comments, based on my own experience and the experience of our industrial commission's staff. But, first, I should like to mention briefly agriculture, education, and health, as they are emphasized in the rural development program.

Although I am not an agriculturalist by training or long experience, I have learned much in the past 7 years while creating Winrock Farm and developing a herd of Santa Gertrudis cattle which—I am happy to report—is attracting the attention of my fellow cattlemen.

The experience I have gained confirms a conclusion reached by thousands of farmers, as well as farm economists—namely, that the 40-acre farm is becoming increasingly rare as an economic unit. The trend has perforce been to mechanization in order to reap the benefits of larger unit operations. The owners of small farms, often logically and always understandably, do not want to abandon the land which has been owned by their families for generations. Yet they are faced with the alternatives of selling at a financial loss and moving to more populated areas or of finding outside employment to supplement their meager farm earnings. The latter alternative is the hope of a large majority of these people, a hope that should be sustained.

We of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission are pleased that much of the new industry coming to Arkansas is selecting the smaller communities—almost, as it were, to fulfill the hopes of many of these fine people who want to stay on their land.

Changes are also taking place in education and medicine. The consolidation of school districts, running hand in hand with the development of a network of better roads, is making possible better educational opportunities. Better medical facilities are also available for the improvement of health standards. To be sure, this progress is often made at the expense of the old family physicians, who traditionally dealt not only with the health needs of his patients, but served as family confidant and adviser as well.

WHEN INDUSTRY DECIDES TO MOVE

Now concerning the No. 1 aim of strengthening and locating industry in low-income areas and widening the range of off-farm opportunities: How do we go about it? And how can people in the rural areas organize themselves so as to be more effective and to participate more fully in the rural development program?

One of our commission's problems is to convince people living in rural areas that industry itself decides when and where to expand. This management decision usually takes place within the framework of an annual capital budget. It is based on forecasts of long-term sales growth and considerations of competition.

Once the decision to budget capital for a new plant is made, someone in the company is assigned the responsibility for determining just where the additional plant capacity ought to be located. In many cases the expansion takes place right at the existing plant location; and of course a good part of the industrial expansion in Arkansas is occurring in existing plants. But sometimes the expansion requires a new plant at a new location. It may be that production facilities have to be located nearer to the newer and growing markets of the South and Southwest; it may be that new sources of raw materials, fuels, and quantities of good water are required to meet the needs of rapidly expanding production. Or it may be that a large supply of efficient labor must be found. Whatever the case, each company frames and weighs these questions differently, and each company wants specific information suited to its own needs. Only after selecting the broad geographic region in which it wishes to expand is the company ready to seek outside help and to search out information about specific locations within that broad region.

AIDC ACTS AS PRIVATE CONSULTANT

At this stage, industrial development agencies like ours are a great asset to industry. Our commission can be of tremendous help to the site-seeking company, precisely because we make it our business to know more about our region and Arkansas than anyone else, and because we present information to fit the company's particular requirements.

We start with the company's needs rather than our desires.

Today we have more than 200 companies which we consider active prospects because each has asked specific questions about Arkansas. Our staff prepares individual reports for these companies by drawing upon the resources of a wide range of public and private agencies which help supply complete factual answers to all questions. This service is confidential, and we follow up by guiding company representatives on a tour of the State to help them confirm all the information needed to make a final choice.

Our commission's role as a private consultant to industry is but one part of the big job we have assumed. Much work is in progress at the community level. Plant location consultants on our staff can bring the company's representative only to areas of Arkansas already preselected. It is up to the local community to provide the facilities and environment which make it attractive to industry. At the present time, our commission is working with 138 communities to help them prepare for industry, through our six-point self-help program. We also work with a group of nine utilities in an annual yearlong community improvement contest. However, we have found that the preparedness job at the community level is usually too big for voluntary committees alone. A full-time local development man is needed to carry out an effective program, which not only enables the community to present itself in the most favorable light, but which brings together financial and real estate interests so that a satisfactory agreement can be reached with the company representative.

How then, can this smaller picture of the industrial development process be related to the national rural development program?

THE RURAL COMMUTERS

First, one of the harsh facts to be reckoned with is that industry traditionally has not been too interested in expanding into isolated rural areas. For over a century now industry has flourished in the great urban centers simply because there it found a concentration of workers within walking distance of the factory. Industry also depended upon the big city for power and water, and it often regarded the same big city as a major market for the goods it produced. The whole history of industrialization then has been the history of urbanization.

If our efforts to strengthen industry in low-income areas are to succeed, we must try to crossbreed industry with agriculture—to domesticate it—as it were, to a more pastoral existence. This proposal is not as farfetched as it may seem at first, because the same technology which made the 40-acre farm obsolete also freed the factory from its ties to the big city. No longer do large numbers of workers need to live within walking distance of their place of work. In Arkansas it is quite common for workers to drive 20, 30, even 40 miles to their places of work. Today, electric energy is available in the remotest areas, and manufacturers produce for national and international markets as well as for local ones.

Of course, industry in 1959 still has many secondary requirements which bind it to urban centers—transportation facilities, financial institutions, municipal services, communication centers, business services, and suppliers, to name a few. And the key people that industry needs—its skilled workers, its engineers, its manager—are accustomed to the amenities of urban living * * * the supermarkets, the schools, the concert halls and other services and diversions. It is such remaining requirements which must be reconciled with the aims of the rural development program. And in view of this reality, I personally think that the industrial development of a rural area must be focused on the larger of the area's small cities.

THE AREAWIDE APPROACH

Does this mean, then, that there is little hope of raising the income of people on farms and in small towns by industrial development? Not at all. A second and most encouraging fact we have learned in our work is that the benefits of a new industrial plant located in the small city are spread fairly widely throughout the surrounding communities and countryside. For example, when Yale and Towne came to Forrest City—which has a population of about 10,000—many people assumed that this new plant would only benefit residents of Forrest City itself. However, a commuting survey recently completed by our staff revealed that a sizable proportion of the plant's employees commute from rural residences in small communities up to 40 miles away. This is not at all an unusual phenomenon; surveys in 35 other small cities in Arkansas have shown the same broad commuting pattern.

Recently I learned with much satisfaction that the national rural development people in Arkansas and in several other States were experimenting with an areawide approach—covering several counties as a single unit. From an industrial development point of

view, this approach makes more sense than the county-by-county approach which had previously been in effect. In Arkansas, the multiple-county area chosen is in a hilly low-income region centered on the city of Batesville, which has a population of about 7,000.

In two recent instances apparel plants were located between small cities and the buildings were financed jointly by the small cities. One plant was built between Dermott and McGehee in southeastern Arkansas. The other was built in western Arkansas and financed by seven small cities, including Metropolitan Fort Smith. In each instance the plant was located beyond the limits of any city.

As a matter of fact, the areawide approach is effective even for larger cities. Three of our larger cities in southern Arkansas—Camden, El Dorado, and Magnolia—have formed a joint industrial development council. Recognizing that they are within 35 miles of each other and that many of their workers commute between the cities, they have found it advantageous to promote the attractions of their three-city region as a unit and as the beginnings of an oil, paper, ordnance, and metalworking complex. I understand that there long have been such subregional development efforts successfully operating in northern Mississippi and northern Alabama. I would strongly suggest that the national rural development program take into account such basic requirements for effective organization.

WHAT ARKANSAS CAN OFFER

I warned you earlier that I would end with a sales talk. Some of you may have been wondering why industry should consider it advantageous to locate in such a rural State as mine.

Well, it so happens that our labor surplus which is a problem for us can be a great asset to industry. When members of our staff knock on doors in the giant cities of the North they find industry quite conscious of periodic and acute labor shortages. Only one-fifth of the additional nonfarmworkers needed in our 10 most industrialized States can be supplied by natural increases of the labor force from within those States. Over half of the adidtional workers must come from reduced employment, increased participation in the labor force, and a shift out of farm employment. To rely on this source is to scrape the bottom of the barrel. Many industries throughout the North are counting on migrating youth from Arkansas and other Southern States to fill their peak labor needs.

But they need to ask themselves if this is the most efficient way to plan for future labor requirements. One fact they should keep in mind is that these transplanted workers have adjustment problems which lower their morale and productivity—a characteristic long noted in all immigrant labor.

What we in Arkansas can offer is another and better way of filling the growing labor needs of expanding industry—we offer industry an opportunity to tap this labor supply at its source. The first advantage that a new plant has in Arkansas is the opportunity to select the characteristics of its work force. Experience of our new industries has been that five capable workers apply for every job offered. Although most of our labor supply lacks industrial training, it has been found quick to learn and receptive to new and improved methods. We can offer industry a fresh start for building sound employee relations.

Yes, our experience teaches us that there is a large number of workers able and willing to commute from their farm homes to industrial jobs located in the towns and smaller cities of a State like Arkansas—who can continue to live and improve the homes they own and be happy in the small communities they know and love. It has been frequently and truly said that America's great strength in large part has stemmed from the pride of property ownership. The mechanical evolution in agriculture is sapping some of this strength, but wise planning in industrial location can certainly aid in the preservation of this truly great American value.

Recently there has been much newspaper comment concerning the financial straits in which many industrial States now find themselves. In the past 10 years the bonded indebtedness of these States has risen by 300 to 400 percent while, I am pleased to say, the State of Arkansas has reduced its indebtedness by 12 percent. To me, there is much to be learned from these startling happenings. The established industrial States are now being faced, as a result of overcrowding and overindustrialization in metropolitan areas, with the staggering cost of urban redevelopment which involves the problems of traffic, health, education, slum clearance, and housing.

Long-range planning 50 years ago might have eased the cost of the dubious luxury of the crowded city life. People frequently point a snide and disparaging finger at States like Arkansas and Mississippi which are low on the economic totem pole. True, the people of these States have had less than their share of life's material things, but now as they grow—and growing they are—they are in the fortunate position of being able to profit by the monstrous mistakes that have been made by some of the wealthier States.

Now, before the Governor of New York reproaches me for using this platform to make a raid upon his industries, I must hasten to assure you that in the 4 years of our commission's existence we have been successful in persuading only one sizable company to move its whole operation to Arkansas. In all other instances a branch plant located in Arkansas simply represents an expansion. And these branch plants in Arkansas strengthen their parent company's competitive position in the Southwest's growing markets as well as provide more productive work opportunities in one of the Nation's problem rural areas.

From Athlete to Regent Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago all Americans who were interested in college athletics knew Ray Evans and his excellent record. Ray was an all-American in football and basketball at the University of Kansas.

Upon leaving school, Ray entered the banking profession, and is now executive vice president of the Traders National Bank in Kansas City. As a member of the board of regents at the University of Kansas, he received his appointments to that post from both Democratic and Republican Governors, and this year he was elected chairman of the board.

Following the resignation of Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy, who has accepted a similar position with the University of California at Los Angeles, the board of regents, under the leadership of Chairman Ray Evans, performed a distinct service in selecting Dr. W. Clarke Wescoe, now dean of the university's school of medicine, who will assume the duties of chancellor July 1.

The chairman and the members of the board of regents are to be congratulated upon the immediate appointment of such an outstanding and well-qualified American as Dr. Wescoe, and the selection displays the straight thinking and rare judgment which Ray Evans has always exercised in the sports arena and in his business undertakings.

An editorial appeared in the Kansas City Kansan on February 3 which quotes the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight's comments on the election of Ray Evans as chairman of the Kansas University Board of Regents, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the extension of my remarks:

RAY EVANS, CHAIRMAN

When members of the State board of regents elected Ray Evans as chairman for the coming year they were recognizing the continuing interest in schools of a man who once was one of the State's best known students.

"As an all-American in both football and basketball at K.U., Evans was known to sports fans throughout the United States," comments the Topeka Capital approvingly. "Since that time his enthusiasm for his school has been maintained and he has been a strong voice in alumni and athletic affairs at K.U.

"Since his appointment to the Regents his interest has broadened to include all of the State's schools. It is tribute to his nonpartisan conduct of his office that after having been appointed by Republican Governor Fred Hall he was reappointed by Democratic Governor George Docking."

On the same subject the Pittsburg Headlight comments that Evans is "the first chairman to be plucked out of the hall of football fame. He is the first top star of athletics to sit on the board of regents. But he has been on the board long enough to show his qualifications as a man of business. This is good. It is becoming more apparent all the time that one of Kansas' greatest responsibilities is to prepare the big State schools for the heavier obligations that lie ahead to the young men and women now approaching college days.

"These schools are now big business. Regents who not only are capable of participating in big business operations but are farseeing and broad enough in their thinking to recognize the heavy demands the upcoming generations are putting on Kansas are needed.

"And that is the reason that Kansas is interested in having men such as Ray Evans on the board of regents."

Financing Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, during recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging—on the subject of financing health care—we received many excellent statements.

Most of them added more documentation—to the inescapable conclusion—that there must be a system of national health insurance for our elderly citizens.

Among those who testified was one whose name has become almost a watchword in the field of health insurance.

I refer, of course, to the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, Representative from Rhode Island.

Representative FORAND is the author of H.R. 4700—which is more popularly known as the Forand bill—and about which I have received several thousand letters in the past few months.

I am sure that, despite the opposition of the administration and others, we will enact into law in this country a program of health insurance for the elderly—and that it will be based on the social security system.

But whatever form the final law takes we will all owe a debt of gratitude to Representative FORAND for the work he has done in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony given by Representative FORAND before the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MCNAMARA. We hate to have Congressman FORAND with us and not give him a chance to say a few words for the record and maybe clear up some of the misunderstandings about his legislation.

Congressman FORAND, do you want to talk from here or would you prefer to sit at the witness table?

Mr. FORAND. I will go right down there and face you, Senator.

Senator MCNAMARA. All right, fine.

If there is an expert in this area, it is you. We know of your study and are certainly very happy to have your comments for the record. Go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE AIME J. FORAND, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman and Senator, I am one of those who is not a newcomer to the problem of the aged and I think, for the record, I should say that I have been interested in this problem of the aged since I first went to my State legislature which was in 1923 at the time that the Fraternal Order of Eagles started their movement for old-age pensions, and I have been interested in it ever since. I am one of the few Members of this Congress that have had experience doing welfare work where again the problem of the aged was brought very, very vividly to my attention, during the almost 2 years that I spent as chief of the Division of Soldiers Relief in the State of Rhode Island and commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers Home.

Now, I had not expected to take the stand this morning but I read this morning's papers and also I have heard the statements made here today and I think there are a few points that should be cleared up for the record.

First of all, I would like to impress upon all the news media, the newspapers, radio and television, that when they say the program I propose would be Government paid, they are all wrong. It would be paid by those who eventually would be the beneficiaries with the exception of that small group that would be picked up upon inauguration of the program, because what I propose is a self-sustaining program the same as the rest of our social security setup and, while the funds would be handled by the Federal Government just as other social security funds are handled, the money would come from the beneficiaries, the workers and employees and not out of the general fund of the Treasury.

When I introduced my bill in 1957, I made the statement which I have repeated several times since then, that I was not wedded to the language of my bill.

I was offering it as a basis from which to work because I was sick and tired of hearing a lot of words and finding that no action was taken to solve a most pressing problem.

I do not intend to go into the details of the plan. I think it has been explained time and time again and in order to conserve the time of the subcommittee, I shall gloss that over for the moment.

One thing that seems to have escaped the people in view of the fact that we talk about some 12 or 13 million beneficiaries who would immediately receive benefits under my plan is the fact that, while this would take up this group, it is providing an opportunity for the younger people who are working, to be able to take care of paid-up insurance so that when they reach retirement age, they will be the beneficiaries of the system. Not only would it be of great help to these individuals now, particularly those who have aged parents, but the younger fellow, 25 or 35 or 45, the young married man does not know when he is going to leave this world. He does not know how many children besides his widow he will leave behind him. These are people who would benefit as a result of this. He would be providing, through the payment of this insurance, for the care of these others who he would leave behind.

Much has been said about how much this would cost to the individual particularly. So much money would be taken out of his pay envelope.

Well, the truth of the matter is when you figure at the highest possible figure which is a wage base of $4,800 now, it would take only 25 cents a week, the price of a pack of cigarettes. How many people are drawing $4,800 a year in wages? A great many, but not all by a long shot. You know, and I know that there are many who are in the $2,000 and $3,000 bracket. Those individuals who have an income of $2,400 would only pay about 12 or 13 cents a week, and where could they buy this type of coverage at that price?

The commercial insurance people, of course, are opposed to my bill. But I think they are blind. I think they fail to see the point. And, as Senator HUMPHREY said a few moments ago, if this bill went into effect, it would permit these private insurance companies to cut their premiums and increase their coverage because they could eliminate the high risk, those people 65 or over.

They are missing the boat now just as they thought when they were fighting the original social security bill.

Now, the doctors are all opposed to it—I should not say "all"—let me correct that, because I have so many letters in my office from individual doctors to the contrary—many, many doctors have written to me that they are members of the AMA but the AMA is not speaking for them in this matter. But the AMA, which is supposed to represent the doctors, says that the hospitals will be overcrowded if this bill should become law.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that if the hospitals are to be overcrowded as a result of this, there are two reasons for it: One is the great need now existing for hospitalization and medical care of many of these aged people. The other is that the doctors would not be doing their job because under the provisions of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, no one can get into the hospital unless a doctor says so. The doctor has to make all arrangements for him. He cannot stay in the hospital any longer than the doctor says he can stay there. So, that is all window-dressing.

Although the administration has not come up with any program as yet, they have done a lot of stalling over these many months. The truth of the matter is that they have been toying with several plans and according to the newspapers and according to Mr. Flemming, the Secretary of HEW, when he was before the Ways and Means Committee, their plan has to do with State and Federal cooperation in actually subsidizing the insurance companies.

That would mean about $400 million out of the Federal fund, out of the general fund each year, rather than from contributions made to the Social Security fund by those who would benefit.

Further, let us keep in mind, and I believe practically every Member of Congress has a good knowledge of the legislatures of the several States, how long would it take before these several States could work up a program to join this Federal program?

Why it would take years. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it may interest you and the other members of this committee to know that only last week in the Ways and Means Committee of the House when we were considering public assistance, the question of medical aid to those on public assistance came up.

We tried to check. You will recall, I think it was in 1958, that Congress voted to make an allowance of, I believe, it was $5 or $6 per claimant or per client under the public welfare for medical assistance.

To this day there are still 15 States that do not have a medical program under public assistance. Yet they are drawing the money from the Federal Government and we do not know how they are using it.

Now the administration has been talking about studies. They have made so many studies that they meet themselves going back. They have not come up with any program. They do not have one. And I repeat what I have said before: If my plan is not the best plan to take care of this situation, let someone come up with an alternative that is better and if they have it, I will accept it.

Now, the doctors talk about socialized medicine. This would not be any more socialized medicine than the payments already being made under social security. The truth of the matter is that this would operate on the same basis with the Government paying the bill as Blue Shield operates today. The Blue Shield is a doctors' organization. They are the ones who control. They are the ones who set the fees. They are the ones who agree to accept as total payment for a bill the amounts specified in their schedules providing the income of the individual is below a certain level.

This would operate in the same way. Sometimes I feel rather sick at heart to realize how some of these doctors feel and seem to be closing their eyes to the medical needs of the people and just thinking of their pocketbooks. I have one in my own entourage of relatives who had to scrape to go through medical school. Like all other doctors, he got the benefit of the public schools being paid for out of tax money. In addition to that, some employers, God bless them, were kind enough to provide him with employment at perhaps much more than he deserved as far as the wages were concerned, because they knew he wanted to study medicine.

And today, less than 10 years after he has graduated, he owns his own home. He owns a house where he has his office. He has three cars in his family and he is one of those who is out fighting against the Forand bill.

He has forgotten that his own father could not afford to put him through school. His

father was working in a cotton mill for low wages. His mother was working in a hospital as a scrub woman, but he has forgotten all that and I say to you, that he is one that represents the thinking of many of our doctors today, unfortunately.

The doctors in their paper, the AMA News, a few weeks ago had an editorial urging their State medical groups to publicize the fact that no one who needs medical attention need go without it because he is without funds. Well, it happened that either on the same day or within a week of the time that editorial appeared in that paper, I received a letter from an aged couple out in the Middle West. The man is 78. The woman is 72. The man can not work at his age, is rather feeble. His wife was taken to a hospital. The doctors said there was no hope for her. There was no need of keeping her there. He took her home and he is taking care of her. Their income is $98 a month under the social security system. Yet, with his letter, he enclosed two letters from collection agencies, dunning him for the payment of $15 due to a hospital and $40 owed to a hospital.

So, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, no matter what the doctors tell me, I prefer the evidence, the concrete evidence I have in my office. And, if you were to come into my office, I could show you a stack about a foot high of letters containing hospital bills and medical bills that have been paid by the individuals.

Only yesterday, I received a letter from a lady in my own district. She is 78 years of age and has been unable to work for a long time. She had a little home of her own, five room house. She has had to borrow money on that home in order to be able to pay her medical expenses. And she sent me a list of the medical expenses she had been paying—and the medicines she had been buying in the drugstores at these exorbitant prices they are charging for drugs today and told me her home had been taken away from her. All she has left in this world is $100. She had to give up her insurance policies. She is now going on public relief and says she is praying that something along the lines of my bill would pass so it might be of some help to her, but if not for her, because she does not expect to be in this world for long, then for others who find themselves in the same predicament.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken much more time than I should. I hope I have cleared up a few points of misunderstanding. Thank you very much.

Senator MCNAMARA. We are happy to have you here, Congressman.

I think you have perhaps presented us with one of the finest statements we have heard so far in favor of doing something about this very serious problem we are all facing. You did not take too much time. I am sure we can listen to you all day in what you say on this subject.

Mr. FORAND. You are very kind, Senator. That is something I feel down here, in my heart.

Senator MCNAMARA. I am sure of that.

Mr. FORAND. There is so much to be done in this field. We have got to get going. Stop talking and start acting.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator, do you have any comment or question of the Congressman?

Senator BRUNSDALE. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman FORAND for coming over here and talking to us. Thank you.

Mr. FORAND. Thank you very much. If I may be excused, I will go back to my own business.

Senator MCNAMARA. Surely. Thank you again.

Reporting the Labor Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's daily newspapers are increasingly under attack for failure to control their conservative prejudices and for misusing their great power to the serious disadvantage of large groups in our country.

Prominent Americans pointed out to editors and journalists at recent meetings in Washington, D.C., that press irresponsibility threatens our very democracy.

Such observation comes as no news to millions of union workers and their families who often know too well the bitter hostility of their local newspaper. For generations organized labor has had to win economic and humanitarian gains for the whole population while fighting off the attacks of most of the Nation's newspapers. Yet, in spite of this, labor has worked with other broad groups including many enlightened managements in our country to build together the greatest democracy on earth.

Still fresh in the minds of 16 million American citizens and their families is the press conspiracy to vilify organized labor during the last couple of years. Indeed, the Landrum-Griffin law stands as the newspaper industry's greatest, and most dubious, contribution to the American labor movement.

In this all-too-short season when the Nation's newspaper editors and journalists may still be soul searching as the result of their Washington torments, I want to commend to their attention and Americans generally, an article from the New Republic. It is entitled "Reporting the Labor Story" and is written by William Abbott, assistant education director of the United Rubber Workers AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have reproduced here Mr. Abbott's excellent article:

REPORTING THE LABOR STORY

(By William Abbott)

A Roper poll of December 1959, listed 12 current public concerns and asked: "Which do you think are serious moral problems?" 89 percent of those interviewed named juvenile delinquency. School segregation had a 71 percent vote, disarmament 66 percent, rigged TV shows 41 percent, payola 34 percent. And 88 percent listed dishonest labor leaders. The only reference to business wrongdoing among the poll's 12 problems came under the heading of false advertising. There was no mention of profiteering in drugs, administered prices, using call girls to sell products or the running of businesses by racketeers.

Considering that Robert Kennedy, the counsel for the McClellan committee which investigated labor racketeering, has said that only "a small fraction of 1 percent of all the 430,000 trade union officials are corrupt or dishonest," the Roper poll's finding becomes highly interesting; even more interesting when one recalls that during the period in which the Teamster escapades were being exposed, Fortune magazine reported that embezzlers, many of whom were highly respected American businessmen, steal from $500 million to $3 billion a year.

And while the McClellan committee accused five unions of taking $5 million from union tills, Life magazine reported that $5 billion changed hands among business and professional men in bribes, kickbacks and payoffs. In terms of the sheer bulk of money mishandled the public presumably should have been more agitated about dishonest business officials than their labor counterparts. They weren't, and one must ask why. One answer lies in the power of the American newspapers as a special interest lobby, a lobby which campaigned for the Labor-Management Disclosure Act of 1959.

The accusation can be made—and only too well documented—that from 1957 through 1959 the press of the Nation, by and large, engaged in a massive effort to pass legislation which unions without dissent considered punitive. The newspaper lobby won its case by several proven propaganda techniques: (1) It headlined corruption in unions on its front pages while it played down stories of business corruption. (2) By constant linking of the words "union" and "rackets" it conveyed the strong impression that there was probably as much fire as there was smoke in the allegations of wholesale racketeering in unions. (3) It probably helped influence the conduct of the publicity seeking McClellan committee by minimizing or ignoring stories of anti-union thuggery and the violations of civil liberties of union sympathizers. In the process it built one James Hoffa into a monstrous devil or a martyr (and built up Hoffa in his union, too), depending upon where a man stood.

Headlines in the Akron Beacon-Journal, which the local labor movement considers more fair minded than most newspapers, illustrate a press pattern during the 1959 campaign for a new labor law: "Five Labor Unions 'Taken' for 5 Mfilion"; "Kohler Accuses UAW of Terror"; "Barden Bill Hits 'Union Tyranny'"; "Seek Link Between Hoffa, Underworld"; "O'Neil Says Labor Bosses Frantic"; "Crackdown on Union Reds Urged"; "Union Men Held in Extortion Plot."

During the Nathan Shefferman period when the McClellan committee was investigating antiunion rackets, the stories on the hearings were dropped into inside pages, and even then the Teamsters Union often drew top billing. All investigations of business skulduggery soon stopped. Where was the news value?

The playing down of management misdeeds is again shown in the Akron Beacon-Journal of June 25, 1959, which gave a Teamster corruption story in Pittsburgh two columns on the front page. The same edition carried the news of the indictment of the hometown Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. on charges of pricefixing. It made page 53.

The New York Times index for that year (1957) contained 10 columns of stories on labor racketeering, three columns on Union "Reds" and 16½ columns on all other labor stories including strikes. There were almost as many stories on racketeering and communism in unions as on all labor's other activities combined.

IF IT'S A UNION MAN, IT'S NOT NEWS

Typical of the way newspapers report—or rather do not report—news likely to create a sympathetic attitude toward unions is the story of Hosiery Workers organizer, Robert Beame. Almost lynched on

February 11, 1959, in Franklin, N.C., for trying to help organize a union, Beame, battered and beaten, escaped the mob in a wild auto chase. The national press had two chances at the story. The Chattanooga Times printed an interview with Beame from his hospital bed, and later Beame held a press conference for Washington, D.C., reporters. One reporter for a national press service swore that he sent the story out over the wire, but not a paper which was surveyed by this writer carried the story.

Stories of brutal attacks on union sympathizers became juicier in 1959—but not to most newspapers. High-ranking officials of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union were beaten, blackjacked, and stabbed. A woman organizer was dragged out of her bed by a mob; a company gave its adherents baseball bats to use on its own workers who were trying to organize a plant; Sol Greene, assistant general manager of the Joint Press Council, was attacked on February 20, 1959, in Tenafly, N.J., by a gang of thugs who used lead pipes and bottles; there were many, not just several, stories of city and town officials actively engaged in breaking strikes and union organizing drives.

In 1956, an Alabama Governor's Commission investigated a woodworkers strike in which an unarmed unionist had been shot in the stomach. The Commission found that town marshals and other officials in two towns were on the company payroll, that the 79-cent-an-hour woodworkers had to buy from the company store and live in company houses. Then the Commission's report mysteriously disappeared. Outside of labor papers, this story of violence and intrigue made only the Alabama papers. It became an established rule to write up ordinary union members struggling against odds only when they were fighting the leaders of their own union.

Textile Workers Washington representative, John Edelman, began in 1957 to send out documented news releases giving a blow-by-blow account of what was happening to textile workers in the South. The Textile Union hoped publicity would force congressional committees to hold hearings on the union's charges. These stories were largely ignored.

PLAYING UP THE LABOR BOSS ANGLE

What made "news" was the Teamsters Union. A poll of Associated Press editors in 1957 listed the Teamsters as the fourth best news story of the year. It had more copy value to these editors than the Middle East crisis, Asian flu, hurricane Audrey or the fight over the civil rights bill. Reporters reported the capers of several Teamsters officials more religiously than sports writers reported the latest aches and pains of ball players. Their living habits, how they bet at the races, what they bought, what they ate and who cooked the meals were all described in detail.

When Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS wrote the Chicago Sun-Times in August 1959, that the Landrum-Griffin bill would cripple union organizing drives and seriously threaten, if not break outright, small, weak unions, the Sun-Times replied DOUGLAS had missed the point: "The basic issues," the paper asserted. * * * [are], the provisions concerning blackmail picketing, secondary boycotts, hot cargo clauses and those instances where small businesses are frequently denied legal recourse by both the NLRB and the local courts in labor disputes."

Thus, the "basic issues" were "business issues." To PAUL DOUGLAS there was another, rarely reported, issue—protecting a man's right to form and keep a union of his own choosing. The Senator used the letter-to-the-editor column to express a viewpoint on the labor bill at variance with all the major papers in the city.

In fairness to the press, hostility toward unions has lessened considerably over the years, and a Virginia newspaper publisher probably expressed the current general attitude when he remarked: "Unions are fine as long as they don't make trouble." Some unions report a high rate of success in placing stories favorable to them in even the most unlikely of newspapers. In one Ohio collective bargaining situation an ultra-conservative Hoiles newspaper, which was heatedly pro-company, gave the union equal space to present its case. But when the chips are down, a newspaper which lives on its advertising can usually be expected to act in what it considers its class interest. What happened after the labor bill was approved by Congress is evidence of that.

Right after passage, James Carey, president of the International Electrical Workers Union, wrote a letter to Members of Congress in which he told Congressmen who voted for the bill: "We will do all in our power to prove to the workingmen and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and that they should take appropriate action at the ballot box."

The Carey letter said nothing that was not already widely-known. He repeated the long-standing AFL–CIO policy of furnishing voting record information to union members. But what a sensation saying nothing new caused. "Carey's threat," made front-page headlines across the land for several days. Then, when the "news value" wore a bit thin, big pictures of Congressmen standing up to this labor boss adorned the papers.

But the press throughout the Nation failed to pick up a story in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution which reported the woes of Georgia Democrat, ERWIN MITCHELL, who was weighted down by pressures from the business lobby supporting the Landrum-Griffin bill. From the time the chamber of commerce first got in touch with him until after the bill was passed, Congressman MITCHELL was pounded by phone calls, letters, and telegrams from wealthy and influential business leaders. "Don't make it difficult for us to support you, ERWIN. Campaigns are expensive, you know.

While the Carey letter got headlines, there were few or no stories in most papers about business pressures on behalf of Landrum-Griffin.

Isn't it a "serious moral issue" if 94 cities have single ownership papers, and if this means that access to divergent points of view is denied, and if most American newspapers largely feature a one-class point of view? What becomes of "freedom of the press"?

In Maryland, one Congressman said fellow Democrats urged him not to run for office because he was identified too closely with labor and "McClellan committee headlines" alone would defeat him. And while he did win the election the incident illustrates the power of the headline on the thinking of political strategists.

Some brush the problem aside with the comment that nothing the papers say matters much, that the press breeds a healthy cynicism, and that people no longer believe what they read. "More Milwaukeeans swear at this paper than swear by it," said a Milwaukee politican who was explaining the success of candidates a Milwaukee newspaper opposed. But if it's true, isn't that a "serious moral issue?"

Go to Teamster halls around the Nation and you will find that the very people most denounced in the press are among the ones most honored—and sincerely so. Why? Because the press has built Hoffa and friends into heroes for many a unionist. If the press one-sidedly reports the news, if on its front and editorial pages it opposes a large number of labor programs with which workers identify, why should Teamsters believe what the press has to say about their leaders?

The only answer to this situation I know is to create other kinds of newspapers which express other points of views equally strongly. James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, has suggested that labor itself must provide the answer by inaugurating daily papers in industrial centers. At present, however, labor has neither the money nor perhaps the will for such an undertaking. Yet, if labor does not do it, what other power group can?

Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, to many of us the present bill does not encompass the protection of civil rights that we had visualized when debate opened on this bill.

Giving credit to the bill in the most favorable light, this is only moderate legislation. We still have a long way to go in guaranteeing civil rights to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. I have given earnest consideration to the bill. This seems to be the best bill which can be obtained at this time and under these circumstances. This is an advance over the Civil Rights Act of 1957. This is the second step in the onward march of civil rights for all of our people. It has taken us almost a century to come this far. However, we have in the past 8 years made much greater progress than in the previous 75 years.

If we can take the experience of the Attorney General with reference to the 1957 civil rights bill, it does seem that we will have better means of enforcement of constitutionally guaranteed rights. In many ways this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General to enforce these rights in accordance with the legislation.

I have voted for this bill as a means of helping to achieve a better climate in which civil rights may be enforced and guaranteed. It is true that the Senate made substantial changes when it came to that body. In title I, the Senate deleted the word "corruptly" and struck out the portion under which the criminal penalty imposed would not run concurrently. From the same title was stricken language which would have made it a crime to interfere or obstruct a court order by a threatening letter or communication.

The other body also struck out a section which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution for having given wrong information regarding a bombing. However, the Senate did include a provision making it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes. The Senate version also reduced the preservation of voting records from 2 years to 22 months.

In other sections, the Senate eliminated the House section whereby the Commissioner of Education could nego-

tiate for leasing of school buildings which were constructed with Federal aid—whenever local authorities could not provide educational facilities for children of members of the Armed Forces.

In title VI, the Senate put in a section requiring that hearings before any voting referee shall be held under the direction of the U.S. district court.

It appears to me that this bill is neither one to the right or the left, but is essentially a middle-of-the-road bill. However, if properly enforced, I believe that it could result in substantial gains in the next few years for those who have been denied their civil voting rights for almost a century.

I think probably the greatest one gain to come from this bill is the moral support which will be given to those who seek to have their voting rights established, as well as to we who have been interested in helping them obtain those rights. I personally shall continue to work to obtain decent treatment for these people who have suffered so long. If these rights must come inch by inch, at least we will realize that as Americans they are worth working for.

Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Forand bill—H.R. 4700—is a legislative attempt to accomplish a necessary and practical result. It is not, as some are led to believe, a contest between the sick, aged, low income, retired people and the doctors of this Nation.

This bill does not solve completely the medical problems of the aged, and it was not designed to attain such a goal. It merely guards against total disaster financially as a result of medical misfortunes beyond the control of individuals. The people want and need security from the unexpected medical disasters which are inevitably encountered in the later years of their lives and the financing methods outlined in the bill are a small price to pay for such security.

All of the alternative proposals advanced as afterthoughts by groups opposed to this legislation are too little and too late. This opposition wanders and roams in the vague realms of the theory, creating mountains out of molehills on the argument of socialism and dissipating their energies attacking windmills of supposed dangers, Many of these arguments operate on the basic premise that people have no business becoming 65 years of age and getting sick.

On the shopworn argument of socialism, I defy anybody to show me a single line, page, paragraph, or section of the Forand bill that would socialize or control medicine. Nothing in the act can be construed to give the Secretary of Health supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided. There are specific provisions in the act to provide a "free choice by the patient" of surgeons, hospitals, and nursing homes. Any fair and objective definition of socialized medicine would call for Government-owned facilities and Government-employed personnel. Such is not the case with the Forand bill.

Much of the information distributed by the opposition to the Forand bill is distorted, incomplete, fragmentary, and untrue. If the purveyors of this material would forget individual rights and concern themselves with obligations to society in general, we could get on with this business of prepaid public health insurance with greater speed and dispatch and with less heat and more light on the subject.

The medical profession has every right in the world to concern itself with entrance qualifications of its members, the standards and ethics of its profession, and its licensing laws. In these concerns, it acts in the public interest. When some of them venture into the field of the mechanics of paying for these services through public or private bookkeeping plans, they are operating out of their field which runs contrary to public opinion and in this respect does not carry the qualification of experts.

Most organized groups support medicine in its fight to maintain its strict professional status, and they are dismayed at the opposition to the Forand bill. This opposition is based on the theory of constant repetition of a phrase or slogan often enough until some people start believing it. The Social Security Act itself once withstood a barrage of the same sort of propaganda attack; yet, who today would have the audacity to propose its abolition?

This opposition to the Forand bill contains an element of compulsion which in my opinion is unhealthy when exercised upon a profession so highly respected. This compulsion should rest upon some intelligent consent on the part of the members of the profession in our country, and such is not the case. The medical profession has been led unwittingly to this position by autocratic leadership who have set themselves up in the image of primitive gods, hurling thunderbolts at the general public, as they attempt to delay the inevitable demands of the great mass of people, as outlined in this bill.

A look at the history of our country will show that every reactionary force must eventually give way, and I state that the opposition to the Forand bill is of a reactionary nature, with very little argument of a positive nature being offered to present an opportunity for rebuttal.

There are too many pitfalls in our present methods of providing for medical problems in the later years of life. There are too many restrictions, cancellations, and inadequacies. Those who need health insurance the most have it the least, and the Forand bill will provide retirement without fear of financial disaster because of illness.

To Preserve Our Constitution and Constitutional Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the Houston Chapter, Council of Women Realtors of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, which each year conducts an essay contest among high school seniors on the preservation of our Constitution and our Republic.

This is indeed a noble effort, and I think the members of the council, the judges, and the scores of students who participate are to be congratulated. It is gratifying to me to see that the youth of today—who will be our leaders of tomorrow—are keenly aware of the challenges being made against our Constitution. And it is heartwarming to find that there are patriotic Americans such as the members of the council and the judges who will give freely of their time and money to sponsor such a worthwhile project.

Four youngsters won the prizes offered by the council in the contest. They were Don Irvin, 3430 S. MacGregor, who won first prize; and Fontaine Gotch, 3602 Garrott; W. Sears McGee, Jr., 1516 Missouri; and Marjorie Hinds, 2207 Bolsover.

I think the Members of Congress and Americans in general could well ponder the thoughts expressed by young Don Irvin in his prize-winning essay, as printed on the editorial page of the Houston Chronicle:

TO PRESERVE OUR CONSTITUTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC

(By Don Irvin)

In the Constitution the Federal principle was adopted. That is, the powers of government were divided between the Central and State Governments by an authority superior to the Central or State Governments—the sovereign people.

This division of power cannot be changed by either Central or State governments acting alone, but only by that sovereign people acting through both Central and State Governments.

In this division of powers those delegated to the Central Government were specifically enumerated and dealt with the general good, notably the defense and security of the Nation, control of commerce, currencies, and credit. It was implied, and later (1791) expressly stated in amendment X, that all "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution • • • are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

MANY SAFEGUARDS

To guard against tyranny, the powers delegated to the Central Government were organized into three separate and equal departments. • • •

The Constitution was laced and interlaced with checks and balances within and between each department to assure that public officials would be the servants, not the masters of the people.

Despite these aforementioned safeguards and others, those Americans of 1788 still had misgivings about this supergovernment created by the new Constitution.

Particularly did the implied power and supreme law of the land clauses strike terror to their hearts and brought the demand for protection against the Federal Government's possible invasion of the personal rights and freedoms of a sovereign people and the reserved rights of the sovereign States or people.

If we mean to preserve our Constitution and our constitutional Republic we must see that these checks and balances are rigidly observed.

There must be strict adherence to the 10th amendment. For example, no branch of the Federal Government shall usurp a State's right to control it schools.

The three departments of government must be kept separate. * * *

The Supreme Court in its 1954 desegregation decision virtually enacted laws and certainly violated the 10th amendment. If we are to preserve our Constitution some new safeguards must be set up limiting the power of the Supreme Court to defy the will of a sovereign people.

Despite all the checks on the President's powers, Presidents stretch their constitutional powers far beyond the point of discretion or safety. The President is the most important lawmaker in Washington. Presidenial agreements, such as the Yalta agreements, that sidestep Senate approval, are often very dangerous commitments and do not represent the will of the sovereign people. If we are to preserve our constitutional Republic, certainly new safeguards must be taken regarding both the treatymaking and military powers of the President.

Our constitutional Republic cannot survive if the Government continues to enter the economic field. * * *Bureaucracy, alphabet agencies, creeping socialism will destroy the very liberty and freedom of our people.

The welfare state with its cradle-to-the-grave coverage will stultify industry, initiative, and self-reliance, without which qualities no republican government can survive.

POWER TO DESTROY

If the power to tax is the power to destroy, then certainly we are well along the road to destruction with a national debt now approaching $300 billion, continuing unbalanced budgets, and crushing burdens of taxation. If we mean to save our Republic, we must hold a tight rein on the purse strings of our Congress. We must ferret out graft and corruption in the Government, abolish waste and extravagance, and curtail those billion-dollar giveaway programs in every corner of the globe.

Wonder what the Founding Fathers would say about the crushing burden of presentday income taxes and hidden taxes numbering 150 in a loaf of bread and 1,000 in a quart of milk?

And lastly, we must protect the sovereignty of our Nation in all these entangled dealings in U.N., UNESCO, NATO, SEATO, the World Court, etc.

Unless we look to these things, and soon, the blessing of liberty may not always be secured to ourselves and our posterity.

Give District of Columbia Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 4630, and the discharge petition with reference thereto, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune as it appeared in that newspaper on April 25, 1960:

GIVE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTING RIGHTS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The recent naming of Brasilia, Brazil, as the world's newest capital, prompts the revival of this writer's pet peeve.

A phone call to the Brazilian Consulate has revealed that Brasilia is within a Federal district, as is Washington, D.C. However, the residents of Brasilia, like the residents of Canberra, Australia, also located in a Federal district, can vote in national elections.

To my mind, the ballot is a mockery, as long as the citizens of our Nation's Capital are denied it. With presidential elections in the offing, this travesty looms ever larger.

Vote? Of course. In Brasilia, Canberra, Ottawa, London, Paris, Rome, even Moscow. But not in Washington.

Let's give the citizens of our Nation's Capital civil rights.

AVERY GILES.

LITTLE SILVER, N.J.

We Give Away Food and Have Some Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very excellent editorial which appeared in the April 26, 1960, issue of the Kansas City Star. I think every so-called "do gooder" should take a moment to read this provocative editorial. It is quite easy to say "Let us give food to underdeveloped countries"; but there are many other factors to be considered. This editorial very clearly presents the prime factors which must be considered when a good giveaway program is underway. I urge each and every Member of Congress to take a moment and read this editorial:

WE GIVE FOOD AWAY AND HAVE SOME LEFT

Why don't we give it away? To many people this always seems the logical solution of the farm surplus problem. Time and again you hear the statement that half the people of the world go to bed hungry every night, and many people in the United States don't have enough to eat.

The truth is our Government does give food away, in amounts that are staggering. But the United States continues to produce more surpluses. Also we have discovered that giving food to underdeveloped countries has its difficulties.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently made a computation of its free food distribution efforts over the last 7½ years. In that time a total of 13,793,700,000 pounds of surplus foods has been moved into use in this country and overseas. Of this amount 5,361,800,000 pounds costing $1,326,400,000 was distributed in the United States while 8,431,900,000 pounds costing $1,375,500,000 was given to people overseas.

These figures do not include sales of farm products under the Public Law 480 program in which this country takes the currency of other countries as payment. Nor do they include exports subsidized in other ways.

Certainly the world (except perhaps those countries which compete with us on exports) benefits from the farm surpluses here.

While our Government continues to offer surplus foods to certain areas overseas it has discovered that it is often easier to sell products than give them away. The underdeveloped countries are populated almost entirely by people who make their living from the soil. They are concerned with protecting their own markets. These countries have no storage facilities and poor transportation systems. Also, while the people may be undernourished their problems are not confined to hunger alone.

Through our sales under the Public Law 480 program we are attempting to help these countries develop their own resources, an effort which apparently will have more lasting effect than a program of gifts.

In the United States, the surplus foods are offered to the States to be distributed through regular welfare agencies. The present administration insists that these agencies offer the most economical and effective way both to handle the foods and get them to the people in need. The plan gives local control to authorities who best know the situation.

Others argue for a plan under which needy people would be given stamps to trade at stores for food. This would hand the entire control of food distribution and its cost to the Federal Government.

Perhaps the method of distributing food is a proper subject for debate, but we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that the nation is making use of its surpluses and has been for a long time. Also, our farm surpluses are not to be compared exactly to leftovers from a bountiful dinner. The Government buys these surpluses from farmers and when they are eliminated it buys more. We also could have surpluses of motor cars or men's hats to give away if we subsidized production beyond demand.

In fact, the situation is too complicated to be settled solely by the process of giving food to hungry people.

De Gaulle and the Summit Conference—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the signs of new flexibility as the May summit conference approaches are further analyzed by Columnist Walter Lippmann in two articles which I submit for the RECORD today as separate insertions. The first, which follows, points out that General de Gaulle "is now the leader and the chief spokesman of the Western alliance" and goes on to develop Mr. Lippmann's conviction that "the national interest of France demands that there shall be no revival of pan-Germanism and that even a political union of the two contemporary Germanys should be put off for a long time." The article is from the April 26 edition of the Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—NEW LEADERSHIP

(By Walter Lippmann)

After his visit to Washington, it can be said that on the German question General de Gaulle is now the leader and the chief spokesman of the Western alliance. It was high time for a change. For until recently we have had no German policy. We have had only a tangle of slogans and fictions about

reunification which could lead to no solution and settlement of the German problem, and were not seriously meant to do so.

General de Gaulle has assumed the leadership of the alliance by sweeping aside the hackneyed slogans and the equivocal fictions. He has given the alliance a new lead in how to think and how to talk about the cold war and about Germany.

Let us hope that the speechwriters in the Pentagon and the State Department will give close attention to the change in style which was demonstrated in the press conference on Saturday and the address to Congress on Monday.

Perhaps the greatest difference between General de Gaulle's way of thinking and the conventional thinking of the day is that he sees and treats the Soviet Union as primarily a European great power, and only incidentally as the headquarters of world communism. For him Russia existed long before Lenin and will exist long after Khrushchev. Russia is a European nation with national interests in Europe, and the central clue to policy in dealing with Russia is to be found not in the writings of Marx and Lenin but in the history of Russia.

This does not mean that communism, which is a secular religion, does not play a great role in the Soviet Union and in its relations with the rest of the world. What it does mean is that in negotiating with the Soviet Union, the statesman should fix his eyes on the Russian national interest, not let himself be razzle-dazzled by the ideology.

Having fixed his eye on the Russian national interest, on what any Russian Government would protect or aim at, the statesman can know where lies the true area of negotiation. When he stands firm, as the saying goes, he knows concretely where to stand firm, where is the point at which Russia's national interests and ours should be accommodated.

General de Gaulle is one whom not the most foolish among us would call soft on communism. And yet, when he speaks of the Soviet Union, he does it with cool and impeccable courtesy. He does not stoop to the vulgar epithets which the ghostwriters feel they must sprinkle through almost every official utterance. This courtesy comes from the fact that General de Gaulle sees France and he sees Russia as perennial nations within a European society.

This style and tone does not mean, as some may think, that General de Gaulle is a lordly figure left over from another age. There is much reason to think that in talking with Mr. K. as the head of one European power to the head of another European power, he holds the key which can unlock the door to a detente, that is to a relaxation of tension.

The key to the door is that the national interest of France demands that there shall be no revival of pan-Germanism, and that even a political union of the two contemporary Germanys should be put off for a long time. This is also Russia's national interest. Communist ideology no doubt demands the unification of all the Germans under a Communist state. But the national interest of Russia is different from that. The Russian national interest is to prevent the rise of so formidable a competitive Communist power in Europe as all the Germanys would make. Russia has quite enough competition of that sort in China and the rest of Asia.

This is the reason why the Khrushchev-De Gaulle talks have been followed by such an improvement in the climate. Undoubtedly General de Gaulle made it clear to Khrushchev what is the French interest in relation to the German question and that at bottom it is not radically different from the Russian national interest. Since then, Mr. K. has known that if he wants to protect the national interests of Russia in Germany and in Eastern Europe, an understanding is possible. But if he wants to expand communism instead of protecting Russia, he will run into a stone wall.

The reader must remember that statesmen cannot say these things in so many words. What is happening cannot be openly avowed officially or legalized in formal documents. Many faces will have to be saved. There are critical elections here this year and in Germany next year. For some time to come we shall continue to hear the old slogans and fictions about reunifying Germany within the NATO alliance but nevertheless, no matter what we hear, if this was ever a German policy, it has been dead for years. It has been dead not only because the Russians would have none of it but because so many in the West never wanted it at all.

Broadcast Journalism and the Mayflower Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was presented by WTOP television and radio on April 15, 1960. In preface I would just like to say that I consider it to be in the highest tradition of broadcast journalism and editorial opinion as opened up some years ago by the famous Mayflower decision.

The editorial follows:

THIS EDITORIAL WAS BROADCAST ON APRIL 15, 1960, OVER WTOP TELEVISION AND WTOP RADIO

We view with a good deal of sympathy the effort by Congressman CHARLES PORTER of Oregon to compel the State Department to issue him a passport to travel in Red China.

The case can be considered from two viewpoints. One is Mr. PORTER'S contention that, as a member of the legislative branch, he has an inherent right to travel where he pleases. Mr. PORTER asserts that the State Department's refusal to grant him permission to visit the Chinese mainland violates the principle of the separation of powers. Although the courts so far have rejected his argument, the Supreme Court should—and probably will—have the final word.

However, a more important question in the Porter case involves a matter of national policy. Mr. PORTER believes there should be an effort to "establish communications" between the United States and Communist China, in contrast to the present State Department quarantine. He says he would like to travel to Red China as a member of a commission to "talk turkey" with the Reds on trade relations.

Much the same line was taken recently by a Rockefeller Fund report on foreign policy and by Representative CHESTER BOWLES, writing in the current issue of "Foreign Affairs." There seems to be a growing dissatisfaction, which this station shares, with the refusal to permit any meaningful contact at all with the Chinese Communist regime.

We do not argue that Red China's sins should be forgotten or its continuing menace ignored. However, establishing communication with Peiping would not imply American approval of what the Communists are doing or have done.

It would seem wise therefore for the State Department to pay new attention to our increasing requirement for some contact with Red China and allow Congressman PORTER to pay his visit. If the Reds agree to the trip, nothing would be lost and something might be gained. If they refuse, world opinion would take note of that fact.

How a Proud People Keeps Tradition of Freedom Alive in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the privilege today to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent series of articles about Poland which has appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Next week will mark the 169th anniversary of the day Poland adopted her celebrated Constitution of May 3. This document introduced to the continent of Europe, for the first time in history, the democratic principles incorporated in our own American Constitution.

Since, throughout the world, Poles and friends of Poland will be paying tribute to this historic document, I believe this series by Mr. James Morris is particularly timely for it demonstrates so eloquently that today, even though the people of Poland are forced to live under a Communist government imposed on them against their will, the spirit which led the Polish people to adopt the Constitution of May 3 in 1791 still prevails.

We, as Americans dedicated to the principles of freedom, can learn a great deal from the people of Poland who, living under the most adverse conditions, continue their inherent belief in equality and justice.

I believe the Chicago Sun-Times has performed a notable service in bringing this penetrating series to the attention of its readers.

The series follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 24, 1960]

POLAND TODAY—HOW A PROUD PEOPLE KEEPS TRADITION OF FREEDOM ALIVE

(By James Morris)

WARSAW.—On the stroke of every hour throughout the day a small shutter opens in the belfry of St. Mary the Virgin in Krakow, the oldest and most beautiful of Polish cities, and a trumpeter, the bell of his instrument shining dimly in the shadows, blows an ancient call to arms.

Bold, clear, and beautiful it sounds across the market square, where the women squat beside their flower stalls and the taxis squelch among the slush, and it rings away among the tumbled houses of the place to the broad frozen Vistula and the high ramparts of the castle, where the old kings of Poland lived in a splendor of gold bowls and tapestry; but suddenly in midphrase the trumpeter stops, and his music ends abruptly with a kind of dying jerk. Four times he tries, turning north, south, east, and west,

but four times his fanfare is interrupted, and he never completes it.

The trumpeter blows this way because many tangled centuries ago, in the dim recesses of Polish history, a predecessor rousing Krakow against a Tatar invasion was shot in the back by a barbaric arrow halfway through his summons; and the fact that to this day he never finishes his call, and that his heart-rending failure is broadcast every day at noon by the Polish state radio, is a gage of the depth and resilience of Polish tradition.

In considering the People's Republic of Poland, as a political phenomenon, as a Communist experiment, as a dependency of the Soviet Union, it is wise to bear in mind the trumpeter of Krakow, and all he so picturesquely represents. Poland is still blazingly Polish, and she breathes a tart spirit peculiar to herself.

CULTURE LEANS WESTWARD

Poland lies in the heart of Europe, her western frontiers well to the east of Rome, her eastern on about the same longitude as Mersa Matruh (an Egyptian village which was the site of several battles in World War II), yet she feels unmistakably a country of the West, a Christian country, a country of individualists, with humor and skepticism and argument like a tang upon the air.

Poland has been under unwanted Communist rule for 15 years, and since 1939 her story has been one of unrelenting foreign domination, actual, or implied; but pay a visit to a students' theater in Warsaw, with its tinkling piano, and its pretty feathery girls, its faint but pleasant baritones, its lighthearted attempts at a soft-shoe shuffle, and were it not for an excess of aspirates and a shortage of vowels in the lyrics you might be back at the footlights or at one of Mr. Slade's forgotten juvenalia.

The Poles are by nature a people of ease, fun, and elegance, a people always con brio. Their manners are impeccable, their tastes ornate, and even the insistent objections of the hygiene specialists have not broken the feudal elaboration with which they kiss a lady's hand. The Poles pursue their professions, their hobbies, and their prejudices with equal gusto, not always indeed with great logic, or overwhelming efficiency, but with a panache, nicely tinged with irony, that often reminds me of the Irish.

NO COMMUNIST ROBOTS, THEY

This punch and pungency of character has sometimes brought the Poles great suffering, but has at least enabled them to survive both as a nation and as a culture; and in our own times it has prevented their land sinking once and for all into the alien uniformity of the Communist bloc.

In 1956 the ebullience of the Poles led to a relaxation of Communist grip so generous that for a moment Poland seemed the progenitor of a new political compromise—a Communist state, but one so liberal that it might form a bridge of reconciliation between East and West.

Today Poland is not quite so exhilarating as she was three years ago; but, thanks entirely to her own prickly pride, she remains much the most relaxed and open-minded of the Communist powers.

We may safely assume that three-quarters of the Polish people loathe the form of government that rules them; but nevertheless this is not now one of your grisly whole-hog police states.

There is a censorship of newspapers, passports are not always easy to come by, Western diplomats and local diehards will make your flesh creep with tales of hidden microphones, informers, and tape recorders. Incoming mail is certainly opened as I can testify from the grimy censorious thumbmarks that nearly obliterated one of my mother's less legible references to the arrival of the new vicar. But though the apparatus of complete despotism undoubtedly exists, since 1956 it has not been exercised.

THE POLES SPEAK FREELY NOW

There are, I am assured, no political prisoners in Poland today. People talk to you with abandoned liberty and outspokenness. Nobody, in my experiences anyway, is scared to be seen with a foreigner (though the more wary probably fight shy of diplomatic invitations). The bookstalls are heavy with the world's pinker press, but anybody who likes can read the organs of Western reaction, from the Guardian to Woman's Own, in the bars of the big hotels.

Poland does not feel a happy country, but she does not feel a frightened one. "I am not bringing my son up as an opopsitionist," a parent wrote in a Warsaw newspaper the other day, "—one in the family is enough."

Intellectually, Poland is in a turmoil of activity, her coffee shops buzzing with the exchange of ideas and the clash of opinion. Western culture of all kinds ferments and flourishes. Plays, English, American, French, German, are translated by the dozen and performed in a myriad of theaters. Western books are at work, many 12-tone composers, poster painters of involved technique, angry young men and existentialists and devotees of the "method." Architects are just beginning to squirm themselves out of the awful stultification of Stalinist taste, and philosophers dabble freely in anything from Bishop Berkeley to Albert Camus.

AN INTENSELY RELIGIOUS COUNTRY

Above all, Poland remains an intensely religious country. The intelligentsia, like its brethren everywhere, is mostly agnostic; but the people at large are said to be more stanchly Catholic than any other race within the wide fold of Christendom.

The church, which is engaged in a perpetual running battle with the regime, is the only organized opposition in Poland; but so powerful is it, so patently does it represent the feelings of its faithful millions, so stubborn is its hierarchy, that it remains inviolate—the most powerful body of dissent within the Communist bloc. In Poland the atheist state even pays the wages of religious instructors.

How you respond to the fervors of the Polish church depends upon your own predilections; but for myself there is nothing more moving in Europe than the spectacle of a Polish church at evening mass, when the crowds of the poor and ever-faithful stream from the snowy streets into the dim cold church, to a glitter of vestments and candles and ornaments.

A VERY MOVING SPECTACLE

The very congregation around you, squeezing through the brown velvet curtains of the door, stands there in a condition halfway between slump and ecstacy; and the intensity of belief is so profound that it feels almost tangible, hanging and drifting about your head like a cloud of incense.

I am moved not simply by this unyielding faith but because you can see in the eyes of these people something of the tragic quandary of Poland, something of the terrible pathos that lies behind its gaity, as a hint of tragedy so often underlies the tumbling of a clown. All that the Poles have snatched out of communism, they have won by their own strength of character; but for such a people it is not much.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 25, 1960]

HOW GEOGRAPHY "TRAPS" POLAND

(By James Morris)

WARSAW.—Poland is trapped; trapped by geography, by history, by the worst of luck. There are few people who share our Western values more intensely than the Poles, and few who deserve sovereignty more; but they are saddled with a Government and a political system they do not want, and there seems not a shadow of a hope, not an echo of a proud fanfare, that they can rid themselves of it.

Since 1956, indeed, the regime has not been ferociously or cruelly intolerant, and its philosophies are not without merit.

Much has indisputably been achieved in Poland under Communist rule: The reconstruction of Warsaw from a wilderness of bloodstained rubble, great new housing schemes, new industrial projects.

Nobody, so far as I know, is starving in Poland. People are reasonably well dressed, shops are moderately well stocked.

The present Communist leaders of Warsaw, notably Wladyslaw Gomulka himself, are not power-drunk egotists: on the contrary, they seem to live lives of ascetic restraint. There are few flashy cars for the wise boys of the party, such as you see brazenly skidding around the streets of Prague.

When Gomulka was sent a new kind of television set, as a gift from the state factory, he asked if he might pay for it on the installment system: he is a plain, humorless, dedicated workingman, and he lives in genuine simplicity in a two-room apartment.

A POOR, BACKWARD LAND

Nor can one be blind, in theory anyway, to the practical advantages of the system. Poland is a poor and in some respects backward country, and though her prewar Government worked energetically enough to raise her from the slough, still there remains a heavy legacy of old unhappy times.

The country is congenitally "agin" the Government. It is riddled with fiddles, corruptions, evasions, black markets. The Poles have inherited from all their past tyrannies and occupations a natural tendency toward the devious way, the slipped note from hand to hand, the little backstairs peculations.

They are flaming patriots, but they have been dominated by alien or unpopular authorities for so long that they often find it difficult to equate love of country with social conscience; and on paper anyway communism can provide the element of discipline and communial effort that everybody (not least themselves) agrees they need.

Nevertheless, Communist government in Poland is a tragedy, if only because it really represents the domination of a foreign power. Few would deny, not even the stanchest party workhorses, that were it not for the ever-present threat of Russian power, communism would be swept out of Poland in a few crowded glorious hours.

Only the wildest conservatives wish to return to the prewar past, to restore the great industries to private hands, and summon back the exiled aristocrats: but nearly all Poles would probably vote, if they had the chance, for some kind of democratic socialism that was truly independent.

PREFER FREEDOM OVER ECONOMICS

They care less about economics, if I judge them right, than about freedom, national and personal. They want to be themselves, Poles, citizens, unhampered by dogmas, strategies, or Socialist realism. They are sick to death of norms, congresses, delegations, medallions of Lenin, party bonhomie, state enterprises, and all the tedious paraphernalia of the creed.

More than anything, they are sick of Russians. The Russian troops stationed in Poland are kept strictly within their allotted limits, for fear of incidents; and if ever the people of Warsaw could knock down the Palace of Culture, Stalin's enormity of a gift to the nation, it would be a Mafeking, a Mardi Gras, a blockbuster of fireworks night.

But there is nothing they can do. This is their age without a name and Gomulka represents the most they can hope of contemporary history.

In 1956 their spirit, fortunately met by Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev's brand of gambler's liberalism, enabled them to achieve the degree of independence they enjoy now, under which Warsaw, compared with Bucharest, Budapest, Prague, or Moscow itself, is a positive Paris among cities.

They were willing at that time, as they were in 1944, to die at their barricades, flaunting the pennants of national liberty. But time has passed, the world has shifted, and today the events of 1956 have to them, even in Polish eyes, a miraculous air as if some divine thunderbolt had intervened on their behalf.

Unless there is some universal relaxation of tensions and rivalries, it is difficult to see it happening again, or to imagine the Poles extracting from the tight fist of communism any greater quota of freedom.

THERE IS NO ESCAPE

Consider their situation. To the south lies Czechoslovakia, the most dutiful of the Communist dependencies. To the west is the German People's Republic, not only feared and hated in its own right but also the base for Russia's advance armies. To the east is the Soviet Union herself, and smack through Poland run the lines of communication that link Moscow with Berlin. Poland simply cannot escape.

I am told that if the present ration of political tolerance were withdrawn from Warsaw a revolution would occur and optimists say that Khrushchev, his fingers (if not his conscience) still smarting from Hungary, would hesitate to stifle it by force: but for myself, I have my doubts.

So, I suspect, do most Poles, and in a way this makes the vivacity of their intellectual life all the more poignant, since in political terms it is achieving nothing. I do not know if they have really been forced to accept political impotence—they certainly do not give that impression in the sparkle, skepticism, and irreverence of their conversation: but I think they realize that in the unhappy poker school of our times they have no more cards to play.

They turn from politics, most of them, to other and more hopeful pursuits. Their dinner tables ring with infectious bravado, but after a few days in Poland, when you have looked them squarely in the eyes and probed in vain for unequivocal answers and tried to penetrate their mask of wit and geniality, you will begin to perceive the core of cynicism that lies behind the fun, and to grasp the tearing pathos of their realism.

ARTISTIC, YES; REALISTS, HARDLY

For realism is what they like to call it. By instinct they are anything but realists. They are an imaginative, high-flown, artistic people, and nothing illustrates their character better than the mad but marvelous rising against the Nazis in 1944, when Warsaw, so many miles from friends, rose to arms in desperate inspiration, as on the wings of a Chopin Polonaise. In 1956 they were prepared to do the same again, but in 1960—"well, times have changed a bit, we must count our blessings, and be realists."

For it is still a gray, muted, uneasy world, the world of the Poles today, even if you can buy Erle Stanley Gardner at the bookstall, or fondle Miss Brigitte Bardot from a distance at the cinema. There is plenty of fun in Warsaw, and a lively coffeehouse society, but behind the greasepaint lies the pallor of defeat.

What does a patriot do, born into such geography? Make the most of things, help his country revive and develop, disregard the bitter truths, and foster the compensations? Or dream of a campaign that is doomed in advance, risk losing all that has been won, summon the intoxicating call to arms, like the city trumpeter at Kracow, and man the barricades again?

Most Poles, I think, have found a formula: to remember the present shape and temper of Europe, and pray to the Virgin that, if things can get no better, at least they will not get worse again.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 26, 1960]

REDS' HALFWAY HOUSE: POLES STRIVE FOR IDENTITY

(By James Morris)

WARSAW.—Although Poland, by virtue of her own inimitable temperament, scarcely conforms to the intellectual, the spiritual, or even the social pattern of the Soviet bloc, nevertheless her regime is at heart orthodoxly Communist. Wladyslaw Gomulka's ends are the standard Communist ends, though he may employ, from conviction or from expediency, different means to achieve them. In 1956, when Poland's grim period of Stalinism ended, Soviet Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev, separately appraising a ticklish situation, presumably reached this common conclusion: That the Poles being the people they were, their political system had better be relaxed. If rule by secret police was going to incite them to violence, very well then, call off the cops (the Poles were perhaps fortunate that their moment of catharsis occurred before the Hungarians, too, were goaded into defiance).

Today in Warsaw you hear constant ominous hints that the regime's methods of control are getting tighter, harsher, cruder again. If this is true, it is because liberalization has not worked, from a technical point of view.

Some people say that the Russians, looking with a jaundiced eye upon the existentialists, the burning catholicism, the abstract canvases, and the free speech of Poland, have warned the regime that leissez-faire has gone too far.

It is more likely, though, that if an element of pseudo-Stalinism is returning to Poland, it is because the country is, in economic terms, a mess.

SLIPSHOD ECONOMY A LEGACY OF PAST

Everybody admits that the economy of the country is slipshod and ill-organized. This is only partly due to communism, and is chiefly the legacy of a ravelled past.

Life among the Poles can be delightful, but could hardly be called efficient, or even indeed predictable. The queerest anomalies of economics and logistics give a truly Irish piquancy to financial affairs, and half Warsaw seems to conduct its commercial affairs with a wink and a rubbed thumb.

The lift which took me to the top of the 37-story Palace of Culture had a broken indicator, so that the operator could only tell by intuition which floor we had reached: and this struck me (although she was perfectly unperturbed, and indeed wryly amused by the situation) as revealingly symbolic.

In Poland nothing works quite as you expect it to, or when. The big State-run stores are slovenly and illogical; the city streets are thick with sludge; petty embezzlements complicate half the official accounts.

Poland feels dishevelled, incompetent, and—compared with either Moscow or New York—unkempt. Legend has it that the government, as a public service, erected in the streets of Warsaw some slot machines which would instantly pay the customer 1 zloty upon the insection of a 2-zloty piece. Why were they given up? Overheads too high.

REDS SEEKS TO CLEAN UP SHAMBLES

All this shambles the Communist regime still hopes to reduce to order; and even the most blatant of their opponents admit that some discipline is necessary—though what they mean by the phrase, some subsequent dry witticism usually makes obscure.

Whatever the nature of her government, Poland can only suffer from absenteeism, corruption, alcoholism, and general social bloody-mindedness.

A few idealists or dizzy visionaries might argue that the more ramshackle the Polish economy remains, the more precarious will be the regime; but most honest Poles would probably agree that in a country whose standards of living are still pitifully low, some degree of personal discipline is, even in today's circumstances, a civic duty.

How to achieve it? We would say by increasing incentives, whose paucity keeps the Polish worker in a condition of disgruntled apathy; by widening the private sector of industry and commerce, now the subject of steady, rather than vicious discrimination; by making more allowance for the Polish sense of nationality and individualism; by brightening and warming life with infusions of national self-respect.

But all Communists might answer that they have tried a dose of liberalism, and it has failed. If nonconformism does not bring Poland to her senses, then perhaps uniformity will.

STALINISTS REEMERGE IN PUBLIC OFFICE

There are indeed signs—straws in the wind, no more—that the regime may be tightening its dogmas. One or two well-known Stalinists have cropped up in office again.

There are hints that the clamp of socialist realism may be reimposed on art (though the senior official I consulted at the Ministry of Culture was, I must in fairness report, and believed that whatever the state did officially to guide art into certain channels, the artist must himself be free to experiment and sell his pictures as he pleased).

Communists have recently gained control of the Writers' Union—here, as in the other countries of the Socialist bloc, one of the strongholds of free thought. Translators of Western literature are, it is said, finding it harder to get their work accepted by the state publishing houses.

New attempts may be made to persuade the reluctant peasants into collective or cooperatives. It is whispered that the church has been warned to accept certain state edicts, or face harsh consequences—in particular, to modify its opposition to birth control.

I find it difficult to believe that with Khrushchev's ideas paramount among the Eastern countries, the full terror treatment is to be revived in Poland (tenaciously though it apparently lingers on in some of her neighbors' territories). The springs of the system, though, undoubtedly exist, like a mastiff leashed or muzzled.

LEGAL SYSTEM IS NOW ORGANIZED

The Polish legal system is now organized fairly and according to code, only occasionally bolstered, so it is said, by threats to withhold a passport, or promises to grant one; but there does also exist a framework of military courts which technically have the power, though it is now never exerted, to sentence people for political offenses without public trial.

It is all there, lying dormant: the secret courts, the camps, the whole hideous apparatus of despotism.

We may assume that Gomulka does not want to use these weapons—first, because he suffered enough himself under Stalinism, and is not by all accounts a cruel man; secondly, because Khrushchev, exuding peace and friendship, would probably not approve; thirdly, because world opinion would be inexpressly shocked; fourthly because, as any ex-Nazi will tell you, you never know how the Poles will react.

UNCERTAINTY IS POLAND'S FATE

Thus Poland seems fated to compromise or uncertainty. Today the Poles do not

know whether they can haul a new national identity out of the tragedy of their situation, whether they must remain a precarious halfway house, or whether in the long run they will be absorbed once and for all in an inexorably expanding Mother Russia.

A melange of figures crosses my mind, when I survey my stay among this striking people.

Young or old, successful or awash, in all their eyes there lurked, I thought, that most affecting of the qualities, pathos. The Poles are pathos personified, 30 million souls of brave pathos, through whose affairs there runs, like some distant plucking melody, an unbroken threat of sadness.

Truth About Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the farm income picture gets twisted around once in awhile, especially when statistics are not handled correctly and accurately.

We have all heard the statement that statistics can be used to prove almost anything, but frankly, I was very much surprised when I read a full-page advertisement appearing in the Wall Street Journal on April 22, 1960, regarding farm income. This advertisement made several statements which I feel do not accurately reflect the current farm income picture.

First of all, the headline on the advertisement was "In 1959 Average U.S. Family Income, $6,470; Average U.S. Farm Family Income, $9,978." The point that immediately struck me was the figure of $9,978 which was alleged to be the U.S. farm family income. In the accompanying tables, though, this income was described as gross farm income. Needless to say, gross farm income is not the most important of the various measuring sticks of income. When all is said and done a farmer, like any businessman, is concerned with net income, the final result of his gross income minus his many production expenses.

I probably would not have quarreled with the advertisement if at least the gross income figures quoted were accurate. They were not. The accompanying chart used in the advertisement, indicated that 1959 gross farm income was $46.3 billion. The latest figures that I have been able to obtain from the Department of Agriculture show that 1959 realized gross farm income was $37 billion, over $9 billion less than that indicated by the advertisement. The Department of Agriculture's calculation of gross farm income includes cash income from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of dwellings.

What is really the most objectionable and misleading aspect of this entire advertisement, Mr. Speaker, is the impression it gives of farmers never having it so good. This is just not true. We who are close to agriculture know that the farmer is facing many economic difficulties and we are trying to do something about them. This type of misleading material does not help.

In order to keep the record absolutely straight, I would like to cite an excerpt from the latest "Farm Income Situation" published by the Department of Agriculture on April 25, 1960.

On 1960 farm income the Department says this:

Developments since last fall have enhanced farmers' income prospects in 1960. The index of prices received by farmers has risen 5 percent since mid-December—mainly because of higher prices for hogs, cattle, chickens, and eggs—and is now only slightly below a year ago. Prices of farm products during the remaining months of 1960 are likely to average about the same as, or even slightly higher than, the corresponding months of 1959. Consequently, if growing conditions this year are about average, cash receipts from a continued heavy volume of farm marketings may equal those of 1959. Some further increase in farm production expenses seems likely, however, so realized net income of farm operators from farming may fall slightly short of the $11 billion realized last year.

The advertisement also lists average net income of farm operators per farm in 1959 at $2,547. This figure is much closer to the truth of farm income than is the $9,978 figure cited by the advertisement, and remember, the farmer must still pay for all his living expenses and capital improvements out of this income.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is my sincere hope that we can soon get at the job of doing something constructive about this farm income situation—and by that I mean, first, getting straight what the real situation is, and second, approaching the problem in a forthright and honest manner.

Let's Pay the Postman and Civil Servants, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, almost every year Congress is called upon to deal with the problem of postal and civil service workers' salaries lagging behind the cost of living and creating substantial hardships. A great furor arises, much time is consumed and trouble created for Congress and Government employees alike. Eventually some "better late than never" pay scale revisions are made which like as not are behind the times before they are written into law.

Just last week administration spokesmen opposed the passage of pay raise legislation this year in testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. A study is being made, they said, which will not be completed before September, and thus the whole matter should go over until next year. I do not agree with this argument for the reason that there is an apparent need now for upward revisions in these pay scales. What the study will show, undoubtedly, are many discrepancies between pay scales for various Federal employment which should be adjusted and equalized. This can be done as well after current legislation is enacted as before. Savings clauses could be written into present bills to obviate this kind of problem.

While discussing this subject it is well to point out that obvious inadequacies in our present procedures for handling Federal salary scales are responsible for the never ending inequities which consume the time of Congress and everyone else concerned in dealing with them. These can and should be overcome by appropriate administration recommendations followed up by prompt congressional action. Present procedures for adjustment of pay rates of so-called "blue-collar" Government workers point the way. These are Federal employees such as carpenters, machinists, and other craftsmen whose hourly wages are tied to the comparable wages of their counterparts engaged in similar civilian employment in the same area.

At intervals area wage boards determine prevailing rates of pay in a geographical area and Government pay rates are adjusted accordingly. No lobbying is involved; Congress does not have to pass a law; substantial justice is afforded with regard to pay scales promptly and fairly.

There is no good reason why a similar system, with all its attendant advantages, could not or should not be worked out for postal workers and almost all civil service workers.

One factor that so far has blocked this kind of legislation appears to be the negative attitude of various national associations of Government and postal employees. They argue that such a system might result in lower size pay checks for their members in some small city, for instance, as compared to a member doing the same job in a metropolitan area. They say it is not fair. They demand that all be paid the same.

But should they? Or more properly, in fact, are they? The pay check of a man in the small town where living costs are low represents much more actual, real pay than a pay check for the same amount handed to a man who lives in the high-cost-of-living metropolitan area. I think the unfairness of that proposition and the unsoundness of the position of these national organizations is quite apparent. I think the wisdom and fairness of tying flexible wage rates to prevailing conditions in an area of the country is certified by the fact that it is now done both in private industry and for Government blue-collar workers.

Let us do with the postal workers and the civil service workers what sound principles and common sense indicate we should do. Let us modernize our Federal pay procedures to meet the needs of the times and of the places where our public servants work.

On the subject of current pay bills, the Long Beach Independent-Press Tele-

gram recently carried the following approving editorial:

[From the Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram, Apr. 21, 1960]

LET'S PAY THE POSTMAN

With airmail zooming from coast to coast in 4½ hours and with facsimile transmission in the offing, the U.S. Post Office is keeping pace physically with the jet age. Sadly, it still pays its employees a horse-and-buggy wage.

In 11 years postal workers have received four pay raises totaling 52½ cents an hour. A Long Beach postal clerk in the top pay grade with 10 years experience takes home $159.16 to his wife and two children. Every 2 weeks, that is.

Pay for postal workers ranges from $2 to $2.42 per hour. Figure that up at 40 hours a week. While most of the rest of the economy has been rising on a spiral of wage and price hikes, the postal workers have been practically standing still.

We have supported the postal workers' fruitless efforts in recent years to get a decent pay raise. And we support the current congressional move to give post-office employees a 10-percent pay increase.

Every time a postal pay proposal comes up in Congress, the argument is heard that pay shouldn't be increased unless there is also a substantial increase in revenues.

Although we agree that the Post Office should be put on a sound financial footing, we consider it unfair to tie a Government employee's pay to the price of postage stamps just because he happens to work in the post office.

These workers are getting starvation wages. Congress should give them a solid increase, and the President should sign it into law.

A Bill To Amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Thomas Fagan, the president, and the other elected officials, as well as the membership of Local 249, General Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, one of the outstanding locals in my district, I am introducing this bill designed to take the Federal courts out of running labor organizations. This bill would amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932.

Mr. Fagan said "that since Congress saw fit to pass the Landrum-Griffin bill last year providing that the union membership—and only the membership—has the right to make the final determination of making local union policy, then the intent of Congress is being disregarded when the courts take over the union affairs."

The Landrum-Griffin bill—

He continued—

specifically states that the ultimate remedy of any internal solution is entirely up to the membership of that union, and that no officer can be removed from office except by membership vote.

I quite agree with Mr. Fagan and I feel that our Federal courts are to hear cases and make decisions and should not have the right to manage the affairs of either business or labor, nor the right to run businesses or labor organizations.

This proposed legislation will enable the Federal courts to devote themselves to their normal judicial functions without the need to consider or undertake the administration of any labor organization. It will also permit the union officers, rather than judicial appointments, to run the labor unions.

I would like to point out that unless this proposed legislation is passed, the present condition merely provides another avenue for those who are opposed to organized labor to eliminate it by bleeding the treasuries for excessive charges to cover the costs of paying the expenses and salaries of these "judicially appointed administrators." According to the latest reports released by the Federal courts, it has cost the treasuries of the local unions nearly $1 million to pay the monitors and the staffs as well as the legal fees.

The antiunion forces, which have flourished during the past 7 years, apparently realize they cannot beat the unions so they will, if possible, try to break them financially. They know if union funds are spent to cover salaries and expenses of judicial appointments and lawyers' fees, there will not be any available to promote organization work—if they cannot beat them, they plan to break them.

I feel the passage of this amendment will at least give the local labor unions a fighting chance to use their money for the interest of the membership.

Who Will Be Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since the State Department encouraged the overthrow of Syngman Rhee, founder of the South Korean Republic, by raving mobs, we are beginning to wonder who will be next. The mobs now forming in Japan, if encouraged by the Secretary of State, could overthrow the Government of Japan. The State Department's conduct in Korea could be the signal for mobs to again form on Formosa to overthrow Chiang Kai-shek. Mobs in the Philippines, with State Department encouragement, could undermine the splendid government of the friendly Philippine Republic. The precedent set by the State Department in South Korea could wreck our whole defense in the Pacific. It could place American troops and airbases in great jeopardy and roll back our defense line to our very coastline of California.

This Congress should immediately investigate the motives of our State Department's alinement with South Korean mobs and report to the American people.

The Panama Canal Zone could be next. The American people want to know.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Washington Evening Star for questioning the propriety of our State Department's taking sides with raving mobs against a duly constituted authority in a friendly free Republic.

The following is an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star on April 26, 1960:

CAPITULATION IN KOREA

The street mobs, assisted indirectly by our own State Department, have take over in Korea. And the spectacle is not one which augurs well for the American position in that part of the world.

President Syngman Rhee, who more than any other man has kept Korea alive, has offered to resign if the people desire. He has promised new elections and had said that his handpicked Vice President, Lee Ki-poong, will resign from all public offices. Even so, the mobs, drawing their hard core strength from high school and college students, continued to storm through the streets of Seoul, burning, wrecking, and shouting "death to Syngman Rhee." The Korean troops did nothing effective to disperse the mobs, composed initially of some 5,000 students and 200 professors. According to the Associated Press, the soldiers had been threatened with court-martial if they killed or wounded a demonstrator. By daybreak, again according to the Associated Press, "the city seemed virtually abandoned by police and troops, and the crowds took complete control."

In a word, the Government of Korea, overwhelmingly elected a month ago, has capitulated to the mobs—mobs which in numerical terms represent but a small fraction of the Korean people. Possibly it is doubtful whether our Government could have prevented this if it had supported Syngman Rhee, or even kept hands off. But it did neither. Instead, when police fired upon and killed mob members who were attempting last week to storm the President's residence in protest against fraud in the election, our State Department publicly rebuked Mr. Rhee. And again yesterday our Ambassador in Seoul called upon Mr. Rhee to speed action on the "justifiable grievances" of the Korean people—this while the mob was surging through the streets.

Now the inevitable has happened. The mobs, certainly encouraged by the State Department's attitude, appear to be in control. It is difficult to see how Syngman Rhee, even though he personally still may have the support of a majority of Koreans, can govern effectively—except on the mob's terms. For this result, our State Department must accept a large responsibility. How will it deal with the juveniles who have toppled Syngman Rhee? Are Mr. Herter and his associates really prepared to do business in Korea with a new leader—possible one cast in the Fidel Castro mold?

Wilderness Legislation Needs Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Western States Land Commissioners As-

sociation at its convention in Phoenix, Ariz., April 14, 1960, adopted a resolution which refers to legislation before the Congress.

I particularly refer to Members of this body the second paragraph of this resolution. I agree that the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission should study and report upon the needs for wilderness areas before any legislation concerning such areas is passed.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION C

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Western States Land Commissioners Association that there has been introduced in the current session of Congress, S. 1123, H.R. 5523, and numerous other bills for the permanent creation of wilderness areas; and

Whereas the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, established to study recreational needs throughout the United States, has only recently been constituted and appointed, and has not yet had an opportunity to study or to report upon the needs for wilderness areas; and

Whereas the present administration of wilderness areas by existing agencies is wholly adequate and satisfactory, and the creation of additional organizations for this purpose would entail unnecessary duplication, confusion and expense; and

Whereas the locking up of vast quantities of the natural resources of the Western States without first having made a complete study thereof would have an adverse economic impact upon the overall economy of said States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western States Land Commissioners Association in convention in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 14, 1960, hereby declares and reaffirms it to be to the best interest of the 18 western member States to oppose the passage of said wilderness bills; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Western States Land Commissioners Association be and is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the respective member States delegations in Congress, and such congressional committees as may hold hearings on said bills.

More Support for Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my efforts to secure the item veto authority for the President, I wish to call attention to two editorials.

One of "The Item Veto" appeared in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register earlier this year after the President's state of the Union message. The other editorial, "Schwengel Proposes Item Veto," is from the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette for Monday, April 18, 1960.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that both editorials appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Des Moines Register]

THE ITEM VETO

President Eisenhower Wednesday renewed his bid for a constitutional amendment that would give the President power to veto individual items in appropriation bills.

Appropriation measures are now submitted to the Chief Executive on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The knowledge that the President cannot eliminate individual items in a bill frequently prompts Congress to attach riders to appropriation measures. The result is that the Chief Executive may find it necessary to give his approval to objectional legislation in order to get necessary appropriations. Sometimes a particularly objectional item in an appropriation measure will result in a veto of the entire bill, thereby killing the good with the bad.

Numerous Presidents have recognized the problem and urged adoption of the item veto. The idea already has been given a thorough tryout. The item veto was first adopted by Georgia in 1861 and the Governors of 41 States (not including Iowa) now have item veto authority. Congress itself has recognized the value of allowing a Chief Executive to consider appropriation items separately. In passing the Hawaii and Alaska statehood measures, Congress gave express authority to the new States to make provision for the item veto in their constitutions.

Congress is reluctant to give the President added authority at its expense. But Congress needs to take a broader view and help provide this authority in the interests of good governmental practice.

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Apr. 18, 1960]

SCHWENGEL PROPOSES ITEM VETO

Iowa's First District Congressman, FRED SCHWENGEL of Davenport, has introduced three bills in the House that would give the President the power of item veto if adopted.

The item veto would permit the President to approve or disapprove separate items in any bill sent to him by Congress. Representative SCHWENGEL's bills would give the President this authority and, moreover, would give him the added authority to disapprove or reduce amounts of separate items in all appropriations bills, as well as the right to approve or disapprove items separately in appropriations bills except those which have the approval of the agencies involved, the Bureau of the Budget and the appropriate congressional committees.

The item veto is not well known to Iowans, probably because the Iowa law doesn't provide for it. This does not mean that it isn't a proper delegation of power, however, for the laws of several other States do provide for it.

Our feeling is that use of the item veto in our Federal Government could be more readily justified than in our Iowa State Government, due largely to differences in the form in which legislation may be passed and sent to the President and Governor.

In Iowa each bill sent to the Governor must deal with one subject only. Attempts to attach amendments dealing with another subject to a bill are ruled not germane to the original subject and must be dealt with separately by the legislature, if at all.

Congress has a continual field day attaching amendments of unrelated subject matter to main bills. Quite frequently, some bill that couldn't possibly win approval under its own power is attached to a popular bill and sent to the President on a take it all or leave it basis. Power of item veto would enable the President to weed out such items from bills which might be essential to the public interest in other respects.

Of course, there are times when the item veto would work in the public interest in Iowa, too. Had Governor Loveless been vested with this power during his first term he probably would have used it to cut out the 3-percent sales tax rate extension from the remainder of the revenue bill which also extended individual and corporate income tax rates that had been in effect the 2 previous years. As it was, he was forced to veto the entire revenue bill in order to veto the 2½-percent sales tax rate.

Representative SCHWENGEL is embarking on a long road to get favorable action on the item veto. But we wish him well.

Soviet Labor Unrest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Mr. Harry Schwartz which appeared in the New York Times of April 24, 1960, entitled "Soviet Labor Unrest Seen; Strike Reported in Siberia":

SOVIET LABOR UNREST SEEN—STRIKE REPORTED IN SIBERIA

(By Harry Schwartz)

Reports reaching the United States tell of rising dissatisfaction among workers in the Soviet Union during recent months, discontent born largely of pay cuts, higher work norms and commodity shortages.

At least one major work stoppage is reported to have taken place earlier this year in the major West Siberian industrial center of Kemerovo. Reports from other Soviet cities tell of heated meetings at which workers have openly voiced their complaints.

Diplomats in Moscow who have talked with Soviet economic leaders believe that the Soviet economy has not been doing well recently. That impression sharply contradicts the glowing claims of rapidly rising industrial output made in the recently published official report on industry during this year's first quarter.

WORK STOPPAGE CONFIRMED

The evidence of rising worker dissatisfaction comes from Western diplomats stationed in the Soviet Union. Other information on the problem was given in the press. Bitter complaints were printed recently in Pravda about serious lags in capital investments, the foundation for planned increases in output.

A report that a major strike occurred late last year at the construction site of the giant Karaganda Iron and Steel Plant in Temir-Tau in Kazakhstan was confirmed several weeks ago by the head of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, D. A. Kunayev. Dissatisfaction with conditions of life and work at the site was given by Mr. Kunayev as the reason for the "disruptions" in work.

The sources of dissatisfaction behind the unrest appear to be the following:

Continued shortages of consumer goods in most areas. An American who was in Moscow earlier this year reported that it was a

grim winter even for the best supplied city in the country. At times last month even milk was unavailable. The major newspapers, such as Pravda on April 8, have mentioned continuing shortages of consumer durable goods, such as refrigerators, television sets and furniture, but have said little about the reported deficiences of more basic commodities.

The impact of the program for reorganizing the wage and salary system, which is associated with preparations for the scheduled shortening of the standard workweek from 46 to 42 hours.

No details are available on the most serious expressions of this dissatisfaction, but some hints have appeared in reports on trade-union meetings printed by the union organ Trud earlier this month.

At the sixth congress of coal miners, Trud reported, "serious grievances" against the authorities in charge of wage policy were voiced by many delegates. Trud gave no further details.

A recent congress of Latvian unions heard reports about "serious errors" in the planning of wages in machinery, food, and fishing enterprises. A similar meeting in Turkmenistan was told of "serious errors" in planning wages for oil workers, as well as of poor planning of consumer goods production.

The official Communist Party magazine, Kommunist, conceded, 2 months ago, that in some cases the new salary system meant a reduction in take-home pay for workers.

According to Kommunist, the "baseless high earnings" of some workers in the past were due to low production quotas. These, the magazine said, the workers could easily exceed, thus getting large bonuses. Moreover, it said, workers have been classified in pay grades higher than those to which their skills and performance entitled them.

Higher production norms are being set for many workers. This is part of the effort to increase productivity so that the transition to a shorter workweek may be made with the least need for hiring additional workers.

A Moscow taxi driver told an American visitor recently that under the new regulations he must clean and check his vehicle on his own time, an order that forces him to work an hour a day without pay. This causes him greater loss than the nominal gain from the 4 hours less he supposedly works each week.

There is said to be much resentment among higher paid workers and managerial personnel because of reductions in their earnings. These were imposed as part of the drive to narrow inequalities among citizens. Kommunist has reported that the former ratio of earnings between a plant director and a foreman varied from 3–1 to 5–1, but was being narrowed to the range of 2–1 to 3–1.

A spectacular instance of the impact of the egalitarian moves is reported to be the sharp reductions in earnings received by outstanding Soviet artists. Such men as David Oistrakh, violinist, and Emil Gilels, pianist, often received thousands of dollars for a concert. Their pay now is said to be well under $500.

Free Enterprise, Best Incentive for Bold, New Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, whenever we are called upon in Congress to spend more money or to expand welfare programs, we are told we must do it because we should not be afraid of bold, new ideas. The fact is that bold, new ideas are not created in a welfare state. Man's greatest progress has been made under our own system of free enterprise. No socialist society, no country in which the Federal Government dominates completely the lives of the people has offered such great abundance, such opporunity for advancement, such a high standard of living, all the good things of life to the individual as has been offered in America. I submit that the only source of bold, new ideas is the freedom of men to operate in our kind of society. I commend for your study the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, edition of April 26, 1960:

OUT OF STEAM

As you may have noticed, Congress has been surprisingly sleepy for an election year. Even so, the liberals who are so numerous in the Democratic-controlled Congress have no intention of ending the session with do-nothing tags on their lapels.

Instead they intend to push hard, as a recent report in this newspaper indicates, for a number of things, including some kind of plan for Federal help for medical care for the aged, liberalization of social security, Federal aid to "depressed areas," and probably more subsidies for housing.

Whatever else may be said of these proposals, they certainly cannot claim originality. Even socialized medicine, which embraces Federal medical care for the aged, was under intense discussion in Truman days. As for liberalizing social security, it has become, to the shame of the politicians, a traditional election-year sport. And so goes the procession of weary ideas.

Indeed, it is something of a paradox that liberals are constantly saying the country needs bold new programs but rarely suggesting any. Consider the liberal Presidential contenders: In all the floods of words so far this year no fresh thought swims.

What's the matter? Are American liberals, like their ideological relatives in Europe, running out of intellectual resources?

There are reasons for believing that such may be the case. Contemporary American liberalism has only one unifying force—its faith in Government action as a cure-all for human problems. That approach automatically creates endless disagreement among liberals over how far the Government should go in a given situation. One liberal may favor a regimented economy, another a halfway house, still another relatively few controls.

Or if social security is to be perpetually "liberalized," how can a liberal logically argue it should be liberalized only so much at a given time? If the Government is to tax everyone to provide a little medical care for the relatively few indigent aged, why should it not provide cradle-to-the-grave security for everyone? In fact, if the premise is accepted that Government is the very fount of the good society, must not a consistent liberal contend that the Government should take over everything and so bring about the best society?

These confusions are profound and they plainly dismay many liberals themselves. They help explain a further trouble of the liberals: They cannot offer anything truly bold or new because their basic approach is neither. There is nothing bold or new about throwing up one's hands at every problem and saying, "Let Washington do it." To be sure, innumerable strings can be attached to that bow, but the bow remains the same one of Government spending, and so the liberals' proposals finally all sound the same.

This lack of imagination is causing serious difficulties in the liberal-like parties in Europe. The Labor Party in Britain, the Social Democrats in West Germany are in political disarray because they are in intellectual disarray. Britons are fed to the teeth with talk of nationalization, and the Laborites have little else to offer; the German Social Democrats have junked much of their Marxist dogma.

In both transatlantic cases the big-government advocates have run out of ideas and run into the voters' realization that free private initiative is the only real source of boldness, innovation and prosperity.

We do not suggest that American liberals are in political trouble yet. They are, however, in deep philosophical trouble. That is why you are unlikely to hear from them, in Congress or the campaign, any sparkling new ideas for dealing with the Nation's problems.

Twenty-five Years of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today, our Nation observes the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service.

I am confident that April 27, 1935, will be recorded as a turning point in the history of American agriculture, and of world agriculture. When the Congress adopted the Soil Conservation Act that created the Soil Conservation Service as an agency in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a government for the first time in history established a national policy for the deliberate conservation of its soil and water resources.

Since then we have set a pattern and a policy of conservation which scientists of other countries come here to study and to copy. The Soil Conservation Act signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 27, 1935, after the 74th Congress had passed the legislation without a dissenting vote, established the United States as a pioneer in the field of soil and water conservation.

Of particular interest to me has been the watershed development and flood-prevention phase of the overall soil and water conservation program. Watershed development has been a key part of the Soil Conservation Service program since its beginning. It set up its first demonstration projects within watershed boundaries. Many of the early soil conservation districts were organized on a watershed basis.

The formal watershed approach to soil and water conservation began in 1936 when the Congress passed the Flood Control Act. On May 15, 1952, I introduced the first bill (H.R. 7868) to establish a flood-prevention program. The idea was not enacted into law for 2 years but in 1953 Congress authorized the pilot watershed program. The next year, Public 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, was passed and speeded up this work on a broad, national scale. It places the initiative in the hands of the local citizens. It gives them a chance to develop their own watershed

plans. When they have completed their plans and organization, the Federal Government may come in at their invitation as a junior partner to help them carry out their watershed program. That is the American, the democratic way of doing things.

Sometimes, of course, just because it is the democratic way, things do not get done as quickly as the local people and we in Congress would like. We have to be careful in spending the taxpayers' money. We have to see that a proposed watershed program is feasible and economical; that it will produce benefits in excess of costs. There are times when a project has to wait until the landowners voluntarily make available easements or rights-of-way where dams are to be built.

However, we do get things done just as fast as money is available. This is especially true where the Soil Conservation Service is providing leadership. We get this important work done without sacrificing any of our essential freedom, and without relinquishing our individual rights.

During the past year, as the people have gained experience, the watershed program is moving faster. At first, as applications for Federal participation came in, progress was slow. But now, with hundreds of applications approved for construction work, we are moving into high gear. We are gaining momentum. The pace is steadily increasing. The requirement for funds is greater than ever. We need and seek the understanding of the Appropriations Committee.

I also want to recognize the other parts of the Soil Conservation Service's responsibilities, such as technical service to soil conservation districts and the Great Plains conservation program. All of these various parts are important and necessary. They all fit naturally into the whole, well-rounded program envisioned by the Congress when it passed the original Soil Conservation Act 25 years ago.

Under that act and the additional legislation adopted since then, the Soil Conservation Service has been doing a tremendous job. It is working with both rural and urban people in their efforts to conserve and develop our essential natural resources of soil, water, plants, and wildlife. On this anniversary the Nation salutes the Soil Conservation Service for its first quarter century of devoted, productive work. It is our sincere hope and expectation that the next 25 years will be equally as productive.

Unless we save our soil it will surely not save us.

Low Ethics in High Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic magazine of April 25, 1960:

VAN BUREN TO EISENHOWER

It has been learned, not from the newspapers, that an Arabian stallion, a gift from President Bourguiba of Tunisia to President Eisenhower, was sent by truck to Mr. Eisenhower's farm in Gettysburg, after spending 12 days in quarantine in New Jersey. The public may be excused for looking this one in the mouth. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution of the United States says: "* * * No person holding any office of profit or trust * * * shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince or foreign state."

And in a letter dated May 8, 1840, President Van Buren in declining "two good-bred Arab-Nijd horses" wrote the Sultan of Muscat as follows: "I look upon this friendly proceeding on your part as a new proof of your Highness' desire to cultivate with us amicable relations, but a fundamental law of the Republic which forbids its servants from accepting presents from foreign States or Princes precludes me from receiving those your Highness intended for me."

Joe D. Newton of the National Postal Postal Transport Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Joe D. Newton, of Birmingham, Ala., has long been considered to be a fixture on the scene of postal employees relations in Birmingham and throughout Alabama and the Memphis postal region. Mr. Newton is president of the Alabama Branch of the National Postal Transport Association, the organization which represents postal employees who work in railway mail cars, in highway post offices and at airports and in terminal post offices throughout the United States. We thought Mr. Newton would remain as president of the Alabama branch for as long as he continues in the postal service. I have just learned that Mr. Newton will not be a candidate for reelection when his term expires on May 7, 1960. I hope that some other avenue will be found for utilizing Mr. Newton's unique talents because certainly, now if ever, postal employees need capable spokesmen to defend their position.

As a Member of Congress I have been very close to the National Postal Transport Association and even before coming to Congress I have been intimately friedly with Mr. Newton. I may have been the first Member of Congress to ride in a railway post office car. Certainly I was first in the sense that the ride, which was arranaged for me by Mr. Newton, was accomplished even before I came to Congress in 1954. Under Mr. Newton's wise guidance I learned the specialties of railway mail clerks, the things they need to know, the importance of the service they perform. Today, 6 years after that ride on the railway post office car, I realize that no one either within or outside the Post Office Department has yet developed a method of mail handling which will equal the idea of en route distribution as a benefit to the postal service.

Partly because of the education I received on the trip, and partly because of the supporting material furnished me by Mr. Newton and his colleagues, all my distinguished congressional colleagues from Alabama joined me in a joint appeal to the Post Office Department to establish, or to extend highway post office service. This was done in the realization that with a contracting railway transportation structure the best alternative to the superlative railway post office would be to transplant the same type of operation to the Nation's highways.

My colleagues and I also joined in an appeal to the Post Office Department to continue the district transportation office in Birmingham. From what I can see the information provided by Mr. Newton to the Senators and Members of Congress from Alabama was extremely persuasive and I feel that had it not been that the program of closing district offices was a nationwide plan, we would have been able to succeed permanently as we did initially in maintaining the transportation office at Birmingham.

Thus, if after his term of office expires on May 7, Mr. Joe D. Newton of Birmingham continues to be a representative of postal employees, I hope that he will be able to exercise his persuasive talents at the level of the Memphis postal region. Communications, after all, are the heart of the postal service and so too, I as a Member of Congress, feel that I will be able to communicate more effectively with the several levels of the Post Office Department if Mr. Joe Newton, president of the Alabama branch of the National Postal Transport Association is persuaded to change his mind and to continue to serve as an employee representative.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell Urges Railway Labor and Railway Management To Adopt a Common Viewpoint by Recommending a Fundamental Overhauling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and Gradual Elimination of All Government Subsidies in Transportation in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, in an address at the Railway Employees' Department Convention, Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1960, suggested to railway labor and railway management that they join in recommending a fundamental overhauling of the Interstate Commerce

Commission and gradual elimination of all Government subsidies in transportation in America.

Pointing out that the railroads no longer have a monopoly, Secretary Mitchell said "so the regulations that govern them must be accommodated to the new competition." Urging that an overall approach on the part of the Federal Government to transportation is an essential, Secretary Mitchell continued by stating:

We need a fresh approach to economic policies, regulation, subsidies, and taxation. And certainly for the railroad industry no one is in a better position to suggest the right changes than the men and women of the railroad industry, both those who work and those who manage.

Secretary Mitchell pointed out that the railroad industry while a major element today in a total system of transportation infinitely more complex and variable is but only one element, and that the relative position of the railroads in competition with other modes of transportation has declined.

It is my belief that Secretary Mitchell's address will be of great interest to my colleagues and for that reason at this point I wish to incorporate it in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' DEPARTMENT CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 27, 1960

I am pleased to have this opportunity to comment upon the present situation of the American transportation system, especially that of the railroads and the men and women who make their living in that industry.

It will be the judgment of history that in recent decades other modes of transportation have successfully challenged the former monopoly of the railroads so that this basic mode of transportation now finds itself increasingly in need of a workable, dynamic competitive position.

Not too many years ago a person traveled from one place to another in America by rail, or he stayed home. An industry shipped its goods and received its materials by rail, or not at all. The railroads tunneled mountains, crossed rivers, spanned plains, and what moved for any distance moved over them.

Today the railroads are a major element, but only one element, in a total system infinitely more complex and variable. It is true that both passenger and freight traffic on the railroads has increased absolutely; it is also true that the relative position of the railroads as a mode of transportation in competition with others has declined.

With the steady growth of the American economy has come a network of high-speed highways that link major metropolitan areas and small towns. Powerful diesel trailer trucks, capable of delivering large loads, move over this network of roads and offer a reasonable alternative to shipment by rail, certainly for the short haul.

With a rising standard of living, automobile ownership has grown to the point where the average American has, parked outside his house, an attractive alternative to traveling by rail.

Airlines offer a faster long haul alternative to railway passenger travel, with service intentionally emphasized. With the advent of the jet cargo plane in a matter of years, perhaps sooner, some of the long haul, high-revenue freight traffic of the railroads will be further challenged.

There is nothing to indicate that the growth and progress of formidable competitors to the railroads is going to diminish; I think the opposite is true.

Since this change in American transportation already has had serious effects upon railroad employment, the membership of the rail unions is justly concerned about the future.

I would like to suggest today some of the ways in which that concern might be translated into more effective action than has been evident in the past.

The question before all of us who are interested in a sound railroad industry and a sound transportation system is how we can derive the maximum good from change—that good being a stable, unified transportation system with efficient components that offer both employment stability and competitive advantage, with a minimum of cost to the individual citizen and his family, and to the communities in which those families live.

It should conserve and use the vast investment already made in the lifetime training and experience of its employees, of the many billions of dollars in plant and equipment.

How do we get such a system?

More to the point here: how do the people of American railroading help the industry to hold position?

It makes good sense to me to begin the answer by confronting the difficult truths of change—to start with the premise that if a competitive position is the basic need of today's railroads then it is to the interest of everyone who looks to the railroads to contribute to the finding and holding of such a position.

An acceptance of this first of facts might lead railroad labor and railroad management to the acceptance of new postures; where the rail unions have been in the past an articulate opposition to changes that endanger the welfare of their membership, there may now exist the need for them to join with management to present an equally articulate opposition to whatever endangers the competitive position of their industry. Management might join with the unions to formulate recommendations toward a public transportation policy more in keeping with the realities of 1960 and not so reflective of the vanished realities of 1920.

I do not think that a competitive position for railroads can be achieved if the collective-bargaining table continues to be the only instrument for communication between rail unions and rail management.

This may seem an awkward time to suggest such a thing; actually there is no better time. The railroad unions of America have represented their memberships before management with great credit and success. Rail management, faced with the difficulties of competition, has faced many volatile decisions; the record of a century of service has been a good one.

But now both must realize that the field has widened, that the railroad industry finds itself one part of a competitive transportation system that seeks to obliterate the inefficient and unattractive. If labor and management face the need for new and progressive positions in such a changing world, they face that need together.

To the question of Government regulation, for example, the railroad industry might, and I think should have, a single, strong answer—an industry answer, not one labor and one management answer.

The present structure of Government regulation is based upon a time in economic history when the rails had, in effect, a monopoly in transportation. By protecting the public welfare in the regulation of railroads, the Government protected the public interest in the only mode of transportation that mattered.

As the rails are no longer a monopoly, so the regulations that govern them must be accommodated to the new competition. An overall approach on the part of the Federal Government to transportation is an essential. We need a fresh approach to economic policies, regulation, subsidies, and taxation. And, certainly for the railroad industry, no one is in a better position to suggest the right changes than the men and women of the railroad industry, both those who work and those who manage.

I suggest that a fundamental overhauling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the laws that govern transportation is necessary so that Federal regulation produces equality of competition and not an index to the competition of yesterday. A joint recommendation on this subject from labor and management would go a long way toward achieving that end. If a joint recommendation is not possible, certainly separate recommendations would be in order.

And what of Government subsidies?

The Government subsidizes the building of ships and the losses of American-flag lines. It deepens and develops inland waterways. It subsidizes airlines through the construction of terminals and the carrying of mail. It has subsidized truckers through building public roads. The railroads remain the great unsubsidized portion of the American transportation system.

I suggest that we seek the gradual elimination of all Government subsidies in transportation in America and consider the introduction of user charges so that each mode of transportation carries its fair share of the burden of public expenditures from which they now profit unequally.

A joint recommendation from labor and management in the railroad industry would go far toward achieving this end also; and again, separate recommendations, in the event a joint one is not possible, would most certainly be in order.

Now, the development of these kinds of recommendations, offered on behalf of the entire industry, is an entirely different objective than that of collective bargaining, and it requires a different kind of labor-management approach.

I believe that the railroad industry position on matters like Government regulation and subsidies and user charges would be a strong one, and would contribute to an improved competitive posture for railroads, if it represented the best joint thinking of both labor and management, if it were a total industry position.

Certainly the health of the industry is a matter for common concern, and as the industry benefits from a better situation so do all of the people within it.

Certainly economic change does not wait; lack of flexibility means lost jobs and a continuously deteriorating position.

No one in the railroad industry can afford to have his head stuck in the sands of 30 years ago.

It doesn't mean much to win a collective bargaining battle and lose the whole competitive war.

Collective bargaining "business as usual"—without a real effort to join outside the bargaining table and develop competitive measures—could mean no business at all.

We have big markets in America; we are going to have bigger ones. The railroads' share of them will determine whether or not jobs will continue to be lost, or won back—and that share depends upon the extent to which labor and management can develop a cooperative method for finding a better competitive posture.

One of the things we face in this country is a growing urban-suburban transportation problem which is going to get worse before it gets better. A few years from now the entire eastern seaboard from Richmond to Boston will be, in terms of transportation need, virtually a single urbanized area with metro-

politan centers at intervals. I would think that here would be an area where the railroads, with their rights of way, their terminals in the centers of the metropolitan areas, their established links between suburb and city, could step forward with a comprehensive transportation plan that takes account of their advantages.

If, before such a plan could become operative, Government regulations at several levels needed to be cleared away, then why shouldn't rail labor and rail management offer a recommendation to accomplish that?

At an even more immediate level, there are questions of attractive service, of adequate equipment and of productivity that can snarl up a bargaining table while railroad competitors keep moving ahead—but the answer is not in referring these questions to bargaining but to a different kind of meeting, one in which the leaders of rail labor and the officials of rail management come without the need for combatting each other but with the need for cooperating with each other.

And that need grows with the economy.

The railroad industry has benefited for many years from the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. It has been a good law, and is still a good law for dealing with subjects that can be settled by legal machinery. But it involves deadlines; it involves procedures that move in a regular and orderly sequence toward decision. I wonder how far a piece of legal machinery, no matter how trustworthy for other purposes, should be trusted to resolve questions in which not only the competitive posture of an entire industry but the lives and jobs of many thousands of people are involved?

It seems to me that is letting the law manage men; I think we would all prefer to see men manage themselves.

The single question of work rules and practices that were practical in their day but that might now be obsolete cannot be approached without the most careful consideration and deliberate study—a consideration and study that cannot take place under the gun of a deadline.

It takes a long time and a lot of patient effort to solve any problem in which the welfare of human beings is involved; I would be hesitant about referring that kind of problem to a process that is going to click right along toward what has to be a comparatively immediate solution.

Labor and management in the railroad industry might think about this as they consider how to meet their problem of change, and as they contemplate a mechanism to assure themselves, and the public, that their relationship will be fruitful.

I would like to suggest four ground rules within which collective bargaining and additional cooperative discussion between labor and management in the railroads might take place—a discussion designed to formulate a total transportation policy for the entire industry as it stands in competition with other modes of transportation, a discussion from which might come recommendations on Government regulation and subsidies, and a discussion from which might come understanding and agreement on specific industry problems like adequate equipment, improved services and higher productivity.

The first of these ground rules is that compulsion of an involuntary nature is not a solution to railroad problems. Compulsory arbitration can solve none of the problems I have implied; it can only create new ones.

Secondly, working men and women have something akin to a property right in work procedures and customs engaged in for many years and resulting from bargaining agreements, and these rights should be modified or forfeited by consent, not compulsion.

Thirdly, management, cannot manage or exist without the ability to maneuver flexibility to meet competitive challenges. The status quo is not an answer to the challenge of change; standing pat is often an optical illusion for going backward.

Finally, both labor and management bear a public responsibility that will make itself felt, sooner or later.

The rejection of compulsion, the rejection of forced change, the rejection of standpatism, and the acceptance of the crucial impact of public responsibility—within these four ground rules, it seems to me, rail labor and rail management can fruitfully explore the problems, some of which now divide them, with the objective of creating a common understandnig and a joint policy to keep the American railroad industry in a competitive position, break new ground for it, protect employment, and produce the one thing that will make the difference: the best service for the best price.

Thank you.

Politics Is for People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Republican Delta of Buckhannon, W. Va., came to my attention today, and I would recommend it to my colleagues for their consideration.

Mr. Romney, president of American Motors, points out that politics and government are personal responsibilities, not group responsibilities, and he has outlined some steps which should be taken to return our political parties and our Government to those they are supposed to represent.

Following is the editorial:

POLITICS IS FOR PEOPLE

With the tempo of election year politics increasing everywhere, some thoughts of George Romney, American Motors president, in the May Reader's Digest are timely and important. In an address titled "Politics Is for People—Not the 'Bigs'," he urges that we take part personally and not leave our fate to other people or interests.

Romney is interested in individual action. As explained in his biography, "The Story of George Romney," recently published by Harper's, the automobile executive is opposed to excessive concentration of power in business, labor, or government.

"I believe," says Romney in the Digest, "that corporate officials and union officials should participate in political affairs—but personally, as individuals. They should take every possible step to assure members and employees that this is a personal right not to be abridged in any manner.

"Each individual must speak for himself, directed by what he believes in. Of course, to be effective he must combine his energies with the energies of others, but through the instrument of a political party, not through his corporation or his union."

To stop the drift toward increasingly massive centralized government, Romney has three suggestions:

1. Make certain, by modernized law, that power outside government is dispersed and kept dispersed, so that big government is not needed to hold it in check.

2. Improve the character of State governments and modernize the smaller government units, such as the parish or the county.

3. Revive the feeling that people can participate effectively in control of the government.

"We need to bring our political parties and the people together," says Romney, "if our democratic system is to continue to be truly representative."

As a step in this direction he suggests that we give an hour as well as a dollar to the party of our choice. He also has several other proposals, all worth reading, study, and action.

Brooklyn's New Caledonian Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article on the Caledonian Hospital in Brooklyn, a $2 million project which is now nearing completion. It was planned and built by Mr. Bernard E. Feuerstein, an architect who studied the needs of doctors, nurses, and patients. The result is a hospital of modern and original designs with an eye for practicability.

Brooklyn is very proud of its new Caledonian Hospital. In view of hospital shortages in various parts of the country, this brief article may prove to be of significance and food for thought in planning such structures. The article was published in the New York Journal American on March 15, 1960, and reads as follows:

TURNS SURGEON TO BUILD HOSPITAL

A Long Island master builder with a design for doing things right turned surgeon before he undertook the planning and construction of Brooklyn's Caledonian Hospital and Hempstead General Hospital.

Bernard E. Feuerstein, who heads the firm of Bernard Associates, East Rockaway, is now putting the finishing touches on the $2 million construction project at Caledonian Hospital.

But prior to starting on these jobs, Mr. Feuerstein attended several surgical operations, though he hates the sight of blood. He also spoke to hundreds of department heads, administrators, patients, professional and nonprofessional staff at over a dozen hospitals.

His purpose was to determine the hospital needs from those on the firing line.

Mr. Feuerstein said that by attending operations he could see the needs of the doctors and nurses, inefficiencies of existing operating room facilities, and how he could improve on them.

He also examined the operations behind the lines, in such areas as kitchen, laundry and laboratories, and studied hospitals' unique problems.

Because rapid attention is necessary for patients, with free flow of traffic, Mr. Feuerstein traced the visit of patients from the time they were admitted to their discharge, so that a maximum of attention and minimum of wasted motion could be incorporated into the hospital plans.

Donald G. C. Sinclair, president of Caledonian Hospital, praised Mr. Feuerstein for his work.

Mr. Feuerstein, who received his architectural training at New York University, said his extensive study visits to city hospitals are now paying off for the institutions. They are able to cut administrative and operative costs, and can save considerable funds in the original design by slashing waste.

And, he said, employees and doctors like the hospitals better too. They helped design them.

Home for Smokey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, that this Nation's No. 1 forest firefighter, who has saved the homes of thousands of people, is homeless himself, was the subject of of an article in the Sunday Star of April 24, 1960.

Smokey the Bear, symbol of the Forest Service's successful campaign against man-caused forest fires, spends his days in a temporary cage at the National Zoological Park here, because there is no money to build the home the Forest Service had planned for him, according to the North American Newspaper Alliance.

In an account labeled "Home for Smokey," the Department of Agriculture has about $2,000 in contributions from Junior Rangers and Smokey's young friends around the country. But Director William Huber of the Forest Service's Cooperative Fire Prevention Campaign estimates it will take about $25,000 to get started.

Smokey has been saving millions of dollars and millions of acres from forest fires ever since he was rescued as a cub from a fire in the Lincoln National Forest of New Mexico in 1950. That fire burned 17,000 acres of timber, killed countless animals and burned off the cover which holds the water. The only living thing the mop-up crews saw was a badly burned bear cub. New Mexico State game and fish officials took him back to Santa Fe, treated him for third-degree burns and nursed him back to health on a diet of pablum mixed with honey and milk.

New Mexico's game warden offered the cub to the Forest Service as a living symbol of the need to be careful with fire in the forest. So 3 months after the fire, Smokey, then weighing in at 10 pounds, was flown to Washington.

Since that time, he has become a national figure. The advertising council has built a promotion campaign around Smokey to which businessmen contribute around $10 million worth of time and space a year. The cooperative Federal-State fire prevention program budget is around $200,000.

Smokey also is a major financial contributor to the program. In 1952, because of his popularity and standing with the youngsters of this country, Congress passed a law protecting his name. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue licenses for the manufacture and sale of commercial Smokey Bear products provided the product is in good taste and carries a forest fire prevention message. All the money from these licenses and a 5-percent royalty goes for furthering the nationwide cooperative forest fire prevention program. To date the royalty has totaled some $200,000.

The campaign has been a success. Some 8 years ago about 200,000 man-caused forest fires burned 30 million acres—an area about the size of New York State. Last year, 100,000 man-caused forest fires burned 4 million acres.

As the author of the following article points out, what this country needs in election year 1960 is a good 5-cent contribution for Smokey the Bear:

FIREFIGHTING SMOKEY BARELY HAS OWN DEN

What this country needs in election year 1960 is a good 5-cent contribution for Smokey the Bear.

Smokey, the Nation's No. 1 forest firefighter for 10 years, is homeless.

And if any candidate for President is reading, there are several junior forest rangers who would like to see some action on housing this year for a special friend of theirs.

For a decade, first under a Democratic administration and now under the Republicans, Smokey has lent his name and his familiar face to the most successful fire-prevention campaign in history.

Smokey gets about 1,000 letters a day, more than Senators, Representatives, and Governors, and just about as many as the President.

But all he has received on housing from the politicians and bureaucrats is a string of broken promises.

IN TEMPORARY CAGE

And so he spends his days in a temporary cage at the National Zoological Park here, just another cinnamon bear begging for peanuts; homeless, mateless, cubless.

The Forest Service has a dandy set of plans on the shelf, approved by the zoo and the Smithsonian Institution, to build a separate moated home for Smokey and a mate. It's to be a replica of a forest ranger cabin, with room for little Smokeys to carry on the firefighting tradition.

But the money is scarcer than wild honey.

Somewhere among the billions of dollars handled by the Agriculture Department is an account labeled "Home for Smokey." In it is about $2,000 in pennies, nickels, and dimes contributed by junior rangers and Smokey's young friends around the country.

"But we need about $25,000 to get started," said William Huber, director of the Forest Service's Cooperative Fire Prevention Campaign. "At the rate we're going, Smokey may be gone before we get the money."

Here's where a presidential candidate could step in with a Smokey housing platform, keeping in mind all those junior rangers and their voting parents.

SAVED MILLIONS

Not only is there no tax money to finance Smokey's promised home, but Agriculture Secretary Benson frowns on the idea of the Forest Service soliciting funds for it.

Smokey has been saving millions of dollars and millions of acres from forest fires ever since he was rescued as a frightened cub from a fire in the Lincoln National Forest of New Mexico in 1950.

The symbol of Smokey, leaning on his shovel and wearing a ranger hat, has become a national trademark of the fight against forest fires.

Eight years or so ago, there were about 200,000 man-caused forest fires a year, burning over 30 million acres—an area about the size of New York State. Last year, there were about 100,000 fires caused by man. The toll dropped to 4 million acres.

Each year, the Forest Service sends out 500,000 of Smokey's Junior Ranger kits to schools, youth clubs, and individual Smokey fans.

COST 12 CENTS

The kits include a Junior Ranger badge, membership card, several Smokey stamps, a Smokey photograph, and a letter from Smokey with his song printed on the other side.

"The kits cost us about 12 cents each," said Mr. Huber. "We send them out free, using the money we earn from the royalties on Smokey scarfs, replica bears, and so on. It takes all the royalty money just to finance the kits."

Last month the demand was so great that the Forest Service had to hire an outside firm to help handle Smokey's mail.

Last month also, Congress was asked to provide an air-conditioned kennel for dogs kept by the Public Health Service.

But nobody put in a plug for Smokey, who has grown almost to middle age waiting for people to make good on a promise.

"Can you imagine what a nickel from schoolchildren—or even a penny—would do?" mused Mr. Huber.

Philadelphia Textile Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 23, 1960, I had the pleasure to attend the 75th anniversary dinner of the Philadelphia Textile Institute, one of the great institutions of learning in my district.

Dr. Richard S. Cox, dean emeritus, was one of the speakers on this pleasant occasion. His review of the history of the institute since its early days, when it did not award degrees, to the present time, when it is one of the largest and most advanced institutions of its kind in the world, was extremely interesting and informative. Therefore, I am including his remarks below:

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF PROGRESS OF THE PHILADELPHIA TEXTILE INSTITUTE

(By Dr. Richard S. Cox, dean emeritus)

Looking back over the years to trace the progress and development of an institution such as the Philadelphia Textile Institute, one cannot help but be dazzled by the evolution of the textile industry in the 75 years of the existence of our college.

The dreams, ambitious and mechanical developments, to say nothing of the advent of new fibers to augment the natural fibers of linen, cotton, wool, and silk; all have had the attention of those who had the growth of the American textile industry ever in their minds.

The Philadelphia Textile Institute was founded 75 years ago, because prior to that time there were no textile education facilities in America, European manufacturers aided by their specialized colleges and schools were capturing the international textile market.

Mr. Theodore C. Search, one of the leaders in the group of founders of the college has often been quoted as saying, "If the

United States hopes to maintain the best markets for its textile products, their products must combine the highest skill in manufacturing and the best taste in design."

With these thoughts in mind the textile school was founded and opened in 1884, by a group of Philadelphia textile manufacturers, two of whom are still active, one being represented on the Philadelphia Textile Institute Foundation Board, namely, Dehaven Butterworth, a direct descendent of one of our founders, H. W. Butterworth & Sons.

This group of manufacturers after founding the textile school, founded the Manufacturers Club, which for years was a leading Philadelphia club, located at Broad and Walnut Streets.

Originally, classes both day and evening, were conducted at 1336 Spring Garden Street with the thought of training young men in perfecting their skill in operating the loom and preparing the patterns. In this, the machines were studied so that various patterns could be produced with the study of the timing and setting of the loom.

In 1887 a department of chemistry was added to the curriculum, because the use of chemicals in dyeing and finishing of the fabric attracted the attention of the industry and knowledge of these factors became a necessity.

The move from Spring Garden Street to Broad and Pine Streets in 1892 was the stepping stone for greater advancement and broadening of our teaching and facilities.

Dr. J. Merritt Matthews was added to the staff to head the department of chemistry and dyeing, which had grown by the addition of much needed space in our new quarters.

Dr. Matthews was a chemist of renown who had devoted much of his time to textiles, particularly the new fibers which were beginning to be developed. His book on "Textile Fibers" was the first publication of its kind in the United States and for many years remained a recognized authority on the many natural and manmade fibers. After his death a revised edition had on its board of editors, several members of the school faculty.

Further expansion was made by creating a woolen department fully equipped with processing machinery and later a cotton department for the manipulation of the cotton fiber.

A book on "Cotton Spinning" was published, written by William E. Winchester, a PTI instructor in cotton processing, who in later years became a member of the firm of Deering-Milliken Co.

Raw wool fibers were studied and a book on "Wool" was published, written by Stanley H. Hart, also a PTI instructor who in later years became a member of the board of governors of the school.

The courses in fabric construction, were expanded and figured design and color were added which grew to a full department with stress being made on the production of fabrics designed by the students using yarns dyed by them for their individual fabrics.

Changes were constantly being made in instruction, with the primary purpose of elevating the general thoroughness of the education of the student, looking forward to the time when full collegiate requirements could be met and the standing of the graduate elevated.

A step in this direction was made with the aid of faculty members of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, in the early days of the 20th century, who gave lecture courses to the seniors on "Cost Accounting in Textile Mills" and "Textile Economics."

As the textile industry developed in America, the young men educated in textile schools were required to do more than just learn how to make a fabric, they were concerned with the management of the larger mills that had grown up in the first 40 years of our existence and also in the marketing of their products, hence, courses in management and marketing were developed and included in the curriculum.

With the addition of courses in psychology, English, literature, mathematics, physics, and other humanities, we were in a position to satisfy the requirements for the granting of degrees and in 1941 the Pennsylvania State Council of Education gave the institution authority to grant the degree of bachelor of science to graduates who satisfactorily completed the requirements of the prescribed 4-year course of study.

We were now a college in fact, no longer looked on mistakenly as a trade school, which had been the case in some instances, due to lack of familiarization with our work and the necessity of offering courses to prepare the graduate to satisfy what was demanded by the industry to produce fabrics of all kinds of raw materials in colors that would surpass even a rainbow.

With the granting of degrees the name was changed to the Philadelphia Textile Institute at the suggestion of the Pennsylvania State Council of Education.

Other schools and colleges teaching textiles followed the example of Philadelphia, and over the years, were established in the North and South. They, being State schools or part of State colleges, while PTI remained the only private self-governed college of its type.

Dating back to the founding of the school, as it was known in 1884, it was under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, now the Philadelphia Museum of Art, which had the school of industrial art, now Philadelphia Museum College of Art, under its control, making an organization for the advancement of culture in the arts.

Growing pains and the desire to advance to greater usefulness, led to the formation of the Philadelphia Textile Institute Foundation which was incorporated and chartered in 1944, for the purpose of aiding and developing the Philadelphia Textile Institute. Among its aims was the purchase of a new site for the college with appropriate modern buildings, as well as separation from the museum of art with the granting of a separate charter.

All of this was carried out with the generous help of industry and friends resulting in the present campus purchase and the laboratory and classroom building erection; both of which were turned over to the new corporation upon the granting of the charter in 1949.

In October 1949 classes were opened at our present site all the equipment having been installed during the summer after the commencement in June 1949.

Since that time, the college has become a member of and accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. And also, fully accredited by the Pennsylvanial State Council of Education, marking the achievement of two major educational goals.

During World War I, a very serious problem arose in the colleges. The U.S. Government set up a training program for college students. We at the Philadelphia Textile Institute had our entire student body enlist in the student Army Training Corps, and as enlisted men attend classes each day in uniform, transporting them from their quarters to school each day by motor truck.

With the ending of the war, classes were continued with the entire corps registering to complete their courses.

Following the war the Armed Forces sent officers for training and it was not uncommon to find in the hall of PTI colonels, majors, captains, and lieutenants sent by the Quartermaster Corps and Navy to take advantage of this opportunity.

World War II found many PTI trained men in key positions in purchasing, testing, and research in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, having much to do with the changes required in clothing and equipment occasioned by placing of troops in diversified climatic areas.

Research at the Institute was conducted not only for the Armed Forces but also War Production Board which has continued to this day, resulting in many new fabrics being developed, introducing new blends of manmade fibers with the natural fibers.

Research has become an integral part of our activities and a research department with special equipment for testing and fabric development, especially with new fibers, some as yet, not even on the market, has proven of great value to the industry. An example of its activities include the artificial arteries recently developed in conjunction with our knitting department.

Student tours for graduating classes during the week immediately following commencement, were conducted for 15 years. These tours made it possible for major companies to become acquainted with the young men about to persue careers in the advancing and broadening textile industry.

Seminars for executives were held for a week at Hershey and Shawnee on the Delaware, bringing problems of great interest to those who were leaders in the broad field of textiles.

All of these activities called for expansion in our curriculum and courses in knitting and sciences became a necessity, making our old quarters at Broad and Pine completely inadequate.

Our growth from 1949 on our present campus has been one of continued progress.

The Hesslein Library, housing the best collection of books on textiles and general topics is looked upon as one of the finest in America, if not the world.

Scholler Hall, a residence hall gives students home conveniences in the finest atmosphere.

Althouse Hall, dedicated today, which when completely furnished and equipped will give to our campus, complete facilities for a broad curriculum to meet present day requirements for young men who wish to become useful citizens and possess specific knowledge which industry demands, is the most recent addition.

The credit for the development of this great college belongs to many people, both in and out of the textile industry. P.T.I. with a great heritage is fast approaching a period in its history incomparable with any that has passed. With the sincerity of purpose and the stick-to-itiveness of its present leaders, that has so characterized its past, its destiny must be a success.

Iowa Poll of Farm Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1960

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial which appeared in the April 24, 1960, edition of the Des Moines Sunday Register. This editorial concerns itself with the results of the latest survey by the Iowa poll on farm opinion on the control of surplus gain. As the poll points out, a large majority of Iowa

farm people interviewed believe the grain surplus problem requires Federal Government action. In my opinion, this poll lends strong support for early consideration of farm legislation.

The editorial follows:

IOWA FARM POLICY VIEWS

The Iowa poll survey of farm opinion printed in the columns to the right shows that most Iowa farm people think the Federal Government should act to limit grain acreage.

A small segment of farm people (about 12 percent) believe the Government should set production quotas in bushels in order to check the oversupply of grains.

Farm women seem more ready to turn to production control than their menfolk. Only 9.4 percent of them want to abandon Government control and let the free market take care of the problem. But 25.6 percent of the men favor the free market approach.

Also, 20.3 percent of the women want definite production control by quotas, as against only 4.9 percent of the men.

Both sides of the production control argument can make something of this split in opinion between the men and women. The opponents of production control can say that the women are not so well informed—28.1 percent of them had no opinion on the question. They can say that the high percentage of women in favor of crop controls reflects ignorance. (They had better say this out behind the barn, though.)

But the supporters of control can say that women are more practical than men and less ruled by vague theory and ideology. Women are more conscious of the dwindling family income and see the need for money for the children's education and things for the home. They are willing to accept some regimentation in return for more income security.

One thing is plain: Iowa farm people believe acreage allotments for corn—or a greatly expanded soil bank—would be advisable. In this survey people were given only one choice of the six listed, so there is no way to tell how many might select two or more methods of restraining output of grain. For example, some farmers might favor both corn allotments and a larger soil bank.

The answers to the question about price-support methods show that a majority of those stating an opinion prefer the traditional "percentage of parity" method. Since the Farm Bureau is the dominant farm organization in Iowa, and since its present policy is for the 3-year market average price-support system, this poll may indicate a change in opinion that could result in a change in Farm Bureau policy.

If price supports were based on a percentage of the previous 3 years' market prices, the supports would gradually sink until the market level were reached. Thus this method would put a brake on market price declines, but would not provide any support over a period of years.

Not many Iowa farm people are willing to turn over the price-support setting to an independent Government board—they prefer some kind of a legal formula which administrators must follow.

Perhaps the most surprising result of this survey is the high percentage of farm people who think the National Farmer's Organization policies are best. NFO is a relatively new organization, about 5 years old, but it did very well in this competition with the older farm pressure groups. Farm co-op policies also appeal to a relatively large group.

The breakdown of the answers by size of farm shows that the people on the larger farms are more inclined to vote for crop control (strict cross compliance), grain quotas and parity price supports.

A smaller percentage of them believe the free market can handle the problem.

This result is surprising. We would have expected more of the larger, commercial farmers, practically all of whom belong to the Farm Bureau, to favor its policies of no corn allotments and lower price supports. We would have expected more of the smaller farmers to be in favor of Government help.

HOW FARMERS WOULD CONTROL SURPLUS

A large majority of Iowa farm people interviewed recently by the Iowa poll believe the grain surplus problem requires Federal Government action.

Sixty-four percent said they favored crop acreage allotments, a larger soil bank, production control with bushel quotas. Only 18.5 percent said they thought Government programs should be abandoned, leaving the free market to handle the adjustment.

About 23 percent of those interviewed said the soil bank program should be expanded and that participation should be required as a condition for obtaining crop loans. But nearly 29 percent favor a return to corn acreage allotments, which were dropped in 1959.

When asked what method of price support they preferred, 44 percent approved traditional supports based on percentage of parity. This was nearly twice as many as the number who favored price supports based on the average of market prices for the previous 3 years.

Farm people were then asked which organization's policies they thought were best for agriculture. By far the largest group said they believed the Farm Bureau's policies were best. But large percentages said they preferred the policies of the National Farmers Organization and of farm cooperative groups.

A selected representative sample of Iowa farm people was asked the multiple choice questions shown here. The tables give the percentages for each choice—in total, by men and women and by those living on farms larger than 180 acres and smaller than that size. The questions and results follow:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women	Under 180 acres	Over 180 acres
Grain surpluses are piling up to higher and higher levels. Which one of these Government policies do you favor as a way of solving this problem?					
1. Abandon Government price supports and crop controls and let the free market take care of it	18.5	25.6	9.4	22.1	15.4
2. Continue price supports, return to crop acreage allotments for corn and continue the present allotments for wheat	10.3	6.1	15.6	14.7	6.4
3. The same plan as (2) plus strict cross compliance to prevent substitution of other crops on land taken out of wheat and corn	18.5	25.6	9.4	13.2	23.1
4. Voluntary land retirement (soil bank) on much larger scale, with participation required for those who get crop loans	23.3	28.0	17.2	19.1	26.9
5. Production control by means of bushel quotas on grain, with higher price supports	11.6	4.9	20.3	5.9	16.7
6. No opinion	17.8	9.8	28.1	25.0	11.5
As to farm price supports, which of these methods do you favor?					
1. Price support loans based on percentage of average of market prices for previous 3 years (gradual decline of price supports until free market level is reached)	23.8	31.3	14.3	26.9	21.1
2. Price supports based on percentage of parity	44.0	46.3	41.3	37.3	50.0
3. Price support loans determined without regard to any formula, by an independent Government Price Stabilization Board	7.7	8.7	6.3	3.0	11.8
4. No opinion	24.5	13.7	38.1	32.8	17.1
Which one of these farm organizations stands for policies that you think are best for agriculture at this time?					
1. Farm Bureau	37.2	40.2	33.3	35.8	38.5
2. Farmers Union	6.9	9.8	3.2	7.5	6.4
3. Grange	3.5	6.1	.0	6.0	.3
4. National Farmers Organization	19.3	20.7	17.5	14.9	23.1
5. Commodity groups	4.8	6.1	3.2	4.5	5.1
6. Farmer's cooperative groups	15.9	11.0	22.2	13.4	17.9
7. No opinion	12.4	6.1	20.6	17.9	7.7

Resolution of the Norwich, Conn., City Council Favoring Increase in the Federal Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of Norwich, Conn., on April 4, adopted a strong resolution in favor of increasing the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 per hour. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I call to my colleagues' attention the resolution as follows:

RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R. 4488

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure, and are without any legal limitation on their hours of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Norwich, Conn.; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) which would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the City Council of Norwich, Conn., That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, so that the conditions above described can be corrected; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators from Connecticut and to the Congressman from the Second Congressional District.

Dated at Norwich, Conn., this 6th day of April A.D., 1960.
Attest:

J. DYER POTTER,
City Clerk.

Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now would seem the appropriate time for Members of Congress to advise those responsible for the oil import control program that we are not satisfied with the elevator operation to which the Nation has been exposed since the program took effect last year.

I need not remind Congress that mandatory controls were effectuated by the President because of the failure of the oil shippers to adhere to requirements of the so-called voluntary control program. The latter plan was a consequence of a study and recommendation by a Cabinet committee concerned with the debilitation of domestic fuel industries by excessive oil imports. The recommendation was implemented by Congress through the national defense amendment to the bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There were doubts, Mr. Speaker, about the effectiveness of the voluntary program. Some of us were not convinced that it would work. Eventually the administration and Senate leaders agreed that this means of safeguarding the strength of domestic fuel industries was acceptable and had to be made workable.

The failure of the voluntary program is now a matter of record, and the mandatory program will also go into the books as a complete failure unless established rules are enforced beginning no later than July 1 of this year. The reasons are obvious.

International oil companies cannot be left to their own devices. It was only a short time after the President signed the trade agreements bill in 1958 that importers began to flood the country with foreign residual oil. The 1954 levels, as recommended by the Cabinet Committee and translated into the Trade Agreements Act, were immediately ignored. The final residual oil import figures for 1958 were 182 million barrels, with the surge increasing in the early months of 1959.

It was this disregard of the voluntary program that prompted President Eisenhower to proclaim the mandatory program—based on 1957 levels—effective April 1, 1959. For a short time it appeared that shippers would respect the official allocation levels, but their avaricious tendencies became apparent long before the end of 1959. The year's totals—from January 1 through December 31—amounted to 223 million barrels, or 50 million barrels in excess of the 1957 levels. Unfortunately, the Department of Interior, caught in this swirl of foreign residual oil, agreed to a 17-percent increase in allocations for the first half of 1960. Even this generous concession was not satisfactory to the importers, however, and with the advent of the new year, shipments of residual oil immediately began to spiral upward once again. In the last week of January the daily average went to 946,000 barrels in contrast to the new allotment of 425,000 barrels. Within a short time almost all of the allowable volume had moved into this country, leaving the shipping companies to plead for another raise in controls to prevent a cutoff in the last 2 months of the January-June picture.

I do not excuse the Department of Interior for acceeding to the greedy demands of the international oil peddlers; their diabolical scheme should have been recognized when shipments jumped sharply in the early weeks of the year. Inasmuch as the control program had been in operation for a comparatively short time, however, the Interior Department may be partially excused on the grounds that it had no previous experience in administering such a program. No such excuses will be acceptable to the Congress in the months and years to follow.

To suggest that incoming shipments should be restricted to a day-to-day or week-to-week, or even month-to-month allotment would be impractical.

Secretary Seaton's announcement that a 3-month allocation period would be substituted for the half-year schedules would seem to be a logical development. I believe that, in this way, imports can be controlled effectively.

What I now want to learn is exactly how much oil is to be admitted during the first 3 months of this new experimentation. I suggest that it would be in defiance of congressional intent to set import levels in excess of the 1957 record. Of equal importance is the plan of enforcement. The Interior Department will be in default if it fails to accompany its schedule publication with a qualified warning that any breach of the allocations will not be tolerated. If the Secretary feels that a provision for penalizing violators should be written into law, I am confident that Congress will recognize his request. Certainly there is no disputing the implied will of Congress in its enactment of the national defense amendment. Members of the Senate were given unequivocal insurance that oil import levels would be set on the 1954 statistical tables.

Mr. Spcaker, today I am arranging for a delegation from the House, representing affected States, to visit with officials of the Department of Interior responsible for setting up and administering the oil control program. I invite colleagues concerned with the recent departure from a previously announced course of action in the oil control program to accompany me to this conference.

The national defense amendment was created to provide protection for domestic industries that would be required to carry the energy load in an emergency. Unless the spirit of this act is carried out, further destruction of America's coal- and oil-producing industries is inevitable. The volume of imports admitted in 1959 over the 1957 limit was equivalent in energy value to 12 million tons of bituminous coal. There is no doubt that the coal mines of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia would have participated in business approximating this tonnage had not the importers chosen to ignore the standards set by the U.S. Government. We are in a bad way when international traders are permitted this latitude. To submit to their arrogance is unprincipled; it is shameful; it is odious.

I ask my colleagues to join me in a meeting with the Department of Interior so that we may state in unqualified terms the wishes and expectations of the legislative branch of this Government.

De Gaulle and the Summit Conference—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the second of two articles by Columnist Walter Lippmann which I submit for the RECORD today (the first appears elsewhere as a separate insertion), Mr. Lippmann further develops his view of recent developments as the summit conference approaches. The challenging conclusion of this second article is that Premier Khrushchev may now be thinking of the advantages if Berlin remains divided and that we may be able to keep the status quo in Germany with wit and ingenuity—a somewhat different view than that of those who look to the summit for new progress toward reunification of Germany. This article is from the April 19 edition of the Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE UNAVOWED UNDERSTANDING

(By Walter Lippmann)

The omens are now more favorable that at the summit meeting in May there will be no serious crisis over the German question, no irreconcilable conflict between the Russians and ourselves, no real quarrel between the British and the West Germans. The prospects are that there will be much talk but no negotiation about the German question and there is a fair prospect of an interim working arrangement about West Berlin.

Something, it would seem, has happened to change the climate. The public thing that has happened is that Mr. Khrushchev has been to Paris, has had talks with General de Gaulle, and that while nothing concrete was agreed upon, Mr. Khrushchev went home in a good humor. As we know that General de Gaulle is a hard and resolute man who gives away nothing he thinks he wants to keep, and as Mr. Khrushchev is a tough and persistent man, why is it that the confrontation of these two men

has been followed by such an improvement in the atmosphere?

My guess is that on the German question there is now, as between France and the Soviet Union a basic parallelism—and that it is most likely that Mr. K. has now at last realized it. He has realized too, we may assume, that on the German question General de Gaulle is in a position to speak for the West. The basis of this parallelism of policy is that in neither camp is there any serious intention of proceeding toward the reunification of Germany.

On both sides there is a fear of the power of a reunited Germany. This is the basic understanding which, while it cannot now be publicly avowed by either side, makes it likely that there will be no collision at the summit.

Both sides realize that in the long run German nationalism will not accept gladly the present dismemberment. But for the short run which may be at least a few more years, the partition is acceptable, indeed unavoidable as long as the occupying powers are determined not to risk a war over the German question.

The Germans are not strong enough to unify themselves and the United States has no intention whatever of going to war in order to unify them. On the other hand, a deal between West Germany and the Soviet Union at the expense of Poland and the West, though a theoretical possibility, would now be enormously and intolerably dangerous.

Though there is no agreement between the West and the East, a decision has in fact been taken to keep Germany divided. On both sides, the decision is masked by official formulas. On the Soviet side the formula is to say that East and West Germany are free to work out their own reunion. On the Western side the real decision is masked by the repetition of the demand that the two Germanys should be reunited by a free election.

Beneath these formulas, which are really fictions used for propaganda and for the sake of appearances, the reality is something like this. The Soviet Union means to raise the standard of life in East Germany to a level where East Germany can stand comparison with West Germany. Moscow believes that this will greatly reduce German popular pressure for reunification.

The West, with France as its leader in this matter, is determined to give the West Germans prosperity in the Common Market and status in NATO; it is determined to give the West Germans everything they want except the reunification of their country.

Mr. K. would like to imprison and isolate the West Germans. The French intend to elect them to their clubs, and to bind them by self-interest against the lures and the snares of reunification.

Seen from Europe, there are now five Germanys—West Germany, East Germany, West Berlin, the lands beyond the Oder-Neisse which are annexed by Poland, and Austria. Only once in modern times have all these been united under one government, and that was under Hitler from 1938 to 1945. Only from 1870 to 1945 were the Germans minus Austria united under one government in Berlin. So, seen from Europe, the division of the Germans, which has resulted from the dismemberment of Hitler's empire, is more normal than is their union.

The Western allies are firmly and unanimously agreed in insisting upon the separateness of Austria. They are for all practical purposes unanimous in regarding the lands beyond the Oder-Neisse as permanently lost to Poland. When we speak of reunification, we mean the reunification of East and West Germany with its capital in a reunited Berlin. Though we all speak of it more or less, the fact is that France does not want the reunification. Britain does not want it. While we have some yearnings for it, we accept the partition. And Adenauer's Germany opposes the partition in principle but is quite willing to live with it in fact.

All this narrows the German question down to the question of West Berlin. For on the future of the various Germanys there is a working understanding between East and West.

There is some reason to think that the new flexibility, which the Russians have hinted at recently, may be due to their having had some second thoughts about Berlin. It was easy to say that the Allied occupation of Western Berlin must end. But what if the impossible happened, what if the allies did in fact surrender West Berlin to Eastern Germany, what would happen if Berlin became the biggest city in Eastern Germany?

For West Berlin would have to be united with East Berlin, and the result would be a quarrelsome city of 3½ million people as the capital of a country of about 18 million. The Berliners are a lively lot, and in trying to swallow them, the East German state might well be biting off more than it could chew.

We do not know this, but it is not at all improbable that Mr. K. may be thinking it would be safer if Berlin remains divided, and if West Berlin is insulated from Communist Germany.

Thus, it may well be that a working arrangement, which leaves intact the substance of Western rights, is possible if we can bring to the negotiation sufficient resourcefulness and ingenuity.

A Man's Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Carolina Israelite of March-April, 1960:

A MAN'S RELIGION

Last November 25, the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States jointly condemned the proposal that would set up an agency to administer American funds to aid undeveloped countries in lowering their too-high birth rates. Thereby the Catholic Church involved itself in what soon became a political issue, since Senator JACK KENNEDY had decided to run for President.

Newsmen promptly asked Senator KENNEDY how he felt about this problem as a Catholic and as a presidential aspirant. Senator KENNEDY was embarrassed by the horns of a dilemma but he answered that our country ought not advocate that other countries limit their population. Newsmen also interviewed Robert Wagner, devotedly a Catholic and mayor of New York City. Mayor Wagner evaded the implications of their questions by saying that no such problem faced New York City now.

What embarrassed these Roman Catholics who hold public office in America is more or less the question the Episcopal Bishop of California, James A. Pike, asked publicly: Is not policy laid down by the Catholic hierarchy binding on Roman Catholic candidates? And what if this policy is not consonant with American policy?

I imagine most Catholics find meaning in their Catholicism only when they go along with the Catholic hierarchy. But that does not mean I think a Catholic President would not set up an agency to disburse funds and information for birth control measures if the elected representatives of the people voted such an agency into law.

There are many Governors who are personally opposed to the principal of capital punishment. Governor "Pat" Brown of California is an example. Yet these Governors do not upon their election commute the sentences of all the murders. In fact, most of these Governors tolerate executions within their tenure. It is a matter of fact that some of these men have urged the abolition of capital punishment and many legislatures have agreed with them. There are other legislatures which have not.

The argument over the ascension of a Catholic to the Presidency cannot be whether or not his religion will affect his thinking as a public official. Of course it will. A Catholic President will be conditioned by the precepts he learned and respects as a Catholic. But this is not a unique phenomenon with Catholics. It holds true for Protestant Presidents and for any Jewish Presidents who may in some future campaign be elected.

Religion has inspired much of American politics. The Methodists and Baptists put through prohibition, a law which ran counter to America's natural inclinations.

Conversely, when Franklin D. Roosevelt wanted to raise his voice in behalf of Loyalist Spain he was prevented from doing so by Roman Catholic pressure in our country and President Truman had to withdraw his appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican because of Protestant pressures.

Senator KENNEDY will not be the first President with religious scruples. But the country has survived many other men with religious scruples.

In the matter of fundamental checks and balances, the country is sound and no religious group within it omnipotent. Prohibition was repealed, and someday a minister will go to the Vatican.

I remember watching Al Smith, Governor of New York and a punctual Catholic, finger his rosary at a funeral. Smith served four terms as New York's Governor. New York State is a good example of America in miniature. It has 4 million Protestants, 4 million Catholics, 2½ million Jews, and another million who make up an additional 20 religious sects, plus a fair share of agnostics and atheists. Can anyone point to a single act of Governor Smith, or any public expression that he made, that gave offense to any of these millions? Can anyone prove that Governor Smith's religion ever made him derelict in enforcing the will of the elected representatives? On the contrary, there is ample evidence to show that Governor Smith's Catholicism made him a better man and consequently a better Governor.

Resolution of Greater Falls Church Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, modern technology has completely changed the status of lands once thought to be useless and uninhabitable. Areas that once were considered too far out of the

way to worry about now can be the source of grave danger to us, if in unfriendly hands, or can house important links in the chain of our national defense if in our own hands. Furthermore, scientific advances are constantly increasing the possibility that rich resources hidden in snowy wastes can be tapped economically in the future.

With these things in mind, I would like to call my colleagues attention to a resolution recently passed by the Greater Falls Church Chamber of Commerce, and sent to me:

The Greater Falls Church Chamber of Commerce does urge that the Government of the United States do positively assert and safeguard the claims accruing to the United States of America by virtue of exploration and discovery heretofore made and done in on the Antarctic Continent.

Minimum Wage Law Extensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, without committing the subcommittee or any of its members to any given position on the question of minimum wage law extensions prior to official action by our committee, I want to present the testimony presented by the executive director of our local chamber of commerce, Miss Ginger Joyce.

I do this because it is strictly a localized and personalized view that gives a local chamber's hometown viewpoint.

I present without further comment other than to say that Miss Joyce proved to be a very capable spokesman for the merchants on Main Street in my own hometown of Jeannette, Pa.:

STATEMENT OF GINGER JOYCE SUBMITTED TO THE LABOR STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE APRIL 20, 1960

My name is Ginger Joyce. I am the executive director of the Greater Jeannette (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce. I am pleased and my chamber is proud to be part of this presentation on behalf of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. And we should be part of it because, as a local chamber, we work very closely with our Pennsylvania State Chamber just as local chambers in all parts of the country do. Also, just as the State chambers do, we local chambers represent a broad cross-section of all sorts and sizes of business.

Gentlemen, I have been authorized by the Greater Jeannette (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce to speak on behalf of that group in pointing out the hardships the extension of coverage and increase in rates of the Fair Labor Standards Act would impose on the people of our city, and other small cities such as ours.

Jeannette, Pa., is a city of 17,000 people with a potential trading area of 75,000. It is located approximately 27 miles east of Pittsburgh and is, therefore, considered a part of the Pittsburgh trading area.

I know you have been listening to a great deal of testimony involving figures and statistics, adding up to a strong collection of reasons why such legislation should not be enacted. I realize that such information is necessary and that repetition is a good thing, as a matter of fact, I firmly believe that these figures and statistics should, and must, be drummed out over and over again, round the clock if necessary, until their message is received by those of you who will make the decisions. However, for a moment, I would like to stop talking about the effects of the proposed legislation in terms of figures and take a look at the effects of this legislation in terms of people and communities. People who have worked hard and taken risks to build a business for themselves and their families, these same people who have spent time, money, and effort to build a better community, people who will lose jobs, people who will not receive the fine service they are entitled to and who will not be given an opportunity to earn extra money to help them through school or to be trained in retailing. So let's take a look at our community, and these people. If you could take a stroll down Clay Avenue, our main business street, with me, I think you might see the problem as we see it.

Jeannette, like many communities, is an old, industrial city, faced with the problems of competing with the large city of Pittsburgh, and the new shopping centers in the surrounding area. It is also faced with the problem of providing opportunities for its young people which will enable them to supplement the family income during school years if necessary, and provide them with a future in the community so they will settle here when they have completed their education.

The problem of saving the downtown is one of national concern. The Federal Government has poured large sums of money into hometown projects for this very purpose and has proposed legislation to increase this type of assistance. In Jeannette, the businessmen, property owners , and the city government, realizing the necessity for modernization of our main business street, have put up the money for a $150,000 program to bring our Clay Avenue up to date. This program is 90 percent complete and will be finished this July. Individual merchants are also modernizing their stores in an effort to revitalize the town. Prior to this modernization, the number of empty stores on Clay Avenue was increasing at an alarming rate. Now, through our own efforts, new businesses are moving in to again fill these store locations. We have provided plenty of parking at reasonable rates and, when the street modernization is completed in July, we will be ready to compete with the shopping centers and Pittsburgh and get our fair share of the business, if we increase our services and keep our prices down. However, as you will see when we visit a few of the business people on Clay Avenue, the proposed legislation will result in decreased service and increased prices.

It is common knowledge that service and price are the main advantages to shopping in a small town and, all other things being equal, these two features will attract business to cities such as ours. However, if these two key factors are removed, as they would be if the proposed legislation is enacted, the money, the time, and the effort we have put forth to put ourselves in a competitive position, will have been wasted.

To demonstrate these facts, let's stop first in a furniture and appliance store on Clay Avenue and see what one of the owners has to say about the effects of the proposed legislation on his business.

This is a modern store, and just a look around tells us that it is a fine, well run business which any community would be proud of. The business was built by the father of the present owners, who started out as a penniless immigrant. Through hard work and careful management, the family now owns three stores in various small cities in our area. At least 95 percent of their employees now make $1.25 or more an hour. This family generously supports all community and charitable projects and is a real asset to the community. Their annual gross sales are over $500,000.

Mr. L is worried about the effect of the inclusion of commissions and bonuses in the computation of the time-and-a-half overtime rate on his salesmen. He is certain that he will have to cut down on the hours worked by these men and alternate which salesmen work on nights of special promotions, to keep them within the 40-hour limit. He pointed out that this will mean that the salesmen who do not work the nights of special promotion, in some instances, will be robbed of the opportunity to make more money in commissions in these few hours than they will the rest of the 40-hour week. For example, Mr. L told me that his salesmen averaged $75 in commissions during a recent evening sale.

Mr. L also has men whom he has been keeping on the payroll at a flat fee, whether they work or not. He calls on these men when he needs them for odd jobs, but whether or not he uses them, they are still paid. As Mr. L points out, there is sentimentality attached to employees by store owners in small towns and this is one example of how he tries to make work and help out some local people. If he must put these people on an hourly basis at $1.25, he will not continue to carry them on the payroll as it will result in the need to increase wages for all of his employees.

So in this furniture and appliance store technical rules for overtime will hurt the salesmen and the customers most of all and a too high minimum would stop a nice man from being kindhearted.

Now let's take a look at the most popular spot in town for lunch. It's a modern confectionery store with a counter, booths, and a small meeting room. Mr. B employs 12 people, three of whom are high school girls who fill in during rush hours. Even now, customers complain because he doesn't pass out the extra cups of coffee free like he used to, but in an effort to hold the line and avoid inflation, he has fought to keep his prices down and hasn't increased even the price of a hamburger in the last 3 years.

Now Mr. B can't cut down too much on his help, although he will have to let the high-school girls go, so naturally, his prices must go up. The officeworkers, bank clerks, and most of the sales clerks in town eat here, so if his prices go up—there goes that increase the clerk got—up goes the cost of a business day for everyone in town; and so, as is inevitable, starts the inflationary spiral. This is the stuff of which inflation is made.

Should Mr. B be exempt from coverage, he still must compete for employees with the businesses which will be covered, and will wind up having to pay the going rate anyway.

Next, let's look at a department store which was built by the grandfather of the present owners. He hoped to leave his heirs a business which would make their lives a little easier than his, but with the already complex records which must be kept—the imposing of the Pennsylvania minimum wage; the increased competition from shopping centers, and the higher cost of doing business generally—his heirs are having to work a lot harder to hang onto the business than their granddad did to build it.

This store which previously employed 15 high-school students for extra work, cut all but 1 of these from the payroll following the enactment of the State minimum wage legislation which is 85 cents in our community, 75 cents in smaller towns and $1 an hour in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

Mr. G says that if the Federal legislation is enacted as proposed, the pyramid effect on his other employees wages would necessitate cutting all extra help. He pointed out that he would also cut down on the number of regular employees and those cut would be the older clerks who have been with the store for many years, as his clerks would have to do double duty and he would, therefore, have to retain the employees who are physically fit to take on additional work and responsibility.

Mr. G feels that he will eventually be forced into putting a self-service operation to cut down even further on help.

Now let's take a look at a small ladies' apparel store. This store is privately owned and recently remodeled inside and out. Mr. W has worked for 12 years to build this business. He is fully aware of the competition for capable employees because, even without a high minimum wage rate, he must compete with the largest stores and pay the going rate. Therefore, Mr. W is not lulled into false security by the possibility of being exempted from coverage, for he knows that "coverage or no coverage" he will have to continue to pay the same wages as his competition.

To emphasize his objection to the $1.25 minimum wage, Mr. W pointed out that retailing is an industry where productivity cannot be controlled. It is not unusual, according to Mr. W, to have employees nonproductive for as high as 4 hours. Since no one has yet invented a way to regulate the customers' shopping habits, he must be ready to serve them when they choose to pop into the store. Mr. W's figures show that the average clerk in his store only sells, in an average day, approximately $5 worth of merchandise per hour. Mr. W recognizes, as do the other retailers in Jeannette, the trend toward longer store hours and noted "just when the local stores should be considering longer hours, to meet the outside competition, we will be forced to reduce the number of hours we are open, and this will certainly work a hardship on the community."

And so the story goes, all up and down Clay Avenue. Every retailer will tell you that he would have to cut employees (predominantly students and older clerks), cut hours, cut services, cut down on advertising and raise prices. If this appears to be the kind of activity which will build a business community * * * we in Jeannette fail to see it that way. We are already covered by our State minimum wage, which recognizes the local problems to the extent that we are given a handicap over our big city competitor, Pittsburgh. And if you do not believe that a retail business in a small city does not enjoy the same sales potential as a retail business in a large city, you need only to look at the difference in rent. A small store location, which would rent for $500 in Pittsburgh, only costs $175 a month in Jeannette. If you do not believe that a clerk in a small town can live nicely on far less than her big city counterpart, you need only examine the cost of clothing, lunches, transportation, rent, and so on, of each.

This coverage is referred to too frequently as an extension of the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to these people, but in our community it adds up to loss of jobs, loss of bonuses, loss of commissions, loss of training opportunities, loss of incentive and recognition for outstanding ability and effort, loss of extra income opportunities for retired persons, students, etc.

Let's leave Clay Avenue and the retailers for a moment and visit one of the new industries attracted to Jeannette through the efforts of our chamber of commerce. This industry manufactures a product which is worn by ladies and manufactured by ladies; it's a brassiere factory.

This industry was brought to Jeannette as a part of the chamber's plan to diversify the local industrial base and make use of an unused labor pool existing in the area, unskilled women. When the chamber announced that applications would be accepted for jobs in this plant, over 12,000 women responded in a 2-day period, indicating the need for an industry which could use these untrained workers.

The minimum wage required for these women, while they are receiving their training, is $1 an hour. It is a union shop and upon completion of the training period the workers receive $1.15 per hour base pay, with additional incentive pay on a piecework basis. Through this schedule, the average worker makes over $1.50 per hour. Keeping in mind the fact that these are unskilled workers who could not be used in the higher paying industries, let us study the effect of the increasing of the untrained worker's rate from $1 to $1.25 an hour, on not only this industry but on the whole industrial payroll structure of the community.

If the minimum for these workers is increased to $1.25, then the trained worker must receive a proportionate raise in pay to provide incentive through retention of the wage differential. When the salaries of these unskilled workers are raised, the workers in the higher paying industries will in turn demand a proportionate increase in pay to retain the wage differential between unskilled women workers and skilled male workers. The companies, in turn, will have to raise the cost of the goods they manufacture and, in so doing, will further price themselves out of competition with foreign companies for the world market. This matter of foreign competition is already a problem of growing national and local concern and should be remedied rather than made worse.

It is not my intention that FLSA should become involved in protective tariffs, but I point to this example to show the vastness and the seriousness of the effects of an increase in the minimum wage rate on a national level. It is actually frightening to consider the effects of such legislation, as you trace it from small towns such as ours to the impact of these smalltown conditions on the national picture. When one of our companies loses out to a foreign competitor, as was our experience in Jeannette recently, the entire Nation suffers and the local workers lose work and jobs.

Our chamber and the people of our community have worked hard to bring in new industry and encourage expansion of the existing industries to provide jobs for our people and we will not sit idly by and watch jobs and advancement opportunities being taken from our people. That is why I am here, representing a group that is not made up predominantly of retailers, but of every type of businessman, including industrialists and the educators of our community, to ask you, not so much for the retailers and industries themselves as for their employees, to leave the setting of minimum wages up to the States and let higher pay come from increased sales and profit and local competition, as it must. Leave us the tools with which we may keep ourselves competitive with major cities and foreign competitors. Leave our young people the opportunity to earn extra money and receive training for careers. Leave our older people the opportunity to be self-supporting and to supplement their incomes. Leave our community and the incentive to grow and prosper, and, above all, leave our workers the dignity inherent in earning higher wages as a reward for superior work and ability.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the facts and forecasts of the effects of the proposed legislation on Jeannette and its people and on the Jeannettes all over the country.

Stephen B. Jackson, of Cedar Rapids, Democratic Candidate for State Representative, Presents Ideas of Vocational-Technical Industrial Schools (1) To Train Iowans in Iowa for Iowa, (2) To Stop Job Discrimination Against People Over 40, (3) To Attract New Industry to Iowa, and (4) To Keep the Young Citizens in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, throughout a great part of America today, communities are struggling with the problem of attracting industry and at the same time of finding new employment opportunities for our young people, and farm families being forced off the farm.

Mr. Stephen B. Jackson, of my home district of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, at a recent National Association of States Planning and Developing Agencies meeting in Washington, D.C., proposed the idea for vocational-technical schools in Iowa to assist in the solution of these problems. Mr. Jackson has been my legislative assistant. He is now running for the Iowa Legislature from Linn County, Iowa.

Just 8 days after he spoke to the States Planning meeting in Washington, the Cedar Rapids Gazette, in an editorial, endorsed this idea. I would like to quote from the editorial:

Industries today demand high levels of skills and technical knowledge. Any firm looking over Iowa as a possible plant site is likely to give top priority to determining whether an adequate supply of trained workers is available. That supply would depend on how vigorously and effectively the State's trade and industrial education program is supported.

At a recent meeting in Linn County, Mr. Jackson again expressed his views on the establishment of these schools.

Because the problems I have just mentioned are not restricted to Iowa, but are familiar to many of my colleagues of this body, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for your attention and consideration, Mr. Jackson's speech containing his proposal for the establishment of vocational-technical schools. I believe you will find that his proposal possesses considerable merit, and hope that you will consider its use in your own States.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY STEPHEN B. JACKSON, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATES PLANNING AND DEVELOPING AGENCIES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Iowa has been hit hard by the tremendous impact of the rapid replacement of manpower on our farms by modern machinery and scientific farming methods. Since our economy was not geared to accommodate the massive migration of people from rural to urban areas, and since there was not sufficient nonagricultural employment to take up the slack, many of our talented and

energetic young people left the State to seek jobs in other parts of the country.

Before it is too late, we can and must do something about strengthening our State's economy. In so doing we will be contributing to the individual dignity and welfare of our citizens.

We have made substantial strides in this direction through the growth and diversification of industry, along with agricultural production second to none. Iowa, in recent years, has made progress in obtaining a balanced economy of great stability and promise. But in order to reach the State's greatest potential, we must face the problems that still hinder our progress.

One of these problems, I feel, is a critical need on the part of rapidly growing and changing industry for skilled labor and technicians. Very simply, Iowa, at the present time, is failing to find a solution to this problem.

The solution, I feel, lies in a strong emphasis on a diversified and expanded program of vocational-technical education.

We in Iowa have long ranked at the top among the States in literacy, and while Iowans are known for their native skills, such qualifications are not enough in a highly technical age. What we need are workers who have at least a minimum of training in the basic technical skills of industry.

In approaching the problem of vocational-technical education, traditional thinking will need to be revised. An education program to enlighten the citizens to the great potential in vocational-trade and industrial education must be undertaken. A program must be worked out that meets the needs of the individual as well as the needs of management and labor.

New changes in technology require a new concept of training for increasing the numbers of skilled employees who stay in Iowa. Their vocational training must help them to become more flexible and more skilled in the problems and processes of advanced automation.

Due to continuing new advancements, additional education and training during the work career will be required. By keeping the present working force up to date on changes of automation, we can stop discrimination against people over 40 who lose their jobs because they are said to be unskilled.

In order to attract new industry to Iowa, high school graduates desiring training in the various trades or service areas will have to be trained before starting their new jobs.

This then is the challenge to industrial trade schools, and I, as a candidate for State representative on the Democratic ticket, accept this challenge to promote these vocational and technical schools so that our State and Nation will be a better place in which to live.

Export Program Wrong Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting news periodicals emanating from Washington is the Babson's Washington Forecast. By a happy coincidence the editor of this newsletter is a constituent of mine, Mr. John J. Henry, who lives in the Belle Haven area of Fairfax County.

Mr. Henry is a native of Connecticut who, many years ago, saw the light and decided to become a resident of northern Virginia. Connecticut's loss has been Virginia's gain and we have been most happy to have him in our midst.

Jack Henry has had and is continuing a most interesting career in public affairs. A graduate of the University of Notre Dame, Jack became a radio commentator in Connecticut and later served as administrative assistant to the Honorable Joseph E. Talbot, former Republican Member of Congress from Connecticut and currently Chairman of the Federal Tariff Commission. During the war, Jack Henry was a very responsible agent for the FBI and has since developed into one of the better canvassers of news and public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, Babson's Washington Forecast of April 18, 1960, contains a most commendable article entitled "Export Program Wrong Medicine." Under unanimous consent I insert the lead article of this publication as a part of the RECORD:

Ike's national export-promotion program may show some beneficial results * * * but it points up again the economic blind spot in the vision of both major political parties.

The program amounts to a sort of "propping up" of the patient * * * instead of administering a medicine to cure his growing disease.

The President proposes a change to "hard-sell" methods as a means of bolstering our weakening export trade * * * and he plans new aids to prospective exporters designed to make their credit and financing problems simpler.

Admittedly, New York's Madison Avenue has shown in many cases that markets can be created by push and ballyhoo where markets did not previously exist.

However, over the long pull, basic laws of economics must be satisfied. If the product cannot meet the competitive tests of quality and price, it necessarily faces ultimate doom.

It is in this light that the outlook for our export trade remains dismal.

Basic conflict: The germs which are nurturing the disease now being suffered by U.S. international trade were born about a generation ago in the establishment of two completely contradictory national policies * * * which are now squeezing that trade in vise-like fashion.

The two courses are: (1) Our liberal foreign-trade policy, comprising gradual reduction of tariffs and quotas, continued foreign economic aid, and promotion of mass-production and mass-marketing techniques and facilities abroad; and (2) our "easy-way" domestic trend toward wage boosts that exceed productivity increases, followed by compensatory hikes in prices.

Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, summarizes the problem this way: "We are making the United States the worst place to buy and the best place in the world to sell."

New isolationism: The Nation's liberals have been the ardent promoters of both policies.

By their foreign-policy proposals, they appear to recognize that the world is getting smaller * * * and that the nations of the free world must become increasingly-dependent upon each other.

But, by their relentless advocacy of ever-higher wage rates in the United States, they exhibit their failure to comprehend that such a policy can lead only to the ultimate necessity of our complete economic isolation from the rest of the world * * * in the interest of our economic survival.

Wage rates in the United States are now vastly higher than those in most other countries. Because labor is necessarily the most important part of the cost of production, higher prices of American goods are the inevitable result.

The combination of this growing price disparity and the gradual reduction of U.S. tariff barriers has quite naturally resulted in greater imports and fewer exports by the United States.

As both trends continue, our difficulties will increase.

We have deliberately exported our mass-production know-how to other lands * * * and have given or loaned those countries the funds with which to establish their great new industries.

In addition, other things happened: (1) The nations of Europe banded together in the European Common Market and the so-called outer seven to provide a vastly expanded home market; and (2) production-cost advantages and liberal U.S. tariff policies teamed up to provide a bonanza export market in the United States.

Rising toll: The number of U.S. industries affected is mounting yearly.

It would be impossible for us to take the space to list the American activities which have been hurt by price competition from abroad. The list runs the gamut of American industrial life.

Many of our important industries are feeling the pain—textiles, autos, chinaware, electronics, office equipment, appliances, cameras, watches, toys, sporting goods, etc.

The quality objection is no longer valid. The argument that cheap is cheap has been disproved with dramatic finality.

American industry itself has begun to recognize that the only defense against competition from low-cost labor areas is to use such labor in its own production.

As a result, there has been a tremendous exodus of American capital for the purpose of building production plants in other lands. Statistics indicate that American corporations are investing about $500 million per year for such purposes in Western Europe alone.

Practically all major U.S. corporations have now built or bought such plants * * * or plan to do so in the near future.

Their objective is twofold: To provide, by the only means possible, a market for their products in foreign lands * * * and to meet the competition of foreign importers by bringing the foreign-produced goods of American corporations into the United States.

Other methods by which many big U.S. companies are attempting to meet this increasing price competition include: The importation of component parts which are then assembled into a shell produced in this country or, in many cases, the importation of finished products for marketing in this country under the established American name of the importing company.

Shortsighted labor: Such action may, of course, help to solve the problems of individual corporations but it will not lead to the utilization of America's growing supply of labor.

Yet, it is a strange paradox that America's union leaders have been in the forefront of the battle for relaxation of international trade barriers.

Espousal of such a cause by American workingmen might make sense if it were also wedded to a fight to convert productivity increases at home into ever-lower prices for the products produced by American labor.

However, in obviously self-destructive shortsightedness, labor has consistently chosen to fight for its gains in the form of higher wages * * * regardless of the irresistible upward pressures thus placed on price levels.

If, over the past 20 years, organized labor had bargained as hard for price cuts as it did

for wage boosts, the same increase in actual standard of living would have resulted * * * and, today, U.S. industry would be able to beat its price competition the world over.

It is folly to believe, however, that labor would alter its course * * * even in the face of such realities.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to predict that we will eventually return—full cycle—to a national policy of economic isolationism * * * with a continued emphasis on numbers of dollars, rather than on the value of the dollar.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Six Mile Creek: Watershed Project of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday I called to the attention of the Senate the honor recently given to the Six Mile Creek watershed project located in Franklin and Logan Counties, Ark. This project was selected by the Seventh National Watershed Congress as the 1960 watershed project of the year. An excellent editorial recently appeared in the Arkansas Gazette concerning this award and the benefits which have been derived from this conservation project. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 23, 1960]

SIX MILE'S EXAMPLE WORTHY OF EMULATION

The selection of Six Mile Creek in Franklin and Logan Counties as the "Watershed Project of the Year" represents considerably more than attaching an impressive title to a coordinated system of conservation efforts. The National Watershed Congress studied reports on all similar projects in the United States before it decided that the Arkansas conservation effort came nearest to measuring up to these requirements:

1. The extent of participation of all agencies and groups within the watershed such as the soil conservation districts, county and municipal governments, business, and other organizations.

2. The adequacy of the project in meeting the conservation and utilization needs of the watershed.

3. The status of the project—meaning the degree to which the installations were serving their intended purposes.

In order to understand the purposes of the project it is necessary to know something of the objectives set out in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566 of the 83d Cong.).

This law provides for a complete conservation plan in the selected watershed. Logically, the work must begin at the tops of the hills where the tiny fingers of the streams reach for their first trickle of water. The hills are to be terraced or protected by cover crops to prevent the first hint of erosion or rapid runoff.

Ponds trap the water in the small valleys and lakes with automatic drawdown outlets delay the potential flood in the larger streams. Little knowledge of engineering is required to understand that if this thorough treatment were applied to a watershed all the way from the source to the mouth the flood problem would be solved and natural resources would be preserved for present and future use. The rule would apply to the largest rivers as well as to the streams in the Six Mile Creek class.

Some idea of what this could mean, both agriculturally and industrially, can be seen in the results already obtained in the two counties. Two industries that are of major importance to the area—a comb factory at Booneville and a hosiery plant at Ratcliff—were induced to move into the watershed only because of the availability of water from the lakes. Other towns obtain water for their normal needs from the impoundments. Agricultural benefits include protection of the flatlands from flooding, soil conservation on the hills, and adequate water for livestock. Recreational facilities, improved habitat for wildlife and other fringe assets make the project even more attractive.

Auditors of Six Mile Creek have estimated that the ratio of benefits to costs in the project is $1.51 in assets to each $1 spent. Unfortunately, few of our other public undertakings show such favorable returns.

TVA Circles the Globe as a Model for Developments Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is paradoxical that while here within the United States, where the TVA idea originated, there are those who continue to minimize its significance and importance, throughout the rest of the world it has become a model of democracy in action and a symbol of hope for a new and better way of life. The TVA idea and principle has been called America's most valuable export and has become a pattern and a model for similar developments in every region of the world.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal, a newspaper far removed from Tennessee and the TVA area, published an article appraising what the TVA has meant not only to the Nation but to the world. Because this article so well summarizes this great influence of the TVA throughout the world, I request unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

TVA CIRCLES THE GLOBE—DEVELOPMENTS PATTERNED AFTER TENNESSEE MODEL AIDING BACKWARD AREAS

(By R. G. Lynch)

The recent row, still echoing in Washington over TVA's award of contracts for power-generating equipment to British and Swiss firms over loud protests from American companies must have attracted more attention internationally than it would have if any other governmental agency had been involved.

For TVA are magic letters the world over, which have earned great respect for the United States in many countries.

In the long view, they may earn for the United States a more tangible return, foreign trade experts have said, by opening up vast markets for American goods, as the power generated by new hydroelectric systems spurs the industrial developments and purchasing power of underdeveloped areas.

TVA stands for Tennessee Valley Authority. The letters probably conjure up for most Americans a vague picture of big dams and reservoirs. Few understand that TVA is a model for comprehensive valley development.

SYMBOL OF HOPE

But in Asia, Africa, Central and South America, and Australia TVA means economic hope—flood control, power, irrigation, industry. The dams along the Tennessee River, the powerplants, the Authority's offices have been a mecca for the whole world.

Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote in the Progressive magazine, after an Asian tour:

"It may come as a surprise to many Americans that their Tennessee Valley Authority program is not only well known to countless Asiatics, even in the remotest reaches of that continent, but has come close to mean to them a symbol of a hopeful new way of life for themselves and their children."

In 1958, some 2,700 visitors from foreign lands looked over TVA installations, and 68 engineers, technicians, and others were trained there, some for months, so they could return to their own countries and help with similar developments. Not since 1949 has there been fewer than 1,000 foreign visitors and for the last 12 years foreign trainees have averaged 50 a year. Since World War II more than 12,000 foreign visitors from 90 countries have made the trip.

HIGH OFFICIALS VISIT

Presidents of Mexico, Chile, and Brazil have been there, and their countries have modeled developments after TVA. Prime Ministers Nehru of India, Ben-Gurion of Israel, U Nu of Burma, and Daud of Afghanistan were there, and all their countries have TVA-type projects or plans—or hopes.

The Kahn of Kalat in Pakistan, the Egyptian Minister of Public Works, the Queen of the Netherlands, the Prince Regent of Belgium, a Prince of Yemen, a flock of ambassadors—the list of distinguished visitors is long and impressive.

And all over the world, TVA has been copied. Other nations knew it could be done; the United States had proved it. Some had help under Point 4 agreements with the United States. Some got advice from United Nations mission.

So there is a "miniature TVA" on the Orontes River in Lebanon, a "little TVA" in the Gal Oya Valley of Ceylon, the "Caribbean TVA" in the Yallahs Valley of Jamaica, the "Central American TVA" on the Rio Lempa in Salvador, a "TVA for the Highlands" in Scotland, a "TVA for France" on the Rhone, the "Andean TVA" on the Santa River in Peru, the "TVA twin" on the Snowy and Murray Rivers in Australia.

Before the Communists drew the Iron Curtain across China, the nationalist government started a YVA (Yangtze Valley Authority) for the Yellow River. The National Resources Commission of China held a meet-

ing at Knoxville, Tenn., in 1943, and its engineers conferred with TVA officials and engineers. The Communists apparently are carrying out the development plan.

In many countries, these projects mean a great deal more to the economy than TVA has meant to the United States: Not that they all are bigger programs, but they bulk much larger relatively where the national industrial and agricultural development is embryonic.

CLOSEST TO TVA

India affords examples. The closest thing to a copy of the TVA program anywhere in the world probably is the Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC). The Mahanadi Valley Project (MVP) and the Bhakra-Nangal Project (BNP) also owe much to American prototype.

Seven or eight high dams on the Damodar (four of them completed) along with two low dams and a steamplant, will provide water for irrigation and power, foster navigation and control floods, where devastation has been the periodic expectation.

The other major programs are similar. The first of three Mahanadi dams is complete and the Bhakra's first is about ready. These three programs together are expected eventually to provide irrigation for nearly 10 million acres and generate 1,800,000 kilowatts of power. The generating capacity can be increased when needed. Their impact on agriculture and industry is expected to be tremendous.

The remote Himalayan Kingdom of Bhutan, between India and Tibet, will be one of the areas drawing power soon from a big TVA type hydro electric project India is building on the Jaldhaka River. Prime Minister Jigme Dorji of Bhutan was in New Delhi recently discussing the project with Indian officials and returning a visit Prime Minister Nehru had paid him in September.

TVA AID CONSULTS

India hired a former TVA head planning engineer to help prepare plans for the unified river developments and other former TVA men were consultants. After the DVC program was set up, a former TVA construction engineer became its chief engineer in 1950.

David E. Lilienthal, TVA chairman for many years, was consulted by India and Pakistan about a plan for the Indus River.

In 1953, a sort of TVA branch technical library was established in Calcutta, run by the Indian Journal of Power & Valley Development.

To detail developments and plans in other countries is mainly to repeat the same story many times. All want water for irrigation and power channels for water borne commerce, protection from floods.

The United Nations had TVA draft a plan for the Jordan River in the Near East. Gordon R. Clapp, while TVA Chairman, headed a U.N. economic mission pushing hard for a quick start to the Middle East. Dr. E. A. Morgan, first TVA Chairman, became consultant to the Volta River Authority in the African Gold Coast, now the new nation of Ghana.

The Ghana Government is on the Volta River project, which it sees as its best hope of transforming the nation from a single crop (cocoa) economy. The proposal is for a 4100-foot dam, 310 feet high, which would impound a lake 230 miles long. The hydroelectric development of 617,000 kilowatthours a year, 100 times the nation's present capacity, would be used to process Ghana's great bauxite reserves. The lake, it is estimated, would add 50 percent to the nation's production of fish. Water would be used to irrigate present arid plains and rice would be grown along the reservoir edges as drawdowns lowered the water.

In the tense middle East, Premier Manouchehr Eghbal of Iran, strategic Western defense link on Russia's southern border, said that now that this country had signed the new defense pact with the United States, he would move ahead with that country's billion-dollar economic development plan, a key feature of which is a big hydroelectric network. He said that a deputy would go to Washington soon to compete negotiations for a $60 million World Bank loan for a multipurpose dam, part of the Khuzestan project for which the Iranian budget provides $130 million in the current year alone.

Employees of TVA have served development staffs in Iran, as well as Mexico, Puerto Rico, Colombia, Brazil, Peru and Turkey. Engineers, technicians and officials have come from Japan, Iran, Ceylon, Salvador, France, Wales, Afghanistan and Australia to confer.

British, Egyptian and Uganda delegations visited TVA headquarters and installation in connection with planning for the Nile River. Chilean and Ecuadorean groups spent months at TVA installations.

More will be coming to this fountain of economic hope, for developments frankly modeled after TVA are also in the making in the Union of South Africa, Greece, Italy, Iraq, Portugal, the Belgian Congo, the Central African Federation and Liberia.

The rivers of the world are being harnessed to improve the lot of mankind or at least to try to keep pace with the hungry millions added to the population of the backward areas every year.

The Saline Water Conversion Program Makes a Real Contribution to Our Fresh Potable Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on April 15, Mr. J. W. O'Meara, Office of Saline Waters, gave a very thoughtful and enlightening address on the work and progress of the Office of Saline Water, before the 137th national meeting of the American Chemical Society, at Cleveland, Ohio.

Low-cost saline water conversion is a problem that received little attention until the passage of Public Law 448, 82d Congress, 2d session, providing for research and development of practical means for the economical production, from sea and other saline waters, of suitable water for agriculture, industrial, municipal and other uses. This research act was extended in 1955 and, in 1958 we authorized five demonstration plants, three on sea water, and two on brackish waters.

The Congress had long realized the value of the resource that would be ours if a means of converting the saline waters and the brackish waters at economical costs could be found. In the 7 years the Office of Saline Water has been in existence considerable progress toward the achievement of this goal has been made.

In spite of generally rising costs, the cost of converting sea water to fresh water is coming down. Just prior to World War II the cost of converting sea water to fresh ranged upward of $4 per thousand gallons.

In one or more of the plants authorized under the Saline Act, Public Law 85–883 that the Department will construct and operate, it is expected to convert saline water to fresh for less than $1 per thousand gallons. It is estimated that the cost for converting brackish water to fresh will be 50 cents or less.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. J. W. O'Meara given before the 137th national meeting of the American Chemical Society be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIVES AND STATUS OF THE FEDERAL SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

(Address by J. W. O'Meara, Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior, Paper No. 21, 137th national meeting of the American Chemical Society, Cleveland, Ohio, April 13, 1960)

It is a singular honor for me to extend to you the personal greetings of Dr. A. J. Miller, Director of the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior, and to express his deep appreciation to the American Chemical Society for including a symposium on saline water on the agenda of your 137th national meeting.

The day of the water witch is over. We must turn to scientific and technological research to develop a new source of supply that can provide an ever-growing percentage of tomorrow's water. It is our hope that the papers presented at this symposium will excite the interest of your members and encourage them to apply their technical competence to the complex problems that must be solved in order to develop low-cost processes for the conversion of sea or brackish water to fresh potable supplies.

You are all familiar with the common expression of American slang "The sky is the limit." Indeed, many people still use the phrase to express an unlimited support or endorsement. Yet in the past year and one-half the meaning of the expression has been changed by satellites that now orbit the globe, and the expression must now be interpreted as a limited phrase, for we now know that the sky is no longer the limit. As we stand on the threshold of space, with our eyes glued on the stars, it is difficult to lend an ear to the earthy prediction of Interior Secretary Fred A Seaton that unless we plan ahead with vigor and prudence, the provision of adequate supplies of water—just plain ordinary water, may soon be our No. 1 domestic problem.

WATER SOON TO BE OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

The experience of the Department of the Interior over the past years has clearly revealed one basic fact—water problems, in one form or another, touch all 50 States of the Union. In some areas it is a problem of availability, in others of salinity or quality; it may be a problem of maldistribution, or in some cases a problem of excess. Regardless of the cause, as a nation, we can no longer regard with indifference the increasing imbalance between the supply and demand for water in the United States.

In the United States we are now using about 240 billion gallons of water per day, and this rate of demand is causing increasingly severe water problems in many sections of the country. In 1957, a study conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey revealed that in over 1,000 cities and communities, representing one-seventh of the Nation's entire population, water shortages of varying degrees required their citizens to endure restricted use of water.

If our present rate of demand can cause a problem of this magnitude in a year of moderate drought, what then will be the scope of the problems we may have to face in just 20 years when, according to the U.S. Geological Survey our demand for water will more than double, reaching the immense total of 597 billion gallons per day—if we have it available. The year 1980 does not mark the peak of demand, the consumption curve is expected to continue to rise as our population continues to grow.

POPULATION INCREASE ADDS TO THE PROBLEM

In the foyer of the Department of Commerce in Washington, there is a huge counter turning big numbers ahead at the rate of 330 per hour. The register is recording our national population, which at the present time is increasing at that rate. Last week it passed the 180 million mark, and within the next 20 years, according to Census Bureau projections, we will have a population of 260 million, and 50 years from now our population will have more than doubled, probably ranging around 370 million people.

The population gain has already made itself felt by creating an increasing imbalance between the supply and demand for water in the United States. Although there is a growing public awareness of the problems we must face to maintain adequate supplies of water, we have too long taken for granted the availability of water for our every need. Only in recent years have we realized that water suitable for man's use may be a limited commodity.

WATER IS CHEAP

Water is cheap. In most U.S. cities we can purchase a ton of clear, pure, fresh water, delivered to our homes or factories, for about 5 cents a ton—or 25 cents a thousand gallons—but water is used in such tremendous quantities that it requires vast sums of money to provide the facilities to collect it and put it to beneficial use where it is needed. Quite naturally, water supplies nearest the point of demand were the first to be developed. As these sources become inadequate to meet growing demands, cities are forced to reach considerable distances to tap additional sources of supply, at sites more expensive to develop, and at today's prices.

Long ago southern California outgrew its local supplies and had to reach 240 miles across deserts and mountains to the Colorado River for its water supplies. This project, once criticized as a wasteful overdevelopment, will soon be inadequate. In the next general election the citizens of California will vote on the most expensive proposition ever placed on a ballot. They are being asked to approve a $1.75 billion bond issue to harvest the fresh water of the Feather River in northern California, transport it over 400 miles, lift it about 4,000 feet over the Tehachapi Mountains, and deliver it to the Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

There is a plant on the Island of Aruba, in the Caribbean, that is now producing 2.7 million gallons of fresh water per day at a cost of about $2 per thousand gallons. Of the land-based plants scattered about the globe, with a combined capacity of about 20 million gallons of fresh water per day, the plant at Aruba is the most efficient. Based on our cost standards, these plants are expensive producers, but they are in existence because the cost of water from alternative sources is even higher. As an example, over the past several years the Department has barged over 100 million gallons of fresh water from Puerto Rico to supply the minimum requirements of the people of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands at a cost of about $6 per thousand gallons.

PROBLEM OF ADEQUATE SUPPLIES IS NOT LIMITED TO HOT AND ARID AREAS

The increasingly complex problem of providing adequate supplies of water is not limited to a few hot and arid areas of the South and Southwest. Not long ago, New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, in a letter to Secretary Seaton stated, "New York State faces a very serious water problem in its Long Island counties outside the city of New York. The great outpouring of population has created a heavy demand for fresh water in Nassau and Suffolk counties and the forecast is for even greater population growth."

A letter from Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey states: "The region between Trenton and Wilmington is one of the faster growing industrial areas in the Nation. Many water problem areas already exist in New Jersey. The availability of economically feasible surface water storage sites is already a serious problem."

Examined within the framework of these examples and many others which could be offered if time would allow, it is not difficult to see that the task of providing ample supplies of fresh water for the America of tomorrow may indeed be our No. 1 domestic problem. At least one implication of our ever-increasing use of water is unmistakable: We must find new sources of fresh water, and the most likely sources, obviously, are the great oceans, and the vast reserves of brackish inland waters.

THE PROBLEM OF DISTILLING SEA WATER

As a part of his quest for water, man has been trying for a long time to brew a drink of fresh water from the sea, probably a lot longer than most people realize. For centuries people generally have known how to turn the trick: just distill it. The basic concept of the science is probably as old as the teakettle. But what the world is still searching for is the answer to the question: How do you do this on a large scale at a cost cheap enough to substitute for or augment water from conventional sources?

The first practical conversion units came with the advent of the steamship and its requirement of fresh water for boilers. Today, most of the large oceangoing vessels have their battery of evaporators. The *Forrestal* class carriers of the U.S. Navy for example, carry four 50,000-gallon-per-day evaporators to supply the water needs of those huge ships and their large crews.

While shipboard supplies of water are vital to navies and the maritime industry, the problem in which we are interested is quite different. Aboard ship the primary interest is a reliable supply of water, the cost of the water is of secondary consideration. The interest of the Office of Saline Water is centered on land-based plants that can produce fresh water from the sea at low cost with the emphasis on cost.

CONGRESS PASSES THE SALINE WATER ACT

The U.S. Government's work in this field goes back to 1952, when Congress passed the Saline Water Act to provide for research and development of practical methods of producing fresh water from saline sources. The 1952 act authorized $2 million for a 5-year program. In 1955 the act was amended by increasing the authorization to $10 million and extending the life of the program through fiscal year 1963.

Public Law 85-883, approved by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958, added a new responsibility to the Office. It authorizes $10 million for the design, construction, and operation of five saline water conversion plants to demonstrate the reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potentials of sea or brackish water conversion processes.

The law provides that three of these plants shall be for the conversion of sea water to fresh. One to be located on the east coast, one on the west coast, and one on the gulf coast. At least two of these plants shall have a capacity of 1 million gallons of fresh water per day. Two of the plants will be designed to convert brackish water to fresh. One to be located in the northern Great Plains and the other in the arid areas of the Southwest. One of these plants must have a capacity of at least 250,000 gallons per day. Each of the five plants must utilize a different process.

THE PUBLIC IS INTERESTED

An accurate barometer of the nationwide interest in the saline water conversion program is provided by the number of requests received from civic bodies, public officials, industrial organizations, and private citizens asking consideration for their area as a site for one of the authorized plants. The extent of the interest, I believe, will surprise you. Nearly 200 applications have been received from cities and communities in every State on the coastal perimeter, from 12 inland States, and from Alaska and Hawaii.

FIVE PROCESSES AND FOUR SITES SELECTED

Secretary Seaton has selected five processes and four sites for the demonstration plant program. Several excellent technical papers will be delivered to this symposium which will describe the various processes in considerable detail. I will eliminate, therefore, any description of the processes as I outline the present status of the demonstration plant program.

The first plant will be located at Freeport, Tex. Utilizing the long-tube vertical multiple effect distillation process it will be designed to produce fresh water from the sea at the rate of 1 million gallons per day. W. L. Badger & Associates of Ann Arbor, Mich., are performing the architect and engineering services. Invitations for construction bids were issued on March 14, and plans and specifications were available on April 1. Bids will be open on May 24. We have sold over 125 sets of plans and specifications for this plant which provides a second indication of the sharp interest in the saline water conversion program.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO BUILD AN ATOMIC REACTOR

The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to build a low-temperature low-pressure atomic reactor. We asked the Commission to locate their reactor at the site of one of our demonstration plants for a combination nuclear-reactor saline-water distillation plant. The Commission has agreed to do this if a mutually acceptable site can be located. For the combination plant, Secretary Seaton selected the multistage flash process for a 1-million-gallon-per-day plant to be located on the west coast. We selected a site on Point Loma at San Diego for this plant, but we have recently learned that this site is not acceptable to the AEC. The Fluor Corp. of Whittier, Calif., have been awarded the architect and engineering contract for the distillation plant, and if we can resolve our site problems, we hope to be able to let a construction contract in July or August.

WILL CONVERT BRACKISH WATER TO FRESH WATER IN SOUTH DAKOTA

A process that was no more than a laboratory phenomenon when the Office of Saline Water was authorized in 1952 has been rapidly developed to the point where it is now one of the most economical processes for the conversion of brackish water to fresh. This process, electrodialysis, was selected for the third demonstration plant. It will be located at Webster, S. Dak. The Bureau of Reclamation Laboratories in Denver, Colo., is preparing the specifications for this plant which will be designed to produce 250,000 gallons of fresh water per day. Operating on water containing about 4,000 dissolved parts of salt per million parts of water, this plant will remove about 1 ton of salt daily to produce product water with less than 500 dissolved parts of salt per million parts of water which is required to meet U.S. Public Health standards for good drinking water. If we can meet our established timetable—and meeting schedules is standard procedure under Dr. Miller's able direction—the con-

tract for this plant will be awarded late this summer.

IN NEW MEXICO

The fourth process, forced-circulation vapor compression will be designed to produce at least 250,000 gallons of fresh water per day in a plant to be located at Roswell, N. Mex. Aside from providing badly needed supplemental water to the city, the plant offers a second exciting possibility. Continued heavy pumping necessary to meet the growing demand is gradually lowering the water table in Roswell's present fresh water aquifer.

It has reached a point where saline water is beginning to encroach and endanger their source of fresh water. By pumping saline water from the brackish water aquifer we may be able to retard this encroachment and at the same time, by providing fresh water from the conversion plant, the city can reduce its pumping from the fresh water aquifer which may permit a gradual recharge of the aquifer.

A NEW FREEZING PROCESS FOR EAST COAST

The conversion of saline water to fresh by freezing is relatively new, but we feel it has great potential. Theoretically freezing has several inherent advantages over conventional distillation processes. For example, the lesser tendency toward scaling and corrosion because of the low operating temperatures involved, and more important, perhaps, the lower energy requirement to freeze sea water as compared to the energy required for the evaporation of sea water.

Freezing is so new that the world's first freezing process pilot plant began operating just last October at the Carrier Corp. plant in Syracuse, N.Y. Preliminary tests have been completed and the equipment is being dismantled for shipment to a seashore location for further operational testing. We have awarded the Blaw-Knox Co. of Pittsburgh a contract to build a 35,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant to test another freezing process developed at Cornell University. This process is based on the flash evaporation of a volatile and immiscible hydrocarbon, such as butane, in direct contact with sea water to cause part of the water to freeze.

For the fifth plant we will utilize a freezing process. This plant will be located at a yet-to-be-selected site on the east coast. It will be designed to produce fresh water in the range of 150,000 to 350,000 gallons per day. We will select the site this summer, but construction is not contemplated before fiscal year 1962.

OTHER TYPES OF PILOT PLANTS

Other pilot plant activity includes testing of solar stills at an experimental station near Daytona Beach, Fla. At the Bureau of Reclamation Laboratories in Denver, we have two electrodialysis units one built by Ionics, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., and the other by the T.N.O. of the Netherlands. We have also ordered a unit from the Japanese which will be delivered for testing within 6 months. Various types of membranes are also being tested at Denver. Distillation experiments are continuing in research facilities located at Wrightsville Beach, N.C. Operational tests of a small vapor-compression still designed by Dr. K. C. D. Hickman to supply the water requirements of an average home begin today at Daytona Beach.

THE OFFICE OF SALINE WATERS MAKING REAL PROGRESS

Research and development contracts with universities, research organizations, and industrial firms are probing into the fields of heat transfer, scale prevention, corrosion, membranes, gas hydrates, solvent extraction, and many others, all designed to help us reach our goal of low-cost converted water.

The plants we are about to build will demonstrate the progress that has been achieved through 8 years of research that has been supported by an average annual appropriation of less than $725,000. When the Office of Saline Water was authorized in 1952, the cost of conversion ranged upward from $5 per thousand gallons. We expect the two 1-million-gallons-per-day demonstration plants to produce fresh water from the sea for about $1 per thousand gallons. Our engineering extrapolations indicate that when these processes are incorporated in multi-million-gallons-per-day plants we will gain economies that will enable us to produce fresh water from the sea for less than 50 cents per thousand gallons, and prices even lower than that may be expected for the conversion of certain brackish waters.

These estimates of cost are based on our standardized procedure for estimating saline water conversion costs. It includes all costs at today's prices—land, capital investment, interest, operating costs, maintenance, taxes, insurance, and a rather severe 20-year amortization schedule.

The demonstration plant program has captured the interest and imagination of the Nation and the world, but we believe, and I think you will agree, that plant construction is not the key to low-cost conversion.

While we are building these plants we will continue to pursue our research and development program, for research is the key to progress. To emphasize my message to you today, let me repeat what I said at the outset: We must turn to scientific and technological research to develop a new source of supply that can provide an ever-growing percentage of tomorrow's water. Your participation in this symposium is encouraging evidence of the support and interest of the American technical competence. With this caliber of support we can look forward with confident assurance that the ancient dream of man—fresh water from the sea—can become an economic reality in our time.

Rolling Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1960, Mr. C. Canby Balderston, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, delivered an excellent address on the U.S. economy before the Albuquerque Chapter of the Society of Residential Appraisers, in Albuquerque, N. Mex. The viewpoint expressed is an objective appraisal that should be of benefit to the Congress. Under unanimous consent the talk follows in the Appendix:

ROLLING PROSPERITY

(Remarks of C. Canby Balderston, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Albuquerque Chapter, Society of Residential Appraisers, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Apr. 22, 1960)

What should our economy be doing, and for whom?

The generation now growing up is going to need job opportunities in greatly increased numbers after 1964—almost half again as many as during this year. By that time the number attaining the age of 18 will increase markedly because of wartime births. Moreover, wage earners of the present and their wives will continue to need steady jobs and security of savings. The average wife will need these savings even more than her husband for, having married at an age younger than he and having a longer life expectancy, she will outlive him by about 8 years.

Fortunately, individuals are saving, though not fast enough to satisfy the world's desire to invest. The interest received by individuals and nonprofit institutions is 2.5 times as large as the interest they pay out. For the sake of the millions who rely upon these savings, it is mystifying that more national leaders do not dedicate their talents to protecting the integrity of the dollar. Moreover, savings are needed to undergird technological advance. Upon these two, savings and technology, our country must depend to achieve a still higher scale of living, to help it compete in world markets, and to provide more jobs and more dependable ones. The attainment of these objectives requires teamwork by a triumvirate: sound fiscal policy; sound monetary policy; and prudent business decisions.

I will not discuss fiscal policy except to observe that a Federal budget in reasonable balance over the business cycle is needed to give private borrowers sufficient access to capital markets. In addition, it helps to retain confidence in the dollar by investors, here and abroad. The central banks of the world have been keeping their reserves in dollars as well as in gold, but the continuation of such trust requires that most of the time our Nation live within its income as one aspect of financial management of convincing quality.

The second member of the triumvirate, monetary policy, has been delegated by the Congress to the Federal Reserve System. Such policy is an essential means of keeping the Nation's total money demand, to use Clay J. Anderson's phrase, in balance with its capacity to produce. The effect of flexible monetary policy is contracyclical in that it contributes to the orderly growth of business and to the stability of the general level of prices. The prices of individual commodities will move up and down around this general level as they guide resources into the uses most desired. What has been bad in recent years has been the tendency of so many prices to move only in one direction that people got the idea an upward price drift was inevitable. Although monetary policy alone cannot provide financial equilibrium in the face of large deficit spending, it does help to provide the climate in which booms and busts become less violent. When total demand presses so hard upon scarce resources as to push prices upward, monetary policy restricts credit expansion. When total demand leaves substantial resources unused, it fosters credit expansion as a stimulant to business.

I will postpone the discussion of decision-making and turn to some recent changes in the business cycle. This cycle is not a homogeneous thing, but a composite of many cycles; some moving up and some down. For example, the consumption of electricity has been advancing, while farm prices and incomes have been tending downward. It is scarcely necessary to remind you that the business upturn that began about 2 years ago caused certain indicators to climb to all-time peaks. These include gross national product, net disposable income, and the Federal Reserve index of industrial production. Throughout the postwar period, some sectors have usually been expanding to offset declines in other sectors. Such is the nature of rolling prosperity. But there are ever-present forces that threaten business stability when it is at high levels. The most prominent are fluctuations in inventories and in plant construction, changes in the rate at which consumer installment and mortgage debt is incurred, the pricing policies of business as well as the wage demands of labor, and variations in profits. Of these, I will discuss only the first two.

In the 1957–58 recession, business inventories that had been accumulating at the annual rate of $2.7 billion were, by the first quarter of 1958, being liquidated at the annual rate of $6.9 billion. Hence, the turnaround from accumulation to decumulation was $9.6 billion. Between that low point and the second quarter of 1959, which preceded the steel strike, there was a turnaround in the opposite direction of $17.6 billion. After the rate of accumulation had reached a peak of $10.7 billion, the strike caused inventories to diminish during the third quarter of 1959 at an annual rate of $1 billion, making a downturn of nearly $12 billion. Once the steel strike was settled, inventories began to amount again, with resultant stimulus to the economy. Whether or not inventories are too high at any moment turns in large part upon how fast they are accumulating in relation to the rate of sales. A given inventory level may suddenly appear disturbingly large once sales volume starts to decline, or to level out, or even to increase at a slower rate. In fact the momentum of the shipments that accompany a high rate of production tends to pile up inventories after sales begin to slacken.

Plant expansion, too, has long been looked upon as a destabilizer because of its volatility. Following the consumer boom of 1955, for example, the expectations of population growth, together with the prospect of higher construction costs, caused some companies to build more capacity than they needed. Plant construction in 1956 was 22 percent higher than that of the previous year. Such a building binge has frequently led to an agonizing reappraisal of the amount of capacity in a given industry relative to the demand for its products. Such appraisals of capacity at home and abroad have been evident not only in the short-term recession of 1957–58, but since. It will be interesting to observe the impact upon future expansion decisions of the awareness of the capacity that now exists.

SOME ECONOMIC MISCONCEPTIONS

Our country is plagued at times with the "free lunch" illusion. Notions that there is an easy solution to every hard problem have too vital an influence upon our future for them to be innocuous. They undermine the will of citizens and their representatives to make the hard decisions required if our Government is to live within its means. As Boulding has said: "Without the heroic, man has no meaning; without the economic, he has no sense."

One misconception is that creeping inflation is the necessary alternative to unemployment. Experience teaches that the contrary is true: that good jobs depend upon good dollars. Over the long pull, price stability does not inhibit economic growth, it encourages that growth.

Another fallacy concerns interest rates. There are those who contend that because rising interest rates add to costs, they are a cause of inflation, whereas in fact they are a product of it. Those preaching this doctrine ignore the smallness of interest payments relative to total costs. For State governments the gross percentage is only 1.4 percent, while interest is received by State pension and sinking funds in an amount about two-thirds as large as the gross interest paid. For municipalities, the gross interest percentage to total costs is 3.3 percent. Clearly, what these governmental units suffer from is rising cost of items other than borrowed money. If interest rates had been kept down in the face of rising demand by printing currency or by creating deposit money. State and municipal salaries and other costs would have risen still faster. During the past decade inflation has doubled the cost of services and construction that States and cities have provided. Consequently, the amounts they borrowed increased also, with a resultant rise in the amount of interest paid.

Then there are those who attribute to the Federal Reserve the purpose of making interest rates high. Actually the System desires the lowest interest rates compatible with an adequate rate of saving and with a sound dollar. "Federal Reserve operations to release or absorb bank reserves unquestionably influence short-term and also long-term interest rates, but the extent of this influence is easily exaggerated. Monetary policy is effective only so long as it works in general consonance with the economic realities underlying the situation. These realities include the basic demands for funds, whether to meet seasonal needs, other short-run needs, or for capital formation, and the basic supply of funds through saving. Federal Reserve actions cannot for long enforce rates of interest on the market that are either above or below the rates that maintain a balance between saving and investment.

"Changes in the rate of monetary growth can represent only a very small part of the total flow of funds through credit markets. If the rate of monetary growth were raised with the specific objective of adding to the supply of funds in an attempt to keep interest rates down, the additional dollars in the spending stream would certainly work to raise average prices. The process of monetary inflation is widely understood by both savers and borrowers. Such action would generate expectations of further inflation on the part of both groups. The incentives of the marketplace, present and prospective, would unquestionably tend to increase borrowing and discourage saving and in all likelihood rates would increase.

"In the longer run, the way that monetary policy can contribute to a lower level of interest rates is through its role in maintaining a stable value for the dollar."[1]

The efficient flow of funds from savers to borrowers directly and through intermediaries does not come about without a price. This price, the rate of interest, represents a penalty to those who use some one else's money and a reward to those who save and risk their funds in loans and investments. In our own country this price has been driven to the highest level in three decades because of the pressure of the demand for funds. Last year there was a large deficit in the Federal budget requiring the Treasury to borrow funds from the public at a rate exceeding all peacetime records. State and local governments continued to borrow in near-record volume. Residential construction called for large mortgage financing. All of these, plus the usual business needs, competed for borrowings and drove interest rates upward.

And so, in the year 1959, total credit expanded by $60 billion. This figure was greater than the previous peacetime record of 1958. Mortgage debt, most of it for housing, increased by $19 billion—a record. Consumer credit outstanding rose about $6.5 billion, equaling the 1955 peak.

In appraising the results of last year, the facilitating roles of banking and of the Federal securities market stand out clearly. Commercial banks served mainly as intermediaries rather than as creators of new money. They obtained funds from savers in exchange for investment securities and then passed these funds on to borrowers. This flow from savers to banks to borrowers enabled the need for credit to be met without a dangerous increase in the money supply. The commercial banks did expand their loans, in fact by a record amount of almost $12 billion, but they raised most of these funds by selling Government securities from their portfolios to the nonbank public. The Federal securities market also played a greater role than in other recent years by facilitating the net borrowing of $11 billion by the Treasury and the selling of about $8 billion of Government securities by banks. Such an accomplishment is evidence of the responsiveness of nonbank investors to attractive rates of interest.

DECISIONMAKING OF HIGH QUALITY

So much for the role played by fiscal and monetary policy in creating a healthy business climate. But these two alone are not enough. As I observed at the outset, a third and essential member of the triumvirate is sound private decisionmaking. Steady consistent progress calls for decisions of the best quality that business executives and union officers can make. Their decisions, if sound, will do much to lengthen the period of prosperity that the country is now enjoying. "A business situation is no better than the quality of decisions that businessmen make," Dr. Winfield Riefler once remarked to me.

The quality of business decisions is important at all times, but especially so during prosperity. In short, the duration of the current expansion will be influenced by the quality of decisions now being made by business executives. I am talking about the heads of manufacturing, mining, and commerical enterprises, about farm managers and bankers—and about union officials, too. Unless their decisions reflect prudent judgment as well as a reasonably well-founded appraisal of present and future trends, executives, as well as workers and investors, will pay the penalty.

The problem, of course, is how to balance insufficient protection against too much; to achieve a proper compromise between caution and enterprise, between the safety of a strong cash position and the growth that borrowing makes possible. Proper balance requires that we not be overly cautious when times are bad, nor overly optimistic to the point of imprudence, when they are good; executives should risk neither too little nor too much, be willing to venture but still guard against unwarranted optimism.

At this point I would like to remind you of the case for decentralized decisionmaking. It is timely that this issue be debated because some of those who urge Government to overspend its income in order to supply gaps in the material well-being of the country also suggest curbing any resulting inflation by means of additional controls. Such controls embrace the rationing of scarce materials and goods; price, credit and capital controls; governmental wage setting; and even the assignment of people to jobs. In the past, it has not proven feasible to stop with just one of these controls alone. They are interrelated. I do not believe such a control harness, outside of wartime, is compatible either with the economic freedoms we cherish, or with initiative and efficiency over the long pull.

When centralized decisions are in error, the errors are big ones. Lord Keynes observed that "a democratic approach to public problems must stress the fact that economic totals are only aggregates of millions of parts which may differ from each other in more respects than they parallel each other. Mistakes made by individuals may offset each other but mistakes based on totals are likely to be aggregative and may be disastrous. It has been said about Nazi Germany that it was so well organized that it could only make major blunders. Unfortunately this danger is not confined to totalitarian states."[2]

The economic freedoms that Americans cherish are part of freedom of enterprise. The latter embraces freedom of choice in the securing of credit, in the selection of what

[1] Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee by Chairman Martin on behalf of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on Feb. 2, 1960.

[2] E. A. Goldenweiser, "Monetary Management" (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1949), pp. 2–3.

one wishes to buy, and in the seeking of jobs. The preservation of these freedoms, infinitely precious to all citizens, is a particular responsibility of those in the banking community.

To summarize what I have been trying to say about business decisionmaking, its decentralization ought to be defended stoutly. The burden of proof should be placed upon advocates of national planning whenever they suggest that decentralized decisionmaking be replaced by centralized determination by the government. Some central policymaking there must be, of course. One example is dealings with other nations; another is the regulation of the total supply of bank credit, for as Walter Bagehot pointed out almost a century ago in his classic description of the British money market, "money will not manage itself." But, in general, experience suggests that the allocation of credit, the negotiation of wages, and the setting of selling prices should be decentralized. The making of these business decisions calls for self-discipline and sound judgment. As Chairman Martin has said "The state of the Nation tomorrow—its progress and prosperity—rests with the decisions of today."

We Must Use Our Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Salem Democrat recently had a very excellent editorial which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. This is the answer to those who wildly and demagogically characterize spending as something inherently evil. I believe this excellent editorial places this matter in proper perspective. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "We Must Use Our Wealth," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem Democrat, Apr. 20, 1960]

WE MUST USE OUR WEALTH

Several influential politicians, led by the President, have indicated in recent years an obsession about spending on the part of the Federal Government. The word has become anathema to those people. To produce—but not to spend—seems to have become their guiding philosophy. Some weeks ago we brought out the fact that the President himself has subscribed to the definition of a prosperous, well-balanced American society as one that produces material goods sufficient to satisfy the wants of the people.

This concern with spending is well-founded in part—we do not want to steer recklessly down the road to socialism, with its attendant loss of individualism. However, the term "spending" has been construed to cover nearly everything, including areas of public interest which will never be served except by governmental direction.

What face do we show to the nations of the world? It is one that looks with contentment at private well-being; and abiding concern with the comforts of life. A good economy, yes, but not necessarily what all would call a good civilization.

Author John Galbraith describes an American family which possesses modern conveniences, but uses them in a land neglectful of public needs. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is keenly aware of the inseparability of domestic and foreign policy. He writes:

"A good economy is only a means to a good civilization (which) enhances the moral, spiritual and esthetic values that allow people to live with full satisfaction.

"President Eisenhower said not long ago that 'we grow only by investing more and producing more, not simply by spending more.' But the point surely is what we produce by our investment. Producing consumer goods is not necessarily beneficial. Investing in education or parks and playgrounds is not simply spending more. It is also investment, an investment in the quality, the skills, and the enlightenment of our people. The prestige and strength of the American people must be based on more than the capacity to produce consumer goods."

As the day approaches when we shall again consider politicians, their motives and philosophies (as best we can), we would do well to look behind the phrases and bywords to determine if we are seeking the proper objectives. It should not be a "kiss of death" that one be termed a spender; rather, we ought to learn what he is going to spend for. While a wary eye can still be trained on wild and reckless programs, there is nothing wrong with using our money in the right way. The President notwithstanding, there remains plenty of room to debate and consider using our money as well as getting it.

Joseph W. Childs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected labor leaders, Mr. Joseph W. Childs, passed away this week. He was the type of man that was a credit to trade unionism.

The following editorial appearing in the Akron Beacon Journal on Tuesday, April 26, 1960, should be of interest to all citizens:

JOSEPH W. CHILDS

"A dedicated and sincere trade unionist and citizen who worked unceasingly for the benefit of other people. * * *"

This was Joseph W. Childs, as described by L. S. Buckmaster, whom Mr. Childs had been expected to succeed in September as president of the United Rubber Workers.

Big, genial Joe Childs was first of all a union man. But his devotion to the United Rubber Workers at local and international levels did not deter him from giving almost as much of his time and energies to community service. He served with distinction in city council; he helped UF campaigns; he was active in many other efforts. Whatever he could do to help his union members and his community, Joe Childs did, vigorously.

In everything in which he played a part, Mr. Childs was forceful and fair. Whether it was discussing a contract with employers across a conference table or evaluating UF agency budgets in a United Community Council committee meeting, Joe voiced his opinions clearly, honestly, as he saw the situation. There was never any question how he stood on any matter. One might disagree with him, but no one ever questioned his honesty or his integrity.

During World War II, Childs served his Government in many critical assignments. And although he walked with the great of politics and business, he never was anything but "Joe," the rubber worker.

Few men counted as many friends as did Joe Childs, everywhere in the country. And even those whom he might have termed his enemies, liked him and respected him.

The international presidency would have been an appropriate honor for Joe Childs, a deserved recognition of his tireless labors in behalf of his union and the union movement generally. Death at the age of 50, following a heart attack, deprived him of this reward. But the memory of his useful life and inspiring example will live on in the hearts of his family and friends.

Latin America and the Price of Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a cup of coffee is a weapon in the cold war between the free world and the Communist world.

That point is tellingly made in a recent dispatch to the Dallas (Tex.), Times Herald, written by John Harris, of the paper's Washington bureau.

Mr. Harris' article quotes Assistant Secretary of State Roy S. Rubottom as declaring that "The drop in coffee prices is a peril to the free world." Our Nation has a vital stake in the soundness of the Latin American economy—and we purchase 85 percent of the coffee we use from Latin American countries.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harris' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Apr. 17, 1960]

U.S. OFFICIALS GROW ANXIOUS OVER WORLD COFFEE PRICE DECLINE

(By John Harris)

Coffee is causing sleepless nights at the State Department.

The insomnia is induced by a plunge in the world price of coffee—an economic landslide that could throw our relations with Latin America into turmoil.

"The drop in coffee prices is a peril to the free world," Roy S. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, said in a recent interview.

"Economic trouble in Latin America is an invitation to the Soviets to intensify their efforts at economic penetration of our hemisphere."

A cup of coffee generally costs a dime. Ten years ago it cost 5 cents. Yet during that same time the price of coffee has slumped 20 percent. The higher price per cup is explained by rising restaurant operation costs.

The overall price fall is blamed on overproduction, or "current imbalance between world production and consumption."

ONE-CENT DROP

What happens when the world price of coffee goes down, even slightly? A drop of

1-cent per pound means a loss to producing countries of $50 million per year.

This in turn means closed down plantations and unemployment in 14 nations across the Caribbean and South America.

Last year the United States purchased about 85 percent of its coffee from these nations. In volume, this amounted to 2,700 million pounds, an alltime record. In dollar value, these imports represent the lowest receipts to producing countries in 12 years.

This is where we, our jobs, and maybe our security, come in.

EARNING LOSS

With the price drop in coffee, Latin American earnings from coffee shipments to the United States have fallen from $1,400 million in 1954 to $975 million last year. As a result, Latin America hasn't got enough money to buy goods we make here.

But the standard of living is rising throughout Latin America. People want more and more things they don't make in their own countries.

Many Latin Americans are for the first time using modern appliances—many are wearing their first shoes. Huts and other living quarters are improving and education is on the march. The population is exploding.

BROUGHT FROM UNITED STATES

At last count, the coffee-producing countries purchased 20 percent of all products exported from the United States. They gave employment here to 370,000 persons. A total of 1,041 communities in the United States were directly engaged in commerce with these countries.

The $2,700 million worth of goods exported to the 14 coffee-growing nations included $630 million in heavy machinery, $517 million in vehicles, and $400 million in grain, vegetable, and animal products.

WEAK, WATERY

All of this has led to another complaint by coffee producers: The cup of coffee poured in the United States today just isn't as good as it used to be.

If it were better, it was suggested, the United States would be buying more coffee.

Sr. Miguel Angel Cordere, Jr., is president of the International Coffee Agreement, an organization interested in selling more coffee. He spoke recently at a meeting of coffee growers in Florida.

"If you were still enjoying the full-flavored cup of 10 years ago," he said wistfully, "you would have to import another 6 million bags."

Coffee experts claim that 2½ gallons of water should be used for each pound of coffee. But they said as much as 4 gallons are being used in the United States today, while the national average is 3 gallons.

A Most Extraordinary Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that some of my remarks be entered in the RECORD concerning a much out of the ordinary constituent, Mr. F. L. Stillions, of Blue Springs, Jackson County, Mo.

Mr. Stillions is a teacher by profession. He is not just an ordinary teacher, but one who is distinguished by having just completed 40 years of teaching in the public schools of Missouri; 25 years of which has been in continuous service in Blue Springs, Mo. Mr. Stillions further distinguished himself by being the first teacher in the entire area who insisted he continue in the teaching profession until he reached the mandatory retirement age of 70. Even more remarkable and in further distinguishing Mr. Stillions from so many others in his profession, he has never missed a day of regularly scheduled school during all these years.

Mr. Stillions was born on a small farm south of Palmyra, Mo., in 1890. He graduated from Palmyra High School and entered William Jewel College in Liberty, Mo. This is an institution of learning under the supervision of the Baptist church. While a student at William Jewel, he became a part-time pastor in Forrest City, Mo. In 1912 he was ordained as a Baptist minister. After his graduation from William Jewel College in 1913, he commenced his service as the pastor of the Blue Springs Baptist Church which he continued to serve for 17 years.

During the years of his early life it should be remembered this great man served the people of his community as the pastor of their church and carried out an extensive building program in the construction of a new church. Yet not only was he a good minister, but during all these same years he was a teacher in the schools—and not simply was he a teacher of the academic subjects, but he also served as coach of both the boys' and girls' basketball teams. He will be particularly remembered for the fact that he provided transportation for the teams in his own car and at his own personal expense so that the teams he coached might enter competitive sports in other towns. For 2 consecutive years, 1935–36, his basketball team won the championship award.

Then in the year 1947 when most people of his age—age 57—at that time are thinking of retiring, Mr. Stillions entered the University of Kansas City and completed work for his master's degree.

In his 40 years as a teacher, Mr. Stillions spent 27 years as a high school principal. It is refreshing to note that Mr. Stillions was not a specialist in that he confined his teaching activities to one bracket of subjects, but was a very versatile teacher in that he taught Latin, English history, algebra, geometry, and even chemistry in the field of the sciences.

When Mr. Stillion retires at the end of the current school year he will have the unusual distinction of having been teacher to three generations within one family, Mrs. Raymond W. (Maurine) Wyatt, her son, R. W. Wyatt, and her grandson, Donnie Wyatt, now a senior who will graduate this year.

Probably no other man has had such a profound effect on the lives of so many people in the Blue Springs community. As teacher, minister, husband, and father, he has given his unselfish devotion to each status. His efforts have helped thousands of young people to a better life and his influence has thus extended far beyond the community of Blue Springs.

In the presentation which will be made to Mr. Stillions, there will be the Latin inscription, "Exgisti monumentum aere perennius," meaning "You have completed a monument more enduring than bronze." Nothing could be more fitting to describe the life of this great teacher.

Wayne Gard Writes of Chisum, Andy Adams, Goodnight, and Other Famed Texans in Cowboy Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, nine famed Texans who braved severe weather and wild Indians to bring civilization to our Republic and State have been chosen for inclusion in the National Cowboy Hall of Fame at Oklahoma City, which was chartered by the 85th Congress.

This distinguished and unforgettable group includes Oliver Loving, regarded as dean of the trail drivers; Dan Waggoner, founder of the famed Waggoner Three-D Ranch, second in size only to the King Ranch; Sam Houston, our incomparable soldier-statesman; Stephen F. Austin, who led our main body settlers into Texas; and famed ranchers and cowboys Andy Adams, the cowboy writer, John S. Chisum, of Chisum Trail fame, Charles Goodnight of Palo Duro Canyon, Miffin Kennedy and Richard King of King Ranch.

Texas is the greatest ranching State in the Union. Its famed longhorns were pointed north and west to graze ranges from the Dakotas to Washington to California.

Mr. President, the current issue of the Progressive Farmer contains an excellent article on this subject written by Mr. Wayne Gard, one of the ablest writers of the ranch country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article entitled: "Texans Ride to Cowboy Fame."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXANS RIDE TO COWBOY FAME

Honors are in the making for some of those wind-bitten Texas cowmen who braved parching droughts, chilling blizzards, and Comanche scalpers to grow beef on the plains. Nine rugged Texans are among the 84 chosen thus far for inclusion in the Cowboy Hall of Fame. The first major unit of this eventual $5 million shrine and museum is under construction at Oklahoma City and should be completed soon.

No one knew better the hazards of the cattleman's frontier than one of the nine Texans, sturdy Oliver Loving, who risked and lost his life in taming it. Loving, who has been called the dean of the trail drivers, was born in Kentucky about 1812. In 1845 he moved to Texas, settling first in Lamar County. The next year he moved south

into Collin County, where he farmed, bought and sold livestock, and freighted from Houston and Shreveport.

Looking for a less crowded range, Loving trailed his herd west in 1855 and settled in the hills of Palo Pinto County. He found good grass, but profitable markets were far away. In 1858 he joined with a Parker County neighbor, John Durkee, for a drive to Illinois. The two brought their herds together in Parker County, near the Tarrant line. They trailed northeast to Preston, crossed the Red River, and headed up the Shawnee Trail. After crossing the Mississippi River at Quincy, they sold their steers at good prices.

In August 1860, Loving and three associates gathered about 3,000 steers on the upper Brazos and trailed them north through the Indian teritory and into Kansas. They followed the Arkansas River west into Colorado and wintered their herd near Pueblo. In the spring they trailed north to Denver, where they readily sold their steers. When Loving arrived home, after being gone a year, he found that because of Indian raids, his family had moved into Weatherford.

During the Civil War, Loving trailed beef herds east to feed the Confederate forces. After the war, in addition to his cattle raising, he ran a small country store on the Belknap road. In 1866 he joined a younger frontiersman, Illinois-born Charles Goodnight, in a drive to New Mexico. Merging their herds with 2,000 head in all, they followed the abandoned Butterfield Trail to Horsehead Crossing, then turned up the Pecos Valley. After selling their steers at Fort Sumner, Loving took several hundred cows and calves on to Denver and sold them there.

In 1867 Loving and Goodnight again trailed beeves to New Mexico. Along the Pecos, Loving and Bill Wilson rode on ahead of the herd. On their third day out, they were attacked by a band of several hundred Comanches. They took refuge under a bank of the stream, where they were hidden by smartweeds and scrub oak. But in the evening the Indians found them. As the cowmen prepared to defend themselves, one of the savages put a bullet through the wrist of Loving and into his side. That night Loving, weak from the loss of blood, insisted that Wilson leave him and try to escape and warn the rest of the outfit.

Wilson made his escape; but before the other Texans could reach the site of the fight, a party of Mexicans found Loving and took him on to Fort Sumner. There he lingered for several weeks before he died. His last request was: "Take me back to Texas. Don't leave me in foreign soil." His body was packed in charcoal and hauled back to Weatherford for burial.

Another hardy west Texas cowman chosen for the Cowboy Hall of Fame is Dan Waggoner, founder of the famed Waggoner Ranch, now the second largest in Texas. Born in Tennessee in 1828, Dan was brought to Texas in the middle 1840's when his family settled in Hopkins County.

His father died in 1848; and about 2 years later tall, blue-eyed Dan Waggoner bought 6 horses and 242 heads of Longhorns and located on Denton Creek, in Wise County, near the frontier town of Decatur. In 1851 he increased his herd and bought 15,000 acres near Cactus Hill, about 18 miles west of Decatur.

Waggoner prospered and kept adding to his pastures and to his herds. In 1870, with his son Tom and a few picked hands, he trailed a herd from the Little Wichita to Kansas and came home with $55,000 in his saddlebags. This enabled him to buy more Longhorns at $8 a head and to add to his land. Soon he had pastures in Wilbarger, Foard, Wichita, Baylor, Archer, and Knox Counties.

Once someone asked Waggoner if he intended to buy all the ranchland in north Texas. "No," he answered, "I don't aim to buy it all—just what joins me."

Waggoner brought in Hereford and Shorthorn bulls to upgrade his cattle and made his Three-D brand one of the most famous in the Southwest. He died in Colorado in 1904.

The heirs of Waggoner, further enriched by the discovery of oil on the ranch, continued the breeding of fine stock. The pride of the ranch today is one of the world's most famous quarter horse stallions, Poco Bueno.

Other pioneer Texans chosen for honor in the Cowboy Hall of Fame are Andy Adams, Stephen F. Austin, John S. Chisum, Charles Goodnight, Sam Houston, Miffin Kennedy, and Richard King. And for other notable cowmen of the State the door isn't closed.

TVA Continues To Prove Its Value as a National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the TVA is a great national asset and over the years it has made many contributions to the well-being of all sections of the United States and in the national interest. The critics of this great agency are fond of pointing out the many ways in which the TVA has and is benefiting the region in which it operates but they are very prone to overlook and disregard the many great contributions the TVA has made for all of the people of the United States.

Even during the past few years when the TVA has been the subject of the most bitter controversies and attacks the TVA has continued to serve the national interest in many ways. The TVPPA news recently summarized some of the more recent contributions of the TVA to the entire Nation and specifically to consumers of electricity everywhere. Because these national contributions are so often overlooked when we speak of the TVA, under unanimous consent, I include this excellent article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

TVA PROVES TO BE A NATIONAL ASSET—UNTOLD BENEFITS

For years TVA's friends have said TVA is a national asset, with benefits from its programs and policies spread throughout the Nation.

For example, they point to TVA's low electric rates—and the resulting high use of electricity—as a pattern from which private power companies have both learned and profited. Private power companies nearest the Tennessee Valley have made the sharpest cuts in retail rates—thus benefiting customers served by these companies—and yet have increased their common stock earnings twice as fast as the national average for power companies—thus benefiting power company stockholders. But the power companies bitterly oppose TVA.

On electric heating, some 20 percent of all consumers served by the municipal and rural cooperative distributors of TVA power heat their homes electrically. It is striking that the first National Electric Heating Exposition, being held this month in Chicago, comes more than a decade after electric heating became popular in the Tennessee Valley. Private power companies are, somewhat belatedly, jumping on the bandwagon; they are reducing electric rates now, to encourage electric heat. They are learning and profiting from the example set by the local distributors of TVA power, though the lesson has taken quite a while to sink in. It was not too many years ago that power companies were sarcastically critical of the idea of heating an entire home with electricity. They let the Tennessee Valley, and the Pacific Northwest, do the pioneering.

IDENTICAL BIDS

Last month the Nation saw another example of how TVA benefits electric consumers throughout the Nation, and a Federal grand jury in Philadelphia benefits the private power companies, returned a series of indictments charging numerous manufacturers of electrical equipment with violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act "in connection with the sale and distribution" of several items of electrical equipment.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an editorial on February 19, said, "everyone who pays taxes on electricity bills is an invisible party at interest" in the case.

"For bringing into the open the phenomenon of identical bids in the sale of many items of electrical equipment, TVA is largely responsible," the editorial stated.

It was TVA which made public the identical bids received from many manufacturers. It was TVA and several publicly owned electric systems in the Tennessee Valley which presented testimony before Senator KEFAUVER'S Senate subcommittee probing identical bids. Yet many other Federal agencies, State and local governmental agencies throughout the Nation, private power companies and other private businesses were allegedly subjected to the same identical bidding practices. Clearly TVA's action in first announcing identical bids was in the national interest.

Indictments announced thus far deal with products whose annual sales total about a quarter of a billion dollars a year. In the concise wording of a Chattanooga Times editorial, "This isn't peanuts." And a Justice Department official said: "These indictments and civil actions are the first in a series of proceedings arising out of the Department's extensive grand jury investigation into all phases of the heavy electrical equipment industry. The investigation is continuing into other phases which involve products of significance to industry and national defense."

A RELATED MATTER

An earlier TVA action which was widely criticized at the time—the purchase of foreign-made equipment—is not unrelated to the question of identical bids. Concerning its purchase of a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator last year from an English firm, TVA said "this history of price increases by the only U.S. suppliers * * * led TVA to invite bids from qualified foreign manufacturers as well as domestic ones." TVA at that time said prices charged by American turbogenerator manufacturers had gone up 50 percent since 1951, compared with a 5-percent increase in average wholesale cost of all commodities. The relationship between TVA's acceptance of foreign bids and the matter of identical bids from U.S. firms has now been publicly established.

Since TVA's award of a contract to the English firm, prices of many items of electrical equipment have been reduced by American manufacturers. Arnold R. Jones, TVA board member, said last fall that "every utility in the country is buying cheaper because of what we did. There has been a reduction of 17 percent in purchase costs since our action." This is another case where TVA's policies—though arousing controversy and appearing to be politically unwise—have shown to be in the national interest, and have benefited TVA's bitter foes, the private power companies.

WHO IS BUSINESS MANAGED?

Private power companies—proudly and expensively advertised as "business managed"—did not make public complaint about identical bids, or high prices for electrical equipment. It was the public power agencies which brought this to the public's attention. The result: Every electric consumer in the Nation should benefit, because of lower prices which utilities are now paying for key items of equipment. Perhaps the publicly owned systems are more business managed than the private companies. As the Nashville Tennessean editorialized: "Once again, TVA has saved American power users—both public and private—a considerable wad of money. Once again it has demonstrated that an organization is not necessarily cursed because it bears the name public. And that the suffix, private, is not invariably sacred."

But Public Service magazine—an independently owned and managed publication which sharply criticizes TVA and local public power systems at every turn—says TVA's newly acquired revenue bond financing authority puts TVA on the horns of a dilemma. Says this anti-TVA magazine: Revenue bond financing may mean that TVA "must begin to behave like a private corporation, increase its rates * * *" and so forth.

Does this mean that an agency must increase its rates in order "to behave like a private corporation?" The Philadelphia grand jury indictments charge, among other things, that various agencies "have been forced to pay high, artificially fixed prices" for elctrical equipment because of the alleged conspiracies among manufacturers. Competitive bidding is supposed to reflect competitive enterprise at work. Too, there is evidence that this definition of behaving like a private corporation and increasing rates might fit many private power companies, which have increased rates by nearly half a billion dollars in the past 10 years, and have ben granted 515 of the 557 rate boosts applied for since 1946.

TVA may indeed have to raise its rates. But it will do so only after having made every effort to hold its costs down only after courageously attacking the policy of identical bids after buying coal on bid basis at the lowest possible cost after building its projects below cost estimates with a dedication to low rates and economical operation that would well befit any private corporation.

If behaving "like a private corporation" just means increasing its rates, time and again, as many regulated private utilities do, it is safe to say that TVA will not do so. Twenty-six years of low-cost power is sufficient evidence to the contrary. But if behaving "like a private corporation" means unstinted devotion to the lowest operating costs, to keep the price of electricity as low as possible for the greatest consumer benefit, then TVA has been behaving like a private corporation for more than a quarter of a century. In fact, TVA has set an example which the Nation's private power companies might well follow in their "business-managed" operations. One would think that the power companies would actually thank TVA for saving them money on their equipment purchases, and on other matters. But somehow it doesn't seem likely.

U.S. Education for 4,000 Africans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently Mr. Harold C. Case, the president of Boston University, proposed that this country's colleges and universities each invite two African students to study in the United States, annually.

Mr. Case recently returned from a trip to the African continent; and his suggestion both recognizes the great emergence of the African peoples politically and socially, with the resulting need for education, and offers a counter to the plans of the Soviet Union for a so-called free university for students from the underdeveloped areas.

A recent article, in the New York Herald Tribune, by Education Editor Terry Ferrer, reports on President Case's idea; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASKS U.S. EDUCATION FOR 4,000 AFRICANS

(By Terry Ferrer)

Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, yesterday proposed that every one of the 2,000 colleges and universities in this country invite two African students to study here beginning in 1961. The 4,000 Negro students would receive free tuition, room, and board from the colleges, and their travel and incidental expenses would be paid by their own governments.

Dr. Case, who recently returned from a 2-month visit to Africa, said in an interview here that "next to nationalism, the greatest urge in Africa now is for education. I am firmly convinced that whoever designs African education will design the continent's political future as well."

Later this month, Dr. Case will present his proposal to the State Department for its approval. He will also ask the American Council on Education, the Nation's largest higher education association, with more than 1,000 members, to serve as a central clearinghouse on the project. The Africans would study at either the undergraduate or graduate level, Dr. Case said.

Two American colleges, Boston University and Dillard University—a Negro institution in New Orleans—have already made plans to take two African Negroes each beginning this fall.

Dr. Case pointed to the Moscow announcement on February 23 that the Soviet Union would open next fall a "University of Friendship of People" for the free education of 4,000 African, Asian, and Latin American students. "Under my proposal," he said, "we would steal from Russia any propaganda value its new university might have."

It is imperative, Dr. Case said, that American education take a responsibility now for African higher education so that the new African nations "do not flounder as they go into independence, or enter the Soviet bloc of nations."

The need for higher education in Africa is evidenced, he said, by the fact that in the whole of the Belgian Congo, which becomes independent next June, there are only 18 known Negro college graduates. In all of the countries he visited, the number of college graduates "is so low as to be negligible," he said.

Laws Alone Can't Assure Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, "Laws Alone Can't Assure Rights," that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver Colo., on Monday, April 25, 1960:

Passage by Congress of the new civil rights bill, which is only the second piece of civil rights legislation to be enacted since the post-Civil War period, was an important accomplishment.

During the 2 months devoted to consideration of the bill, southern Members won some concessions. However, the mood of the country, as reflected in the mood of the majorities in both Houses, required a strengthening of measures relating to Negro voting rights and the punishment of persons who use bombs in racial disputes or defy court desegregation orders.

The bill, as passed, meets those requirements.

Southerners who fought the proposal at every turn concentrated on trying to keep it as mild as possible. They fully understood that Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN and Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, because of their responsibilities to the national Democratic organization, would have to produce a new law of some kind.

As realists in politics, RAYBURN and JOHNSON performed their duties well. Without their leadership there would have been no new enactment.

How much the 1960 civil rights measure will accomplish remains to be seen. Certainly, no phenomenal results are to be expected immediately for several reasons:

1. Efforts by the Department of Justice and the Federal courts to put the new measures into effect will be contested by lawyers for the Southern States every step of the way. Provisions of the new law will have to go through the U.S. Supreme Court for testing. This will take time.

2. Federal courts and Federal referees, in protecting the voting rights of Negroes, will have to be guided by State laws relating to voter eligibility, and some of these laws have been ingeniously drawn to prevent any but the better-educated Negroes from qualifying.

3. The strengthening of the legal rights of Negroes to the ballot may not mean much in areas of the Deep South where fears of possible economic reprisals will still be used to keep Negroes from the polls.

A man is not going to be eager to try to exercise his rights if he knows that his act of voting may cost him the job he holds under a white employer, cost his wife her job as a maid in a white home or result in the calling of his farm loan by the local bank.

The use of sanctions of this kind are anticipated by both whites and Negroes in the South. J. M. Brooks, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Richmond, Va., was quoted in a newspaper recently as saying:

"A Negro will come in to register and the registrar will say, 'Does Mr. Jones know you're trying to vote?' Well, Mr. Jones owns the store and the Negro owes him a bill, so he forgets about registering and goes back home."

This type of suppression of Negro rights cannot be cured miraculously by passing a law in Congress. The law will help. It would be a mistake to expect it do anything more.

Sniffing Out Dope Pushers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a column written by Ruth Montgomery which appeared in the April 14 edition of the New York Journal-American.

The problem of dope traffic coming into this country continues to be a serious one, and I was pleased to read in Miss Montgomery's column that Narcotics Commissioners Harry J. Anslinger has appointed Mr. Sam Pryor as his special adviser on how to catch smugglers bringing heroin into this country on our airlines.

Mr. Pryor is a resident of my home State and has long been interested in the narcotics problem. He is an outstanding American businessman who has dedicated much of his time to helping make this country a better place in which to live.

I am certain that he will do a great job for our Narcotics Commissioner.

I also would like to mention that Commissioner Anslinger deserves a great deal of credit for his efforts in fighting the narcotics problem in this country. Commissioner Anslinger has done an excellent job despite the fact that he has a limited staff to deal with such a vital problem.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Montgomery's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNIFFING OUT DOPE PUSHERS
(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A statue may someday be erected to the first dog that can develop a talent for sniffing out illegal heroin.

Man's best friend has already proved so adept at "pointing" opium that America has virtually rid itself of the vile traffic in that habit-forming drug.

Narcotics Commissioner H. J. Anslinger discloses that German shepherd dogs, especially trained for this unique service, have become so proficient that they have "just about cleaned out New York and San Francisco Chinatowns of opium—and cats, as well."

These heroic shepherds, who are performing similar chores in Cairo and other world centers of narcotics traffic, have such a delicate nose for opium that they can even point to it in locked, steel safes.

So far the Narcotics Bureau has been unsuccessful in training dogs to track the scent of heroin, which is now the preferred drug of America's 60,000 addicts.

The problem is an urgent one, because most of the heroin that illegally enters America originates in Red China, and 65 percent of our addicts are under 30 years of age. In fact, nearly 12 percent are teenagers.

The jet age is a boon to international gangsters who dominate the illicit narcotics field. A slow boat from China is no longer good enough for Maffia mobsters and other organized crime syndicates, who smuggle dope into this country to lower our morals and our morale.

Virtually all of the international traffic has now shifted from ships to airplanes, and for that reason Anslinger has appointed Sam Pryor, executive vice president of Pan American World Airways, as his special adviser on how to trip up the airborne smugglers.

"Pryor is a Godsend to us in this jet age," Anslinger exclaimed. "He travels all over the world at least twice a year, and knows every trick of the trade when it comes to customers or airline personnel trying to slip contraband past customs officials. This knowledge is desperately important to us, when you realize that a smuggler flying out of Hongkong can now reach San Francisco within hours."

Pryor, a director of the Boys' Clubs of America, became interested in the narcotics problem when he saw "normal boys turned into animals" by the use of dope.

"I have five children and eight grandchildren," he mused, "so I can afford to get mixed up in this risky business if it's going to make a safer world for them. It's a horrible situation when teenagers, hopped up on heroin, commit major crimes—not just juvenile misdemeanors."

Anslinger does a slow burn at our British cousins, who refuse to let his agents help clean up the narcotics situation in Hongkong. He points out that this oriental city just outside the bamboo curtail is the chief clearing house for the China-grown narcotics that illegally enter America through Los Angeles and San Francisco.

The British Home Office vigorously denied it when Anslinger recently asserted that the city of Hongkong has as many drug addicts as our 50 United States combined. Suddenly it performed an abrupt about-face.

Great Britain has now issued a white paper officially admitting that Hongkong houses from 150,000 to 250,000 heroin addicts. America has only 60,000, thanks to Anslinger and his dedicated agents.

Skin Deep Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the following editorial entitled "Skin Deep Liberals" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Apr. 26, 1960]

SKIN DEEP LIBERALS

Once upon a time, a political liberal was a figure of scorn and a target of abuse. He needed the courage of his convictions, because there were no other rewards. This made him, deservedly, a noble figure.

But how times have changed.

For 30 years, especially in the big urban centers, the banner of "liberalism" has been a passport to publicity, public acclaim, profit, and public office.

It is hardly strange that a new, less noble class of self-styled "liberals" has grown up—people eager to cash in on the old labels and the old slogans.

These are the folks whose humanitarianism is only skin deep—those who see the suffering of people as something to feed on politically.

These are the folks who defend loudly all minorities that form cohesive voting blocs, while using vicious, twisted, and prejudicial techniques to attack the economic minority and inflame people against that portion of American life.

These are the folks eager to guarantee the voting rights of colored folks in the South, but blind to vicious machine politics in their own northern cities.

These are the ones eager to rhetorically rescue the "captive peoples" in other lands, but who approve legislatively of making an estimated 5 million Americans "captive members" of labor unions.

These are the folks who shout loud and long about working hours being made short by law while their own office staffs toil 14 hours a day, and capitol employees as much as 16 hours a day with no extra pay.

They love mankind but don't speak to their neighbors.

Such folks would rather have gimmick laws with fancy labels than real solutions to human problems—the real solutions would rob them of their political stock in trade.

And so the positions are reversed. The self-styled liberals, cashing in on the courage of their predecessors, are living it up, popular, fat, and sassy.

The man who needs the courage of his convictions today—who now faces scorn and abuse—is that man who wants to get down from the clouds of emotional slogans and oratory, and get to working on the homely details that can make some of these things actually work.

Cartoons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, every 4 years our national election brings to the fore many characteristics appropo of American life but none appears more solidly and remains before the public more firmly than the cartoonist. Within the next 6 months, I am sure all of our political colleagues with whom we agree or disagree will serve as fodder for the cartoonist.

Recently there appeared in the magazine, Art in America, a description devoted to the American comic scene of the past 75 years prepared by Walt Kelly the creator of "Pogo." Mr. Kelly, former president of the National Cartoonists Society, says that political criticism has somehow come to be less interesting to the popular cartoonist here than social comment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

Mr. Kelly's article for the reason that it describes what has made the cartoonist tick since he became an accepted part of American political and social life.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTOONS

(By Walt Kelly)

During the past 75 years American comic drawing has changed from the solidly executed work of the academician to the rapidly sketched portrayal of an idea that marks the efforts of our most recent cartoonists. It is important that throughout this change the idea has been the motivating factor behind all of the work. The difference lies in the conception of the artist as to which is more important: elaborate and solid construction of the vehicle for the idea, or quick communication to the readers.

Insofar as the idea itself is concerned, the cartoonist differs not at all from other men who bend to the steady storm of life. Badgered by tax collectors, he may issue a scream of protest involving the use of vultures; beset by family he might try a grim delineation of those ordinarily well-loved; children, wives, parents, even in-laws. He might find the social whirl too much for his sensitivity and attempt scathing line indictments of the newly rich, the cocktail set, or toothy people bearing skis and tennis racquets. Recognizing traits of snobbishness in these, his own reactions, he smites himself mightily hip and thigh in an orgy of self-flagellation, a cleansing action which makes him feel that he is entitled to take on his neighbor again.

Political criticism has somehow come to be less interesting to the popular cartoonist here than social comment. The man today is more amused by behavior patterns. This does not necessarily mean that he is afraid, or could not possibly find a market for political cartoons; it is just that he has learned through the last century that we are equally guilty and that the road to perfection probably is not a strictly partisan road. In this, he reflects his times.

Such recognition of participation in ridiculous and incongruous crimes both large and small against humanity is probably the main impulse behind the work of all important cartoonists. Whether the man releases his emotional or intellectual steam through a humorous drawing or a strongly composed blow between the eyes matters little. He is still making comment, sharp, abrupt, unmistakable, and certainly as direct as he possibly can.

Today the cartoonist tries to capture the idea quickly, to fling it down and render it to his readers alive and full of fight. Yesterday perhaps we lost a little life by belaboring the drawing with a weapon known as the crosshatch to a point where the idea became obscure while the drawing had acquired some of the noble solidity of a Roman arch.

Picking at random a few innocent souls to serve as milestones, we find that one of the earliest men, A. B. Frost, a genuine American product, was well enough grounded in drawing to please even the exacting British. Lewis Carroll and his publishers (Macmillan) were satisfied with Mr. Frost's illustrations for "Rhyme? And Reason?" when the American drew them in place of the preferred Englishman, Crane. But Frost, with his ability to breathe life into animals, as he did for Uncle Remus, drew carefully executed, yet lively, characters for the British. This test was more strict than we can presently imagine, for the English have always excelled in the academic side of drawing.

As we pass gingerly by the waiting figure of Thomas Nast, with a gentle nod of recognition, we next see before us the very important Art Young, who in the early part of this century was a political cartoonist of renown. His background was firm and his drawings solidly conceived. His learned caricature of form made drawing look easy. He helped clear the air by demonstrating that the idea had to be clearly stated.

It must be admitted that the American is always self-conscious in the presence of the Holy Grail as such and that our tastes in high art have developed slowly. But let us also concede that there has been steady progress here toward the simple line and the direct idea. Any bird-walk through the past of cartooning history is an arbitrary matter of luck and memory. What we remember we can identify, but this is also a way of judgment. Therefore, we can skip blithely by the Charles Dana Gibson group, having passed Nast at full gallop, and we find after Young, or at about the same time, the towering figure of T. S. Sullivant, probably the greatest caricaturist of animals of all time. His reduction of everything to absurdity in line and mass reminds the bemused idolator of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright, who insisted that the monuments to his intelligence be solidly grounded and in conformity with the terrain. It would have taken a bulldozer to upset one of Sullivant's mice.

Sullivant, like a good many others, was encouraged in his quest for the beauty of simplification by a master of line, Fred Cooper, who as artist and editor (he is also a type designer) served the old Life magazine as a wise and gentle shepherd. A result of this man's influence can certainly be seen in the increasing tendency toward the single, mighty line of the early New Yorker men.

Here, Peter Arno comes immediately to mind. There are some who insist that he has been this country's greatest cartoonist. He is, for sure, one of the greatest manipulators of the straight line. His work takes on the glow of high art at times. All cartoonists are proud of this man's work. Another practitioner of the straight line is George Price. He has a single central idea, confusion, and he expresses it as no one else ever did. He thinks so much of the straight line that, you may have noticed, at times he uses two at once to get from point to point.

There are some, including Price himself, who disclaim Thurber as a cartoonist. They are all wrong. Art Young's simplicity and caricatured form, feeling for mass, all have echoes in Thurber's work. Just look at Thurber's monks drawn for a piece by Alexander Woollcott, the late early American primitive. It was one of the best things Mr. Woollcott was ever connected with.

CEM, called Charlie Martin by his friends, is a little touchy about being considered to have a style. Despite his protests, his ideas and the execution of them form a style. Always interesting, always clearly presented, Martin's work is a great contribution to clear thinking.

The men mentioned have mostly been "panel" artists; that is, they draw single pictures. Those of us who put things in a row with balloons have been influenced by the gentle quiet of a couple of masters. George Herriman brought poetry and a love of fantasy to the comic-strip business through "Krazy Kat," and his drawing was simplicity itself; David Crockett Johnson, when he did "Barnaby," also helped spring a lot of cartoonists out of the stereotype of the syndicated comic strip. "Pogo" and Charles Schulz's "Peanuts" both owe much to the distinguished spadework of both Harriman and Johnson.

Robert Osborne, with his imagery and the symbolic terrorism of Blake, is a result of the trend toward the uncomplicated drawing. He is in a class by himself, though advertising art directors who get their cousins to imitate styles at cut rates, are not yet aware of the difference between gold and dross.

While crowds of new men are coming forward today, the cartoonists we've mentioned are getting a little short of wind, legs are going, and the new rookies look very fast. These new men, still hewing to the line and using the idea as a blunt weapon, are close to the recent European tradition (Where Steinberg properly belongs; his background, training, and taste are continental rather than American). As we paunchier members of the club were not as academic as our turn-of-the-century predecessors, so these new men are not as academic as we.

Jules Feiffer, one of the very best of the younger men, has so many ideas and is such a prolific writer of material that he has trouble finishing one drawing before he plunges into the next. Yet, his work is simple and unmistakable as to meaning.

One notable cartoon by an outstanding new panel man is the drawing of two prisoners chained in a dungeon. Shel Silverstein, the cartoonist, has said that he has been amazed at the inquiry directed toward him about this particular cartoon. (I must admit I felt it represented the great spirit of American optimism.) After being psychoanalyzed by friend and stranger alike, Shel said wearily, "I just did it because I thought it was a funny idea." He's put his finger on the aim of the cartoonist: to be funny, to be direct, to get the idea across quickly; these duties comprise our aim, and we can"t help it if the unreal is real and the tragic is comic.

Liberty and My Stake in It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the special attention of the Members of Congress to the award-winning Farm Bureau essay written by Mrs. John Moyer of Hamlin, Kans. In my opinion, Mrs. Moyer is to be highly commended for her most thought-provoking essay. The essay contains food for thought for everyone.

"Liberty is not inherited, but must be rewon by each generation." My husband wrote this quotation on our kitchen blackboard many years ago and since then it has held a prominent place in my life. I do not know to whom to credit the idea, but I do know that it gives a great purpose to my thoughts and activities.

As I go about my daily kitchen chores, I often glance at the quotation. Sometimes the words cause me to pause in my work and look out to the fields and pastures and hills. As I look at the beautiful and peaceful scene and breathe deeply of the pure fresh air, a feeling of pride and exhilaration comes to me.

How I love the peaceful farm scene and the little village that nestles near our big hill, just a few blocks from my own doorstep. Often I rededicate myself to be a steward of all this, a much better steward than I have been in the past.

I can feel this responsibility of keeping America's way of life, these results of liberty, as directed to me and only to me. As Smoky the bear says, "Only you can stop a forest fire," so my conscience tells me "Only you can keep this liberty."

Liberty? Oh, yes—That is what I am to preserve. You ask, "What are the facts about liberty and what is your stake in it?"

I answer you:

Liberty is freedom to determine one's own actions insofar as it does not interfere with others also determining their own actions.

But I cannot say "I want freedom of religion" and never go near the house of God, nor work with His people.

I cannot say, "I want fine statesmen," yet never go near the voting polls, nor inform myself on the needs of the offices and the qualifications of the candidates.

I cannot say, "I want my children to have the best education possible," yet never visit my schools, nor talk with the teachers and administrators.

I cannot say, "I want better laws," yet never write nor talk to my Congressman.

I cannot say, "I want law enforcement," then not concern myself with the laws and abide my them.

I cannot say, "I want liberty," and never give of myself to have it. The time and talents I have I must share where and when I can to make a better community and world. I must inform myself by my reading those articles, listening to and viewing those programs, and associating with those people who will give me local, national and world conditions, instead of only entertainment.

As Smoky would put it and my own conscience tells me, "Only I can keep this liberty."

Lack of Voting Rights in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the longtime concern of many Members of Congress with the unfair and unhappy state of democracy in the Nation's Capital has become a national cause. Many community leaders and many newspapers are taking up the campaign to gain for citizens of Washington the basic right of all citizens—the right to vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News commenting on the serious lack of voting rights in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Apr. 19, 1960]

OUR VOTELESS CAPITAL

It is an indictment of our democracy that residents of the city of Washington not only are denied home rule but even of the right to vote.

The citizens of Moscow enjoy the privilege of the ballot not available to those in our National Capital.

The Senate finally has approved a constitutional amendment which would give District of Columbia residents the right to vote for President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. The House has a similar proposal pending.

They should be rectified and expedited to passage. So also should legislation giving Washington its own city government, leaving Federal authority only in respect to Federal property and agencies located there.

We suspect that it is racial bias, more than anything else, which has held back this enfranchisement and home rule in past congressional controversies on the subject. If so, even more discredit is reflected on our democratic processes.

Our National Capital should be a showcase of freedom, not a symbol of discrimination.

Danger Signals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the shipyard strike in eight of the east coast shipyards is now in its 98th day. Very little progress has been reported up to date and this costly strike continues. The administration has continued a policy of complete neutrality. This type of policy keeps the administration in a position where it does not have to make decisions. It has a rather devastating effect on the results of the strike, however.

A very well written editorial appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger on April 27, 1960, entitled "Danger Signals." It points up the grave concern not only of the editorial writer, but it is an accurate appraisal of the feeling of all the people of the south shore area of Massachusetts. For the information of the Members of Congress, I am including a copy of the editorial:

DANGER SIGNALS

The Fore River Shipyard strike is getting to be more than a dispute between management and labor.

Danger signals are up. The strike is beginning to pose the question whether the South Shore's biggest industry will remain on its feet.

The strike is breaking up the Fore River labor force. So many union men have found jobs elsewhere that it seems probable that the company will permanently lose some valuable personnel.

The announcement that at least 50 striking workers have been hired at the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard, and that there are 200 openings there, is the latest warning of what is happening to the working force.

The yard's ability to compete is being hurt in another way.

The Navy contract for the first nuclear-powered surface warship gave Fore River an invaluable headstart in this class of work. We hoped the experience would give it a competitive advantage for years. But the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach* remains unfinished as the strike continues. Unless there is a settlement the potential advantage may well be lost.

Relations between Fore River and the Navy are particularly important because of the worldwide depression in shipbuilding. A few years ago a top official at the yard said that the Navy was Fore River's best customer, and that efforts would be made to see that it remained so.

At present only the Greek oil-shipping interests rival the Navy as a source of work at the shipyard. Because of a great deal of recent tanker construction in the United States and other big shipbuilding countries, prospects for more orders for tankers in the next year or two are none too bright.

That leaves the Navy, which already has had the *Springfield* towed out of the yard and which continues to study the possibility of moving other warships elsewhere for completion.

What are prospects for new Navy contracts? The Navy invited Fore River, among other yards, to submit bids for construction of destroyers which will be the Navy's newest. Eight yards bid, but Fore River failed to. Inability to estimate was given as the reason.

The yard has been reported interested in the construction of modern submarines. Present prospects are limited to Navy subs, and the strike could keep the yard from obtaining contracts, even if low bids were submitted.

Fore River has an outstanding record of design and construction in the last 60 years. In World War II it turned out 1,000 ships and held records not only for the number and variety of ships built, but also for value, displacement, tonnage, speed, horsepower, and firepower.

The South Shore has reason to be worried that the yard's great record may come to an end if the strike is not settled.

Wisconsin Claims Pioneer Station—WHA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the radio broadcasting industry has contributed much to the progress in our country and enlightenment of our people.

In Wisconsin, the splendid network of WHA stretches over the entire State. In continuous operation since 1917, WHA is considered the oldest station in the Nation.

We realize, of course, that all modes of communication—radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and other information media—are highly significant, particularly in a republic where progress of the nation—and the effectiveness of its governing bodies—depend upon a well-informed citizenry.

Recently, the Midland Cooperator published an informative article on the history as well as current operation of WHA. Reflecting the splendid way in which WHA—historically and currently—serves to keep our people well informed, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN CLAIMS PIONEER RADIO STATION—WHA IS "MOTHER" TO NETWORK STRETCHING OVER ENTIRE STATE

(By Doris Ardelt)

Wherever Wisconsin's best-known "traveling saleslady" goes—a tape recorder goes along, which accounts in no small measure for the tremendous listening audience of Mrs. Aline Hazard's "Homemakers Program" heard daily at 10 a.m. over the Wisconsin State Broadcasting Service.

Not content with a "run-of-the-mill" homemakers' program, Mrs. Hazard travels throughout Wisconsin, ferreting out the unusual industries, people and places, and tells the rest of Wisconsin about them.

Mrs. Hazard has presented the word-pictures of such unusual Wisconsin industries as mink raising in Jefferson county; sphagnum moss growing in Millston; earth worm growing in Tomah; musical Christmas trees from Lodi; Cheesweet candy from Milwaukee; herb greenhouses from Baraboo; cranberry products and marshes around Wisconsin Rapids and Spooner.

She has visited turkey farms, duck farms, muck farmers, apple orchards sorghum mills, papermills, deer farms, woodcarving museums, historic Wisconsin sites, logging camps; talked with a group of Price County homemakers who made their own community job survey, and has literally sold Wisconsin to Wisconsin.

However, the homemakers program is just a small portion of the widespread coverage provided to Wisconsin listeners by the oldest station in the Nation—WHA, and its affiliated network—the Wisconsin State Broadcasting Service.

This network, composed of two AM stations and eight FM stations, is unique in this country. With receiver-transmitter sites located at Auburndals, Madison, Delafield, Chilton, Rib Mountain, Colfax, West Salem, Highland, and Brule, its educational programing reaches into every corner of the State, and beyond.

An educational, noncommercial network, it offers music, lectures, political forums, farm programs, weather roundups, market reports, stereo concerts, reading of current books, in-school listening programing, operas, concerts, university classroom lectures, speeches and interviews with visiting greats, all services which can be utilized in classrooms as well as to be enjoyed in the home. Visitors from other States and around the world visit the parent station WHA, located on the university campus, to observe its daily workings.

The entire network of FM stations broadcast Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. The two AM stations must sign off at sundown. Saturday programing is carried on WHA–AM only, and on Sunday, WHA and WHA–FM sign on at 9:00 a.m. The State FM network and WLHL signs on at noon. This has proven to be the most economical way to utilize the funds budgeted for this tax-supported statewide network.

All the stations in the network carry the same programs simultaneously through a simple, but powerful, pickup and rebroadcasting arrangement. The "mother" station—WHA—is the initiating point. The various network stations interrupt the programing only for their identifying station breaks and twice-a-day participation in weather roundup programs. In this way the various parts of the State present the weather picture for the day, and inform State residents of the overall Wisconsin weather picture.

It all started with the oldest station in the Nation—WHA, back in the year 1917, with the late Earle M. Terry, physics professor of the University of Wisconsin. In trying to stimulate interest in radio he may well have made the understatement of that year when he said—"Gentlemen, the time will come when wireless receivers will be as numerous as bathtubs in Wisconsin homes."

The early days of broadcasting are a story of scientific experimentation in university laboratories throughout the country. At the University of Wisconsin, Professor Terry, along with others with imagination—notably Prof. W. H. Lighty, director of extension teaching, and Prof. Andrew W. Hopkins, agricultural editor, grasped the significance that this plaything might have in reaching the boundaries of Wisconsin.

Wireless telegraph transmission had been in operation for years, before the onset of broadcasting, as it is known today. By 1915 daily weather reports were being sent out regularly by wireless telegraph transmission at the University of Wisconsin. In that year a Government license was issued for the university transmitter and the call 9XM assigned—9 for the 9th area of the United States—the "X" for experimental—and the "M" designating Madison.

From telegraphy, Professor Terry and his young student wireless-experimenters turned to telephony. Weird, garbled noises at first, the sound signals were improved to transmit voices and music. Hawaiian music was said to have given the best results because of its twangy character. Distortion made the broadcasts almost unintelligible in the early stages.

In the summer of 1917 Malcolm Hanson, a former student of Professor Terry's while on duty and engaged in radio work at various Great Lakes naval taining posts, reported hearing several telephonic broadcasts from the University of Wisconsin. As a result, the year 1917 was marked as the beginning of telephonic transmission from the University of Wisconsin.

WHA—the oldest station in the Nation—bases its claim on continuous broadcasting from 1917. On July 31, 1918, the Navy Department, which controlled wireless transmission, ordered all radio stations dismantled as a wartime precautionary measure. Close on the heels of this order came another authorizing the university stations to rebuild for experimental service to the Nation. Spurred on by this concession, the Wisconsin workers advanced in telephonic broadcasting, scheduling regular broadcasts and keeping detailed records of the results.

On January 3, 1920, a daily schedule of telephonic weather reports was started. According to Federal weather bureau officials, this was the first regular telephonic weather broadcasting service to be carried on in this country. Soon new services were added, including market and produce reports for farmers. Together, these broadcasts formed the backbone of the early service.

From such modest beginning, the numerous other broadcasting services have grown. When the legislature is in session at the capitol in Madison, legislators from both houses participate in legislative forum speaking to their constituents back home. U.S. Senators from Wisconsin report to the voters on Washington Reports. This State-owned network is really used by the people of Wisconsin.

Under the leadership of Prof. Andrew W. Hopkins the service was developed to meet the particular needs and interests of Wisconsin farmers. Radio has made it possible for farmers—even those living in remote areas—to get daily firsthand information and research results direct from their college of agriculture.

Professor Hopkins has also served as a member of the University Radio Committee. It was under Professor Hopkins' guidance that another important WHA broadcast feature developed—the Homemakers Program. Started in 1926 to give housewives reliable information on a variety of home subjects every day, this program has developed into an outlet for presenting Wisconsin to Wisconsin.

Mrs. Hazard, who believes that besides homemaking information, the housewives of Wisconsin want to know what is going on in their State, has a listening audience today of almost as many men as women.

The oldest, the largest, this broadcasting service with its eight FM stations and two AM stations has moved the boundaries of Wisconsin to the far corners of the world.

Address by Patrick A. Tompkins, Commissioner of Public Welfare, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Given at the Governors' Conference on the Aging, April 20, 1960, at Concord, N.H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the Governors' Conference on the Aging, held April 20, 1960, Hon. Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner of public welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and one well qualified by education and experience to talk on the subject, made a most informative and effective speech that might well be entitled, "Public Assistance and Services on the Problems of the Aged." In view of the position occupied by Commissioner Tompkins, and his profound experience in the field of public welfare, the remarks of Commissioner Tompkins are worthy of profound consideration.

It is with pleasure that I include his splendid address in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY PATRICK A. TOMPKINS, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WELFARE, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, GIVEN AT THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON THE AGING, APRIL 20, 1960, AT CONCORD, N.H.

I am more than delighted to be a participant in this, the New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Aging. Although the topic assigned to me by your distinguished chairman, my fellow State public welfare commissioner, is entitled, "Public Assistance and Services," I shall indulge in both poetic and Boston license to address myself to the problems of the aged, the services needed, and the responsibility of public welfare leadership in recognizing problems and providing services, not alone to the aged individual, but to the aging population as a whole. In the evolution of population changes in this country, as crystallized during and at the end of World War II with increasing and accelerating warning signals by a succession of demographic studies through 1958, the aged as a group began to emerge as a special unique, maligned, misunderstood, frequently exploited, sometimes demanding, sometimes meek, but always a larger minority of our country's population; and, as their numbers grew and as more studies were made, more warnings were issued, dire predictions forecast, yet two inescapable facts impressed the student, the researcher, the administrator, be he an administrator of health, welfare, or insurance, the political leader, and the everyday citizen: (1) The economics of the problem of the aged was of national concern and not solely a local responsibility; (2) The aged as a group are self-sufficient, well integrated, responsible human beings—provided their economic problems have been resolved.

True, many aged individuals as individuals present problems; the chronic physical maladies for which protection and remedial medical care must be not only initiated but also provided by resources outside of their homes and families; mental illness requiring institutional or hospital care for the protection of the individual and protection of society; special problems of living arrangements with inlaws, the need for available

and continuing spiritual consolation, cultural and recreational opportunities, on occasion even part-time or full-time employment, plus healthy hobbies to foster inner and spiritual growth. And for these individual problems, the local community in some measure and with increasing awareness, understanding, and better utilization of existing tools and resources is well equipped to provide.

Each of his succession of studies and reports on the aging problem, whether national in character, statewide, or limited to more provincial or local scopes, further crystallized as the number one problem of the aged the two-pronged threat of fear of disease or accident necessitating hospital care and the fear of economic and financial disaster should disease or accident strike. Certainly, the high desirability of preventive health care has been emphasized, as has been expanded diagnostic facilities, better, improved, and expanded home-care programs plus research and demonstration projects for community health services. But overshadowing all of these constructive and desirable observations and recommendations, is the special report on hospitalization insurance for Old Age and Survivors Insurance beneficiaries submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means of the National Congress on April 3, 1959, by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This study and report was, in fact, submitted to the Congress in compliance with a congressional request for such a study known as House Report No. 2288.

Merely as a digression, I think it important to point out that even if preventive health care, home care, and diagnostic facilities were available in all communities, it is highly questionable that the aged person who believes he is in good health can be expected to spend his limited available income when there is no localized or obvious complaint, disease, or injury, particularly in the light of the present high cost of medical services including the cost of prescribed medication.

The hospital insurance report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made no precise and specific recommendations. Yet, no impartial or objective review of the findings—included in the report as to the annual income of persons over the age of 65, the incidence and duration of hospital care for this age group, and the demonstrated longer duration of hospital care for those having no hospital insurance could evade the inescapable conclusion that social insurance for hospital benefits is an absolute necessity now if not long overdue. There are 16 million persons over 65 years of age; 2,500,000 of these have some employment; 8,800,000 receive some old-age and survivors insurance; 2,500,000 receive old-age assistance. Of the total of 16 million, over three-fifths had income from all sources of less than $1,000 annually—virtually the actual cost of a hospital bill for an aged person at modern-day, inflated hospital costs for a serious illness or accident.

Less than 40 percent of these 16 million aged persons had any form of health or hospital insurance and a large portion of the insurance coverage available was inadequate both as to the per diem hospital payment or the limited number of days of coverage the insurance would provide. More significant, the cost of commercial or nonprofit insurance policies is prohibitive when the group contract of the employee in business or industry is continued upon retirement on an individual contract basis. Even more catastrophic is the purchase of two individual contracts for husband and wife out of retirement funds whereas the employee group contract at much lower cost and with higher income also covered the dependent wife.

There are and have been pending before Congress for some years legislative proposals for expanding and extending Old Age and Survivors Insurance so as to include hospital and nursing home benefits to currently insured beneficiaries. Probably the best known, since it is the original and oldest such legislative proposal, is H.R. 4700 popularly known as the Forand bill. This is a very simple legislative proposal. It provides that the taxable wage base shall be raised to $6,000 per annum, and the tax on the employer and employees alike shall be increased by one-half of one percent in order to provide for hospital, nursing home, and surgical costs of retired persons and their spouses not to exceed 60 days in any one year. It provides for admission to a duly licensed hospital or nursing home upon referral by a physician who is freely selected by the sick person.

So, there is nothing complex and, in fact, nothing new in a sense about such a proposal. As long ago as 1935, the national Congress, exercising the will of the people of this country, established a compulsory social insurance plan to combat the hazards of employment, advanced age, the death of the breadwinner, and permanent disability and impairment. There has been a "watch dog" advisory fiscal council which, from time to time, has assured the people of America and Congress that the trust fund out of which beneficiaries are paid is in sound, solvent actuarial condition. Indeed, it has indicated in no uncertain language that the soundness of Congressman Forand's bill cannot be challenged despite the projected cost of $1 billion during the first year of its operation if the legislation were enacted.

The American Medical Association has charged that the proposal constitutes socialized medicine. Such a charge is spurious when, in fact, there is no fundamental difference between the method of selection of a doctor under this insurance plan or the method of payment for physicians' services than is presently followed by the nonprofit Blue Shield plan or the commercial insurance plans presently operating. In fact, H.R. 4700 and companion bills in the U.S. Senate, sponsored by Senators KENNEDY and HUMPHREY, are, in the final analysis, a merely solvent method of payment of hospital, nursing home, and surgical bills, and more important, no new administrative machinery needs to be created. The OASI trust fund is already established and can absorb this new responsibility.

The principles of this legislation have been overwhelmingly endorsed by organized labor, and the individual worker whom you consult is more than delighted to start paying today for insured hospital and nursing home coverage for the days of his retirement when his income is so limited. Also note that the employee pays only when he is working and the contract is nonconceliable. How many persons pay for years to Blue Cross or commercial insurance, get sick or disabled once and find their insurance cancelled?

The elimination of the high-risk cases of the aging population from present Blue Cross and other nonprofit and commercial health insurance carriers would, in fact, increase the sales attraction of a better health package to the currently employed and younger employees when they are at their earning peak. Equally important is that the insured, in accordance with our social insurance system, would pay not a flat rate premium but one-half of 1 percent of his earnings whether the employee made $2,000, $4,000, or $6,000.

Of course, the extension and expansion of an insurance system, which has become in the last 25 years an American way of life for the American workingman and his dependents, is inextricably interwoven with administrative and political problems. In our democratic system, it is the special prerogative of our elected representatives to differ in philosophy, to compromise so long as principles are not compromised, and to weld a protective fabric against the hazards to security which are ever present in an industrial economy as fast moving as that of America's.

Yet, today, there is ample financial and statistical data to adequately demonstrate that, at least for the aged population over 65, the most demanding inroad on the available limited income of the retired person and his spouse is no longer made by the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing, but, rather, by the actual cost of medical, hospital, and nursing home. For example, in Massachusetts, 45 percent of the old-age assistance dollar is spent for medical need and one-third of that medical expenditure is for hospital care and almost one-half for nursing home care. For 18 months, over 50 percent of all applications for old-age assistance in Massachusetts have in fact been referred by and taken at the bedside of the applicant in the hospital or in the nursing home. Though retirement funds from whatever source may meet the basic necessities of food, shelter, and clothing, a hospital or nursing home bill becomes financial disaster and the aged person is forced to the indignity of applying for and receiving public aid. Indeed, the hospital and nursing home administrator is the chief source of referral for public welfare business today.

Unfortunately, there are no studies available as to the pressures and tensions created among sons and daughters who are either legally forced or by pride attempt to assume these catastrophic costs of hospital and nursing care with immeasurable harm to their home and family life and limitation of educational opportunities for their own children.

Again emphasizing the rights of both elected and administrative officials in Government and representatives of interested and organized groups to differ, it appears remarkable that in the light of the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, submitted to the National Congress on April 3, 1959, that almost 1 year later in testimony at an executive session of the House Ways and Means Committee of the National Congress on the subject of medical care for the aged, the Secretary, testifying specifically on H.R. 4700, the Forand bill, said, "* * * therefore I want to make it clear that as an administration, we will oppose any program of compulsory health insurance." The Secretary continued by stating, "* * * at the same time, I desire to emphasize again that I believe that continued progress in the direction of covering an increasingly large percentage of the aged by voluntary hospital insurance programs will still leave us with serious problems. There will still be aged persons whose policies provide inadequate protection. Also there will still be aged persons who will have no protection but who would be willing to participate in voluntary programs if provided with policies at rates that they could afford to pay. This administration—indeed all thoughtful citizens—are acutely aware of the need for approaching these problems with a sense of urgency."

Still later the Secretary stated, "Before arriving at a final conclusion as to whether the Federal Government can devise within this framework of principles a practical program, it is going to be necessary for us to explore further some complex issues." And still later in his testimony, the Secretary said, "We have not reached a conclusion as to the best manner in which to deal with such basic issues as these. In the effort to arrive at sound conclusions, it will be necessary for us to begin immediately to consult further with experts in Government, with outside experts

and groups, and with State officials. It is, of course, not possible to predict the length of time that it will take for these consultations."

If this problem must now be approached with a sense of urgency, the implication is clear that, despite the report rendered by the Department 1 year ago and the inescapable conclusions that must be drawn from that report, no sense of urgency had, in fact, existed either during the time that the report was being developed or in the year since it was presented to the Ways and Means Committee. The fact that, since Mr. Flemming testified, a number of alternative measures have been independently introduced by members of both major political parties in both branches of the Congress, suggests that the urgency merits not further study, further consultation with experts both in and out of Government, but rather the enactment of full-scale coverage of all persons over the age of 65 for purposes of hospital and nursing home protection. The Forand bill in the House and the Kennedy and Humphrey bills in the Senate are simple prepaid insurance bills which add to the present basic necessities of life for the aging population a new and more compelling basic necessity of life—hospital and nursing home care. Psychologically, they eliminate the greatest and most poignant threat to the business of growing old, the fear which accompanies advancing age as to imminent illness or accident, and how medical care is to be secured.

There have been so many studies as to the scope of this problem, the need has been so well defined that one of the most eminent of our newspaper reporters, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, has in the past 6 weeks devoted six separate and distinct columns to this problem. The Washington Post during the week of March 28 wrote an erudite editorial in support of the Forand bill and stated in part, "We think that President Eisenhower has put his party not only on the unpopular side of this issue but also on the wrong side of it." The editorial ended with the following quote: "Why automobile workers—and wage earners in every other trade and industry—should be enthusiastically eager to pay during their productive years for this kind of protection in old age should be readily understandable to anyone in political life. There is no more compelling aspect of social security."

In summary, the problem of hospital and nursing-home insurance for aged and retired employees and their dependents is the great and compelling humane issue of today. It is the great reassurance in terms of services and social security that aged persons want and demand. The substitute plans now before Congress would inevitably double and more than double present public welfare expenditures both in terms of administrative costs and insurance costs for hospital services. The continuance of the means test would be extended to all who desired to participate and be covered by the voluntary insurance plans. They heap indignity upon indignity and fail to face up courageously to the problem of today. This is the basic service that the leadership in public welfare should espouse and encourage by every means legitimately available. The savings to general revenue funds and expenditures out of public welfare appropriations would be enormous not only today but for challenging years ahead. The American Public Welfare Association of which I am a member endorses H.R. 4700, Mr. FORAND'S bill, or any other bill embodying the principles of the Forand bill. Although I am professionally a product of the "case-work school" of social work, my 27 years of administration in public welfare convince me that national social insurance is the best social service for aged people. This particularly includes the Forand bill with its protection against the economic disaster of hospital and nursing home costs.

Dangers of Apathy in the Face of the Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, WNAC Radio, of Boston, has sponsored for some time, with the cooperation of the American Heritage Committee and the American Legion, a series of programs entitled "Dangers of Apathy." The purpose of these broadcasts is to bring about a strong and vigorous citizenry and an awareness of the dangers of international communism. The 75 separate programs making up the series, which have been programed over a 2-year period, will shortly be rebroadcast by WNAC, on a concentrated schedule.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate WNAC for its foresighted and spirited public service for the people of New England. I ask unanimous consent that an open letter from Norman Knight, president of the Yankee Network Division, which discusses the threats to our society from within, as well as from without, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 17, 1960]

AN OPEN LETTER TO MY FELLOW NEW ENGLANDERS

YANKEE NETWORK DIVISION,
RKO GENERAL, INC.,
Boston, Mass., April 17, 1960.

FELLOW AMERICANS: The time is now, not tomorrow or Wednesday or 1963. There are no "second chances" for the loser of the struggle in which America finds itself.

Only fools and Communists would convince us that communism has any real heart for world peace or compatibility with democracy. The Communists in Russia did not overthrow the czar—they butchered the members of the czar's successor—a liberal democratic government. Since 1917 the Russian Communists have used every falsehood, every broken promise, and every executioner's order of which they were capable for one objective; the creation of a world dictatorship.

This is a total struggle, a world crisis which extends without and exists within our borders. As dreadful as the Communist scourge without is, more vicious is the threat from within.

For only a strong and vibrant America can successfully resist further Communist inroads on the world's population (communism now controls over one-third of the world's population, one-fourth of the world's land area). Communists seek to mold men's minds, to accept communistic triumphs as inevitable, to portray peace and prosperity as Communist inventions and to identify social progress with communism. The party line as established by "Agitprop" (device of the U.S.S.R. Communist Party Central Committee) is effectively enforced throughout the world including America. Party discipline has never been stricter than it is now in America under the ruthless, fiery, fanatical, and devious leadership of Moscow-trained Gus Hall.

Unfortunately, the party is now united behind Hall and factionalism has been eliminated. In contrast, the forces exposing and fighting communism are handicapped by part-time leadership, interference from fellow travelers and, most of all, by the public's apathy.

In this struggle there are great towers of American strength who give us leadership. Here in New England, Richard Cardinal Cushing, beloved by all faiths, has set a standard in this field to which all may aspire. His is a contribution that only history will properly relate; for his patriotic actions in defending democracy's bastions here and around the world, legion as they are, include a far greater number which remain anonymous. Three hundred and sixty-five days a year His Eminence inspires a lasting faith in our American democracy and a sincere understanding of the moral values rooted in the Judeo-Christian traditions. Truly, America and the entire world can never be allowed to forget the magnificent dedication of this great prince of the church, so that his example may serve all.

We look constantly to Washington for the guiding hand and fearless leadership of another great American, J. Edgar Hoover, whose courage under every conceivable pressure has often given the Communists pause. Here is a man proud to be patriotic, selfless in his devotion to democracy and concerned only with service to his Nation and God.

A few great men such as Cardinal Cushing and Mr. Hoover cannot continue to accept the responsibility for all Americans; we need a general awareness of the problem and its solutions. Previously, I referred to apathy—"apathy," a word which Webster defines as "a lack of emotion" or "indifference." The general state of apathy among Americans must be overcome if democratic traditions are to be passed on to future generations of Americans.

In order to expose the Communist menace and to contribute to an awakened citizenry, WNAC radio in cooperation with the American Heritage Committee and the American Legion has presented 75 separate programs over a 2-year period, attracting speakers who can vividly demonstrate what J. Edgar Hoover calls Communist illusion and Democratic reality.

To realize maximum impact for this series titled "Dangers of Apathy," I am privileged to announce the scheduling of these programs on a basis heretofore unknown in any medium of communications.

WNAC's regular programs have been canceled twice daily, 5 days a week for 10 presentations a week (each of 15-minute length), so that all 75 programs can be heard twice a day by all. Listeners may tune to WNAC at 6:15 a.m. or at 6:15 p.m. Monday through Friday and hear every program in this series of public affairs broadcasts, presented as a public service.

You owe it to yourself—you owe it to America to listen this week and every week for the next 15 weeks to "Dangers of Apathy."

As I said at the beginning, the time is now, and our first step is to be alert to the dangers of apathy.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN KNIGHT,
President.

Old-Age Survivors and Disability Insurance—Past Major Changes in the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in view of current proposals for changes in the social security law, I

felt that Members and others might be interested in an excellent summary of past developments of this law as prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under the direction of Miss Helen E. Livingston of the Education and Public Welfare Division of that Service. I am therefore including it as part of my remarks.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD-AGE SURVIVORS AND DISABILITY INSURANCE LAW

The social security system provides two kinds of assistance for the aged, dependent children, and the severly disabled in this country: (1) a social insurance plan, commonly known as "Social Security," financed by tax contributions by workers and their employers and paying benefits on the basis of these contributions, and (2) Federal grants-in-aid for State plans for persons (including the blind) who can demonstrate need as defined by the State. This memo will be limited to a brief description of the development of the insurance, or social security plan.

In summary it could be said that three basic features of the social insurance program have remained unchanged since the system was established in 1935: (1) Benefits are paid as a matter of right to insured persons, without a need test; (2) the benefits are related to earnings, as contrasted with uniform or flat benefits to everyone; and (3) the system is financed entirely by equal payroll contributions for employers and employees (and related payments by the self-employed) as contrasted to systems financed from the general revenues. The system has always been on a self-supporting contributory basis (a requirement of the law since the 1950 amendments) without a general subsidy from the Federal Government.

The three major policy changes made by the Congress since 1935 were: (1) The shift of emphasis in 1939 from the private insurance principle based on individual equity to a family program through the payment of benefits to dependents and survivors rather than exclusively to the individual worker; (2) the change in 1950 from a plan primarily for workers in commerce and industry moving toward a universal plan for practically all individuals and families in the country dependent upon earnings of any kind; and (3) the addition of a new program for the severely disabled, accomplished by the disability freeze (a form of waiver of premium) in 1954, and by authorizing benefits for disabled persons aged 50 and over in 1956. Attached is a resume of major features of the Social Security (OASI) Act showing changes made by the Congress since the system was first established in 1935.

MAJOR FEATURES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY (OASI) PLAN SHOWING CHANGES MADE BY CONGRESS

Social Security Act of 1935 (Public Law 271, 74th Cong.)

Coverage: Workers under age 65 in commerce and industry (about 3 out of 5 of the labor force).

Type of benefit: Old-age benefits to the worker when he retired at or after age 65 together with cash-contribution refunds to survivors when the wage earner died and to living workers aged 65 who had not been in covered employment long enough to qualify for benefits.

Benefit amount: Weighted in favor of the worker with short service or low wages but increased for those who had contributed for many years.

Contribution rate: 1 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $3,000 a year. [The original tax rate was scheduled to increase, by steps, to 3 percent each by 1949 but, through so-called tax freeze legislation by the Congress it was held at the 1-percent rate until 1950.]

Retirement test:[1] Benefits canceled by any earnings from regular employment.

Nineteen thirty-nine amendments (Public Law 379, 76th Cong.)

Coverage: Extend to workers over 65.

Type of benefit: Extended to certain dependents of retired workers (aged wives, children under 18) and survivors (widows and children under 18) of deceased workers.

Benefit amount: Revised to reduce emphasis on length of contributions but still gave credit for each year of service. "Money back" guarantee eliminated. [In effect deemphasizing these features in favor of dependent and survivor—or "family"—benefits.]

Average primary benefit at the end of 1941 (first year benefits were paid), $22.60.

Contribution rate: The change did not ultimately become effective because of the "tax freeze" noted above.

Retirement test:[1] Allowed earnings of $14.99 per month from covered employment with no loss of benefit.

Nineteen hundred and fifty Amendments (Public Law 734, 81st Cong.)

Coverage: Considerably extended to some 10 million jobs, chiefly the nonfarm self-employed (except members of specified professions), regularly employed farm and domestic workers, employees of nonprofit institutions (on a group elective basis), and State and local government employees not covered by a retirement system (at the option of the employer).

Type of benefit: Extended to aged dependent husbands of women workers.

Benefit Amount: Roughly doubled through a revised benefit formula (still weighted in favor of low-income workers), with a related increase for beneficiaries already retired. Repealed provision giving credit for each year of service, and related benefit to more recent earnings.

Average primary benefit prior to amendments was $43.86.

Contribution rate: 1½ percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $3,600; to rise, by steps to 3¼ percent each in 1970 and thereafter.[2]

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $50 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Nineteen hundred and fifty two Amendments (Public Law 590, 82d Cong.)

Coverage: No change.

Type of benefit: No change.

Benefit amount: Increased benefits by about 15 percent (around $5). Average benefit in 1952: $49.25.

Contribution rate: No change.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $75 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four amendments (Public Law 761, 83d Cong.)

Coverage: Extended to another 10 million workers in the course of a year, including self-employed farmers, more domestic and farm workers, State and local government employees under retirement systems (at the option of the employer and the election of the group covered), ministers, and all self-employed professional groups previously excluded except lawyers, dentists, doctors, and other medical groups. (About 9 out of 10 workers in the labor force now covered.)

Type of benefit: The "disability freeze" provision—essentially a "waiver of premium" clause was adopted to maintain both the insured status of severely disabled workers at any age, and their benefit amount.

Benefit amounts: Increased by about 15 percent by a change in the benefit formula. Average old-age benefit: $59.14 at end of 1954.

Contribution rates: Increased to 2 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $4,200 to increase to a maximum of 4 percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $1,200 a year, with one benefit deducted for each $80 or fraction thereof above this amount, except that no earnings could be deducted for any month in which earnings were $80 or less.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six amendments (Public Law 880, 84th Cong.)

Coverage: Self-employed lawyers, dentists, and all medical groups (except physicians) and members of the uniformed services.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for severely disabled persons aged 50 and over; age for women lowered to 62 paying full benefits for widows at that age but actuarially reduced benefits for widows and women workers unless they delay retirement to age 65.

Benefit amounts: No change.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2¼ percent each for employers and employees (the additional one-fourth percent to finance the disability benefits plan through a separate trust fund) to increase to a maximum of 4¼ percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight amendments (Public Law 85–840)

Coverage: Minor extensions.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for the dependents of severely disabled persons aged 50 to 64, inclusive.

Benefit amounts: Increased by 7 percent. Average old-age benefit: $66.04 in late 1958.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2½ each for employer and employees on wages up to $4,800 to increase, by steps, to 4½ percent in 1969 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change except that no earnings can be deducted for any month in which earnings were $100 (formerly $80) or less.

[1] Also known as "work test" or "income limitation."

[2] The rate for the self-employed is 1½ times the employee rate.

Mundt Resolution Would Curtail Sheep and Lamb Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry overwhelmingly approved a resolution which I introduced to convey to the U.S. Tariff Commission the sentiment of our committee that the American sheep and lamb industry, is entitled to adequate protection against ruinous foreign imports.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION AGREED TO APRIL 27, 1960, BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY FOR SUBMISSION TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION REGARDING LAMB AND MUTTON IMPORTS

Whereas this committee in 1954 and in 1958 reported out bills which were enacted by Congress to encourage the domestic production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool annually; and

Whereas this legislation provides for incentive payments on wool in order to encourage increased production and to meet costs of such production; and

Whereas in the enactment of this legislation this committee assumed that the lamb phase of the sheep industry would be operating in a free market without price supports; and

Whereas imports have shown a rapid increase in volume during the past 3 years growing from .81 million pounds of dressed lamb in 1956 to 9.5 million pounds of dressed lamb in 1959, and growing from .56 million pounds of dressed mutton in 1956 to 47.3 million pounds in 1959; and

Whereas imports have risen from practically 0 percent of our commercial lamb and mutton slaughter to 7.78 percent in only 3 years, which displays a trend that could become disastrous; and

Whereas live sheep and lamb imports in 1959 totaled 75,073 head including 27,000 head from Canada and approximately 48,000 head from Australia, the latter being the beginning of a regular movement of live lambs from that country; and

Whereas this greatly increased volume of imports is arriving here at prices considerably under those for domestic lamb and mutton, raised in countries where production costs are much lower than ours and with the majority of imports coming into the sensitive lamb price setting areas of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles; and

Whereas this undue market pressure from imports has affected prices received by the American producers of lamb and mutton; and

Whereas there is abundant red meat production in the United States for domestic needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that remedial action should be taken under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to provide adequate protection for, and to avert injury to, the domestic sheep industry.

A New Era for the Pompano Beach Town News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 of this year a new era began for one of the rapidly growing areas of the Sixth District of Florida with the publication of a daily newspaper.

The Pompano Beach Town News of Pompano Beach, Fla., formerly a semiweekly paper, began publication as a daily paper this month. The daily will be associated with the Miami Herald of Miami, Fla., long an outstanding newspaper in Florida and the Nation.

I would like to extend congratulations and best wishes to Publisher Francis Zent and Editor Margaret Moore and the entire staff of the Town News for a successful future in the north Broward County area.

The editorial, "Town News Goes Daily and Launches New Era," which appeared in the paper on April 12, will be of interest to all of those who follow the growth and development of Florida, and for this reason I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

TOWN NEWS GOES DAILY AND LAUNCHES NEW ERA

As a new era begins for the Pompano Beach Town News, with a publication of today's daily issue, it is difficult to suppress a feeling that a new era has begun for North Broward County, too.

Residents may be surprised at the inspiring effect that an alert, objective and forward-looking local daily newspaper can have upon an area.

It can—and the new Town News certainly will—change the whole air of a place, giving a crispness and immediacy to civic and governmental affairs that is felt through the warp and woof of the region.

An area turns a corner, tops the crest of a hill, when it reaches the point of having its own daily newspaper—when its newspaper, that is, says goodby to a weekly status and undertakes to interpret local affairs from hour to hour.

Civic groups sense the change. So does business, and so does government. All will be improved by it; all will be more alert and more effective, and through them, the citizen will feel the change.

The new Town News will bind North Broward together as it has never been bound before—and in so doing, will bind North Broward also to the rest of the county.

At the same time, this segment of the county will become more of an entity, less of an appendage to the more populous Fort Lauderdale area. It will don a new personality, speak with a louder voice, move ahead with more certainty and aggressiveness, tackle its problems with more confidence and vigor.

The combination of the Town News and the Miami Herald, the latter one of the world's great newspapers, an international authority and certainly the recognized voice of Florida, will give North Broward a news package of incomparable scope and proportions.

And in all things the two publications will be just, honorable, and fair, shunning personal ax grinding, devoted to progress, striving to be objective, penetrating, and articulate, at the same time sensitive to and sympathetic with the changing moods and needs of these communities.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the varied resources of New Jersey have been described by its ardent citizens on many occasions, and there is one resource which should receive special attention during this, Chemical Progress Week. I am referring to the chemical industry of the Garden State.

An editorial in the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News of April 26 describes this New Jersey industry and points out that New Jersey ranks first in the Nation in the manufacture of chemicals and allied products.

The location of New Jersey and its skilled work force, together with other advantages, have persuaded many manufacturers to locate there, and they are certainly welcome.

Mr. President, the Herald-News editorial gives an interesting account of present activity and future possibilities. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY, THE CHEMICAL STATE

The chemical industry is observing this week as Chemical Progress Week. It is a week which has especial significance for New Jersey. Our State could be called the "Chemical State" more properly than the Garden State.

New Jersey ranks first in the Nation in the manufacture of chemicals and allied products. It has more than 850 chemical plants and laboratories and approximately 86,000 persons employed in the industry. Their wages total more than $481,289,000 annually. By comparison New York, our nearest competitor, has 68,000 persons employed in chemicals and Texas, which ranks No. 3 in the Nation, has 40,000 employed.

There are many things about the chemical industry that make it desirable. Wage rates are among the highest paid by American industry. It requires a generally higher level of skill, which means higher per capita income. The cost per worker of plants is the highest of all industry. This makes the plants excellent tax sources. The plants are generally quiet, clean, extremely safety conscious, and careful about pollution.

The most desirable feature is that the industry is growing at a furious rate, with the sky the limit. A few of the items listed in the industry's 1960 facts book as possibilities for "the near future" offer an idea of its future prospects. They include "an automobile with no engine; power would come from a small cylinder on each wheel holding oxygen and hydrogen gases; chemicals to control heredity and animal behavior; plastic domes to place over entire houses and yards for year-around climate control; new pain-killing drugs many times more powerful than morphine, but are nonhabit forming."

New Jersey is fortunate to be the favored home of the chemical industry.

Activities of the Home Loan Bank Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker a few weeks ago in my Washington report to my constituents I discussed the invisible and faceless bureaucracy operating through boards, bureaus and commissions, so that our citizens are governed by people they have never seen, never voted for, cannot recall through any process of law, and who administers more administrative law than statute law.

Last week this was brought home most forcibly by the arbitrary, capricious, conspiratorial and unwarranted seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association by the Home Loan Bank Board under the guise of an "emergency." However, in making their announcement of this sudden and unwarranted move, they cited a list of allegations which they said had been in existence since 1947, 1948, and 1949. If these grounds existed 12 years ago, it was the duty of the Home Loan Bank Board to make its move at that time rather than to wait until this savings and loan was in the process of converting from a Federal to a State charter.

The Home Loan Bank Board made false and libelous statements about the management, and caused a run on the association. If any citizen of the United States made such allegations causing a run on a banking or a lending institution, he would find himself in the toils of the law, and would be prosecuted. This seizure is apt to cause a great financial loss to the depositors who are the shareholders of this association, of the surpluses which this association had built up.

It is conspiratorial because the Home Loan Bank Board discharged the personnel of the association and installed many personnel of competing institutions in Southern California. The Home Loan Bank Board agent forced the delivery to him of $22 million in cash and Government bonds and posted no more than a $1 million fidelity bond, when the bond should have been equal in amount to the cash and Government bonds delivered to him.

I have joined with several other Members of Congress in Southern California in asking for a complete and immediate investigation of the activities of the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, its employees and agents, in order to protect the depositors of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include herewith an editorial on this subject from the Newport Harbor News Press in my district.

Armed with a certified copy of a Federal Home Loan Bank Board order, 44 "auditors, accountants, examiners, and assorted personnel" moved in on the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association Friday evening with a seizure order.

Despite the listing of false charges in the order, the avowed purpose for the seizure was to prevent the shareholders and management of the association from converting it into a State mutual savings and loan association that would be free from the arbitrary and capricious abuse of authority and administration of the Federal Home Bank Board, and its alter-ego the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

It was on May 20, 1946, shortly before 9 a.m. when the first seizure of the association was undertaken for the sole and expressed purpose of "creating a run on the association and destroying it." Your writer was there that morning as a reporter for the Los Angeles Examiner. Over the years we have kept abreast of the hundred lawsuits and hearings at various stages of progress now in the courts.

During the hold on the association exercised by one A. V. Amman, Assistant Secretary of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the deposits in the association were depleted by two thirds. So poorly was the administration of this minion of the Federal bureau exercised that neither he, nor the FBI auditors have ever been able to make a satisfactory accounting.

When, under a court order, the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association was returned to its rightful founding management in 1948, the association again began to grow. Where it was a $30 million association when seized, depleted to a $12 million association when returned, in the interim it has grown to $100 million since 1948.

Members of the Attorney General's staff of the United States have admitted on the witness stand that they (1) trumped up charges against management for horsetrading purposes; (2) endeavored to obtain indictments for income tax evasion by principals of management although admittedly no evasion or wrong existed.

The present seizure was likely brought in order to (1) prevent the conversion of the association to a State association, thus permit it to escape Federal harassment; (2) liquidate outside of court the suit of management for recovery of $10 million of misappropriated assets by Federal agents; (3) abscond to the Federal Bureau with the $6 million surplus which belongs to depositors.

Why should we in the Newport Harbor News-Press devote this much space to a story relating to a Federal incident 20 miles removed from the community?

The writer is the publisher of the Newport Harbor News-Press. As a reporter "on the beat in Long Beach" for the Los Angeles Examiner he covered the first seizure in 1946. Because he searched and studied and fought the wrongful acts of U.S. Government employees he was nominated as director by the principals of a shareholders committee. He was elected, reelected. In the interim he has attended a score of congressional inquiries into the abuse of the minions of Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the U.S. Attorney General.

The newspaper reporter who witnessed the first seizure has had the opportunity to gain an education in finance and law, and public administration that would seldom come to a person in 15 years. He has seen the seamy side of Government agencies that have taken unto themselves the possessive interest of the citizens.

The writer over the years has learned to know that neither Democrat nor Republican has a copyright on wrong or on right. He has seen several administrations of the Government of the United States acknowledge the wrong that was perpetrated and yet do nothing.

We have seen Congressmen of California, CECIL KING, a Democrat; CHET HOLIFIELD, a Democrat; HARRY SHEPPARD, a Democrat; and JOHN PHILIPS, JAMES B. UTT, Republicans, fight tenaciously to assist in restoring to their constituents constitutional rights and guarantees and access to the courts for a trail on the merits of charges brought. HOWARD SMITH of Virginia presided over a congressional committee that damned the bank and insurance bureaus.

Government bureaus employ armies of public relations assistants for their administrators to disseminate their libels and frauds. They are free from suit and know no integrity, most are unemployable in legitimate news gathering channels.

There will probably be many libels. We urge you to follow the stories in this paper and in the metropolitan daily of your choice. There will be compilations of the most fabulous story ever told—each lie of bureaus of the U.S. Government will be another morsel of mortar in the tomb of democracy. We will search for the truth and print it here.

BEN REDDICK.

Social Security for Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement sent to me by Dr. Max Seham, of Minneapolis. This statement contains an analysis of the problem of retirement for members of the medical profession and the recommendations of Dr. Seham regarding the inclusion of members of the medical profession under social security.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR PHYSICIANS

(By Max Seham, M.D., Minneapolis, Minn.)

The only professional man in America not protected under the social security system is the self-employed physician.

Why? Are doctors different? Are they immune to misfortune? Are they a caste apart? Is it true, as the AMA says: that "doctors do not retire"?

The truth, of course, is that doctors get sick with the same illnesses they treat in their patients. Their eyes may see double with age. Their joints and muscles may become crippled with arthritis; their hearts may wear out; their arteries harden. And sooner or later, even if they don't retire themselves, their patients may put them on the retired list.

They have economic needs and problems, too. Not all of the 200,000 self-employed doctors in America attain financial independence. Long sieges of illness, bad investments, other misfortunes attack their economic security just as critically as though they were ordinary mortals. "Freedom from want" is a need of physicians just as it is for the rest of America's 175 million population.

For most of this 175 million, social security has become a major bulwark against want. In the face of economic change, marked increase in the number of aged, and the impact of two wars, the Federal social security system has stayed solvent and strong. In 1955, more than 75 million Americans benefited from it. As of last year, some $8 billion was paid out of a $23 billion trust fund to 12½ million retired workers and their dependents. Nine out of ten workers and their families have access to the system's protection. In the last 10 years the maximum benefits have increased from $85 monthly for a family to $254, and the ceiling on covered earnings has gone from $3,000 annual income to $4,800.

Of special benefit to practicing doctors is the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) program. Many a widow and her children could be kept from destitution if her husband were eligible for OASDI. For retired workers alone, benefits can range up to $116 a month. If a doctor now age 65 begins to pay contributions and continues for 4 years, he could be eligible for retirement benefits. If he were 69 now and still in practice, he would have to pay for one and a fraction years, but at age 72 he would be eligible whether he had retired or not. If his wife is beyond the age of 65, 50 percent more is payable.

Before entering into a discusison of social security for physicians, it is well to explain

the differences between social insurance as exemplified by social security and private insurance, whether in the form of annuity policies, disability and retirement insurance pensions, and so forth.

To claim that private insurance is a better buy than social insurance, is to say that bananas are a better fruit than peaches. Since their underlying philosophies are different, their benefits are incomparable. Social security is the appilication of the risk-sharing principle to the largest possible number of people. It attempts to distribute benefits to all who can participate on a contributory basis.

With private insurance, protection starts at the time of purchase of the policy. This plan continues benefits at the remarriages of a divorced or widowed spouse. Social security benefits cease under these circumstances. Under private insurance a person may draw benefits at age of 65, while under the other plan the benefits are drawn only upon retirement, and this may be at a later age than 65. Under a private annuity policy, the longer you pay premiums the more you get. Not so with social security. Unless Congress changes or amends the law, the benefits remain the same no matter how long the beneficiary has paid premiums provided he is qualified.

A practical advantage of social security is the fact that there are no exclusions and restrictions which prevent the aged from getting protection. In private insurance there are usually medical examinations before insurance is made available.

I have before me a circular from my State medical society which promises "an opportunity to obtain coverage for all ages regardless of medical history" through a proposed group life insurance program. On reading the fine print, I find that it is merely a life and accident policy with the rates perhaps somewhat lower than for individual life insurance policies. There are no provisions for disability insurance nor retirement benefits.

It is practically impossible for anyone over 60 to get disability and retirement benefits from private insurance companies. A colleague of mine, whose disability insurance ran out at the age of 70 after a siege of illness from which he recovered, sought desperately to obtain continuing protection. The insurance ads held out promises of large monthly payments for from 2 to 4 years including payments for hospitalization. After several months he was still hunting for a policy which would provide him with a coverage which would be at least equal to that of social security.

In the face of such facts, it is hard to understand why the AMA appears determined to exclude its membership from the system's benefits. At a time when both industry and organized labor are offering additions to social security protection, why is organized medicine, traditionally so paternal toward its members, so insistent on depriving them even of minimum protection?

The spokesmen of the AMA, testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee last summer, gave these reasons for their stand: (1) The social security system is actuarially unsound; (2) doctors do not retire; (3) most doctors don't want social security; and (4) the system is "creeping socialism."

Let us consider these arguments:

1. The social security system is actuarially unsound.

What does the AMA mean? That the system is financially insolvent? Does it mean that benefits received from social security are less and the premiums paid in taxes are higher than the policies the private insurance companies sell?

On both of these scores it seems that the AMA is as far out of step with the present administration as it was with the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. In his 1957 message to Congress President Eisenhower proclaimed, "The system is not intended as a substitute for private savings, pensions and insurance protection • • • It encourages thrift and self-reliance and helps to prevent destitution in our national life."

Because the OASI trust fund showed in 1957 and 1958 an excess of outgo over income, the AMA was fearful that "America faces financial bankruptcy and the collapse of the Republic." On this point Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, has no fear about the solvency of this trust fund because "Congress gives very conscientious consideration to the costs of the program. Up to date the contributions have been higher than the outgo. Any money left over goes into Government bonds which are just as valid as any that any insurance company holds." "I am quite confident that there will be no progressive increase of excess of outgo over income for the OASI trust fund in the near future," concludes Robert Myers in an address before the Cambria County Medical Society on March 12, 1959.

2. They say doctors do not retire.

The AMA has published figures to show that 85 percent of doctors between 65 and 72 are in active practice. Of those, 50 percent do not retire until after 74. Information from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that no one has been able to determine the percentage of doctors who actually do retire. It may be true, as the AMA claims, that most physicians do not retire at the proverbial 65, but it is not correct to conclude that few physicians would benefit from the retirement features of social security. Many physicians who are sick or partially disabled hang on as long as they can because they cannot afford to retire.

3. They say the majority of doctors do not want it.

Another argument of the AMA's high command against the inclusion of the membership in social security, is that the rank and file of the self-employed doctors have voted against it. It is true that in 1952 the polls taken by State medical societies showed the majority of practitioners voted against compulsory inclusion.

However, the most recent polls by the independent magazine, Medical Economics, show an impressive shift in sentiment. Of the 5,000 self-employed physicians who expressed an opinion in 1958, 56 percent favored compulsory social security coverage, 30 percent opposed it, and 14 percent were undecided. Fifty-four percent of general practitioners are for it, and 58 percent of specialists voted yes. Those longest in practice voted in favor of inclusion. Also in the larger communities a higher percent favored coverage. Even physicians in small communities and in rural areas, who in previous years had opposed social security, voted 51 percent in favor, 35 percent against, and 14 percent undecided. Among the reasons most frequently cited for wanting inclusion were: that (1) everybody else has it, (2) it's inevitable, so why postpone its benefits, (3) it's a bargain, and (4) it's a downright necessity.

As a New Haven surgeon puts it: "The $200 a month my widow and two children would draw if something happened to me adds up to the return of an investment of $40,000 at 6 percent a year. It would not affect any other investments I might have. And I can't for the life of me see how I would be giving up any of my personal freedom as some of my colleagues seem to feel."

Congress cannot be held altogether responsible for this impasse. At the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1958, Congressman FORAND revealed letters and telegrams voluntarily sent from every State in the Union, showing that over 2,000 doctors were in favor of being covered and only 135 were opposed. In spite of this 15-to-1 majority, powerful pressure by the AMA and other forces persuaded Congress not to act. Yet in spite of the AMA propaganda, as of 1958, the rank and file of the medical profession have come to realize that social security is here to stay and that it is false pride not to join the system.

The problem of inclusion of self-employed physicians cannot be swept under the carpet any longer. The results of the Medical Economics poll, the letters received by Congressmen, the resolutions endorsed by 26 State medical societies favoring inclusion, justify the assumption that a secret referendum of the total membership of the AMA would reveal a similar majority in favor. The evidence shows that the opposition of the house of delegates, the controlling policy body of the AMA, does not conform to the needs and wishes of the majority of American doctors. It is time that the AMA hierarchy yield to the wishes of its members and reverse its position before the 86th Congress.

4. It is creeping socialism.

The first three excuses for the opposition of the AMA are merely a facade for the most important reason.

Ever since the depression of the thirties, the AMA has been fighting anything that smacks of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and even New Republicanism. Whenever Congress has offered a progresisve health or social welfare measure, the AMA reflexly whips up the oft-repeated warning that all forms of public welfare will inevitably result in the averaging process and destroy individualism and initiative. Dr. Dwight Murray, in his presidential address before the house of delegates in 1958, had this to say: "We have been caught in the throes of a social revolution which demands something for nothing." Dr. George Lull, recently resigned as secretary of the AMA, feels no better about the Eisenhower administration than about the previous Democratic regimes. He writes, "They are attacking us piecemeal. Truman was easier to handle because he came on you head on trying to get socialized medicine enacted at once."

The leaders of the AMA, seeming to suffer from a persecution complex, talk and act as if there were a national conspiracy against the medical profession. With every new bit of social legislation, they fear that the days of American medicine are numbered. This chronic obsession that change means loss of prestige has rendered them impotent and unrealistic in medical economics. The AMA to the contrary, social security and the proposed amendments for coverage of doctors are not revolutionary. They are the logical and inevitable outcome of the great socio-economic-humanitarian changes that have been taking place in our country over the last quarter of a century.

Like all other Americans, physicians can buy accident, sickness, and retirement insurance in such amounts as they can afford and if they are able to pass their medical examinations. But many private practitioners do not have the incomes which will enable them to buy all the insurance they need for adequate protection for themselves and their families. This is especially true when physicians are of retirement age. Social security can help to mitigate such hardships.

Social security is an indispensible institution in our modern economic structure. Few people question the need for social security for themselves and their families. Yet the AMA, through its house of delegates, have taken upon themselves the grave responsibility of excluding 200,000 self-employed practicing doctors and their families from getting this protective floor.

Charles I. Schottland, former Commissioner of the Social Security Administration,

writes, "Personally I think it is unfortunate that physicians are not covered under social security. They are the only large group in the country not now covered. As I move about the country and talk to the younger physicians, I am convinced that most of them want the protection which social security gives to their wives and children."

No one expects social security to solve all economic problems for the individual doctor. Nor need there be any conflict between social insurance and the type of financial security which private insurance companies sell. The former represents the basic protection which can be provided by Government programs, while the latter gives the individual the right and the opportunity to get as high a protective ceiling as his thrift and business success allows. To quote Elizabeth Brandeis, the well-known sociologist, "Social security is more of a net to catch those who fall, rather than an overly soft featherbed."

Kansas Salt Mines—Underground Noah's Arks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include an article prepared by Mr. Ken Kluherz, development director at Sterling College, Sterling, Kans., entitled "Kansas Salt Mines—Underground Noah's Arks." Mr. Kluherz has devoted much of his spare time for the past 2 years researching the value of the Kansas salt mines as headquarters for top military leaders as well as civil defense. The chamber of commerce of Lyons has worked with Mr. Kluherz in exploring his ideas.

It is my belief that the following article contains vital information to the Nation's welfare, both for peace and war, and feel it merits the thoughtful consideration of this great legislative body. I ask your serious and thorough reading of its contents and know that after you have digested it thoroughly, you will be convinced that it should be given careful and complete investigation by our military leaders:

A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid (Matthew 5: 14)—but in 1959 S.A. (space age) the North American Air Defense Command (Norad) is hiding a city in a hill at a cost variously estimated from $28 million to $50 million.

The hidden city in a hill is being carved in the granite of Cheyenne Mountain, near Colorado Springs, Colo., for defense against missile attacks. When completed, the mountain cavern will cover an inner area of 100,000 square feet—roughly a little over 2 acres—and will house 1,200 men in a safe place for the purpose of directing a missile defense program.

The underground command post (a joint project of the United States and Canada) will receive radar data, send out national alerts, guide all enemy missile interceptions, and will be under the direct command of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada.

The military is not alone in considering underground shelters a necessity in this space age. Jack Galt of Cincinnati, executive director of the Ohio Valley Civil Defense Authority, is asking 1 million Ohio families to build their own nuclear fallout shelters.

At Pleasanton, Calif., in November, 17 naval officers and civilian engineers completed a 72-hour experimental stay in a tomblike underground shelter built at a cost of $22,000. Emerging unshaven and unbathed, the men said they experienced no pain and no strain as they lived on survival rations, a minimum of water, little exercise, and no piped-in entertainment.

In 1958 the Rand Corp. made a study of nonmilitary defenses. In a subsequent report they estimated that due to lack of deep shelters and fallout shelters half of the population of the United States would be killed in an atomic attack. They concluded the report with a suggestion that a $200 million study be made to determine means for the ordinary citizen to protect himself, his factories and goods in underground hideouts.

Thus, the list of those interested in promotion of underground shelters is endless and a renewed interest in survival caverns has taken place since Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, posed a hypothetical problem to the Office of Civil Defense (OCD). So that a specific study could be made of fallout dangers, the problem assumed an enemy attack would be made on the United States October 17, 1959, at 7 a.m. eastern standard time. Seventy-one target areas were listed in the problem and it was based on a realistic assumption that could definitely be expected to occur in case of an all-out enemy missile attack.

After careful study of population, weather, and other factors in the target areas on the specified date, Eugene J. Quindland, Deputy Assistant Director of OCD, released an estimate that 48.9 million men, women, and children would perish and 28 million others would be injured.

Terrible as the figures sound, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller heaved a public sigh of relief since previous estimates by experts Dr. Charles Shafer and Dr. William Kellog were as high as 108 million casualties in the United States and, of course, New York City would have the highest percentage.

Fantastic as it may seem, underground shelters may prove to be the 20th century version of Noah's Ark. They may be the means of saving a remnant of the people from fire instead of flood.

From both a military and civilian standpoint the Nation might well look to Kansas for some really king-size underground shelters. Already existing in Kansas are several underground Noah's Arks that by comparison make the Norad Cheyenne Mountain headquarters and Noah's Ark of Genesis seem as small as a mustard seed.

The underground Noah's Arks of which I speak are the Kansas salt mines, any one of which could not only house, in safety and comfort, the 1,200-man staff of Norad headquarters but the entire staff of the Pentagon plus several thousand civilians.

Before the tremendous potential of Kansas salt mines as safety shelters can be realized the inherent fear of mines harbored by most of the people must be abated. That is part of the purpose of this article.

Generally speaking, people are frightened of any space deep in Mother Earth's lap. This fear is largely because of mine disasters which make sensational news when they occur. But, a Kansas salt mine by no stretch of the imagination is comparable to most mining operations from a safety standpoint.

There is perhaps no place on earth (or in earth) safer from either a natural or a man-made disaster than a well-worked Kansas salt mine. This observation is no spur-of-the-moment comment but is made in all seriousness after numerous trips by the writer into various salt mines during the past 2 years and in which dozens of miners were interviewed at their daily task. I think most people would agree it is the safest place on earth if they would take a look with their own eyes as I have many times.

Unlike most mining operations, there are no heavy timbers or steel beams used for shoring up the overburden in a salt mine. The overburden is solid rock and presents no cave-in or shifting problems.

Salt deposits, compressed into solid rock by extreme pressure, were laid down by evaporation from an ancient midland sea some 200 million years ago. The layer varies in thickness from 300 to 400 feet. The Kansas salt beds form a subterranean "Rock of Gibraltar" in about two-thirds of the State, or an area about 200 miles long and 100 miles wide. The same salt beds extend south to the vicinity of the Gulf of Mexico. This single salt deposit contains an estimated 30,000 billion tons, world's largest known salt deposits, and even though a million tons are taken annually the salt beds have barely been scratched.

For purposes of this discussion, we will cite statistics mostly from a single mine, the American salt mine at Lyons (Rice County), Kans. This mine, an even 1,000 feet deep, is as comfortable and clean a place to work as can be found most anywhere.

When interviewing Jim Dinsmore, American Mine foreman, after he answered a long series of questions concerning comfort and safety in the mine, he added a touch of humor with, "Besides, we never get sunburned, and with a ceiling 1,000 feet thick, we're never bothered with a leaky roof." That simple statement points up a situation realized by few people. Salt mines do not have the many common hazards of other mining operations. There is no explosive gas or dust to contend with. There is no bad air. Everything—over, under, and around for hundreds of feet—is fireproof. Not only fireproof but solid. It takes dynamite to blast the rock salt into chunks so big mining machines can handle it. Even after dynamiting many chunks are still too large to handle and must be broken up with pneumatic jackhammers.

The salt beds are both underlaid and overlaid with shale rock. Thus the 1,000-foot-thick ceiling of the American Mine is composed of solid rock in one form or another to the extent of more than half of its thickness.

Casualties in this salt mine are almost nonexistent. Safety record of the American Mine underground is much better than their above ground operations. In 40 years of continuous operation there has been but one fatal underground accident and one serious one in which a miner lost a leg. Both accidents resulted solely from human error and improper use of dynamite. Considering the vast amount of blasting done in 40 years with a weekly usage of 1,250 pounds of dynamite. Where on earth can you find a safer place to work?

Salt miners are a happy lot with no apparent need for relaxation on a psychiatrist's couch. This can be attributed in part to their near perfect working conditions. With a constant temperature of 70° F. and unchanging relative humidity of about 25 percent one can walk briskly in the mine without perspiring. Or in case of a visitor, if you choose to just sit and look you remain comfortable in shirt sleeves.

There is only a gentle and soothing movement of the warm air * * * except at quitting time when more than one-eighth of a ton of dynamite is set off to provide loose salt for the next day's operation. The first time you experience this blast without warning as I did it is frightening. But after surviving your first experience of a huge dyna-

mite charge in a salt mine you are more convinced than ever that it is a safe place to be. The only sensation is that of a tremendous boom, followed by a sudden blast of air past you. Nothing else moves from the force of the explosion because of the extreme solidarity over, under, and around for hundreds of feet.

A stroll through a salt mine in shirtsleeves, regardless of outside temperature, is for some reason both restful and invigorating. Maybe it's because the tangy salt air reminds one of the seashore.

The mine is also clean. Miners emerging after an 8-hour shift are not the grimy looking specimens of which most of us have a mental picture. They carry no more dirt home to deposit on the living room rug than does an executive who spent his working day in a plush office.

Now we've pointed out some of the safety and comfort factors—what about available space for the military or civilians from a civil defense standpoint? In contrast to the approximate two acres of floor space in NORAD headquarters in Cheyenne Mountain, 580 acres have been mined at the Lyons location.

Actually only about two-thirds of the 580-acre area is available as floor space. One-third of the rock salt is left for supporting pillars. With 1,000 tons of salt removed each day, before this can appear in print the usable underground area will exceed 400 acres. Furthermore, within a stones throw, if you could throw a stone through solid rock, is another salt mine (not in operation) containing 55 miles of tunnels. Thus, a few sticks of dynamite and the two mines could be interconnected underground making them into a still larger single unit.

In addition to the fabulously large mine caverns at Lyons, Kans., there are mines at Hutchinson and other nearby towns almost as large. As the crow flies, or in this case, as the mole burrows, Hutchinson and Lyons are about 20 miles apart. If the Federal Government or OCD desired additional underground space but still in an interconnected single unit, the Hutchinson and Lyons mines could be connected at an insignificant cost when compared to other underground construction.

To bore a tunnel from the American mine at Lyons to the Carey mine at Hutchinson would simply require subsidizing the two companies to shift their mining operations to the area between the two widely separated mines. This would involve the laying of additional narrow-gage railroad trackage and longer underground hauls for each company than their normal mining operation. However, there is little doubt but what the two salt companies would gladly dig a connecting tunnel if they were reimbursed for the additional hauling costs because the salt thus mined would be marketable in their normal sales outlets.

Based on the present mining output of the two companies 2,000 tons of salt per day would be removed which would make rather rapid progress toward boring a connecting tunnel • • • and all this at no cost for the excavation other than the extra haul made necessary. Furthermore, the connecting tunnel could be as large or as small as desired. Salt is mined from the bottom of the deposits and normal operations take out a layer about 14 feet deep but if rooms or tunnels were needed with a greater height it would be just a case of blasting it out to desired dimensions.

The cost of a 20-mile subway (which could be equivalent to modern Interstate Highways if desired) would thus be only a small part of the multimillion required for a mere 2 acres excavation in Cheyenne Mountain. The access road to Cheyenne Mountain will cost another estimated $3 million whereas good hard-surfaced roads are already built to the salt mines mentioned.

ENTRANCE AND EMERGENCY EXITS COMPARED

In the Cheyenne Mountain Norad installation two entrances are to be provided. One will be a horizontal entrance and the other an elevator. Thus in a 2-acre space it is conceivable that one atomic bomb could permanently close both. It is doubtful if the 1,200 men trapped within could blast their way out without outside help. Even with outside help clearing the entrances or building new ones would be as time-consuming and costly as the original construction cost. By comparison here is where the salt mines are way out front.

Elevator entrances capable of lifting 1,000 tons each per 8-hour shift are already in operation at all of the Lyons and Hutchinson mines. Several more could be built in widely scattered areas for less than the cost of the access road alone to Cheyenne Mountain.

Then assuming that all mine entrances were known to the enemy and closed by a direct hit on each one it would be a simple matter to put down a shaft at a secret place in any selected tunnel. With the shaft constructed and cemented watertight, it could then be filled with rock salt almost to the surface of the ground. Then by placing a cement cap over the salt filled shaft and covering it with dirt an emergency exit would be concealed in the middle of a Kansas wheat field or grove of trees.

Complete elevator components would then need to be stored underground near the secret shaft. In the event all present entrances were closed by atomic attacks, simply by opening a valve the hidden shaft could be flooded with water. The brine thus formed would flow down the shaft to a disposal well taking the salt with it and leaving an open shaft without any help whatsoever from the outside—indeed, without even the use of any machinery or manual labor.

This is just a variation of an already common salt-mining operation whereby a hole is drilled into salt deposits from above and cased with a pipe within a pipe. Water is pumped down under pressure through the inside pipe, dissolving salt which comes up the outer pipe as brine. By an evaporation process the salt is recovered from the brine as table salt.

After clearing the shaft in this manner the already stored components of an elevator could be erected in exactly the same manner as in a modern skyscraper—from the bottom up. This simple method could provide for one or more widely separated emergency exits whereas in the Cheyenne Mountain 2-acre area it would be impossible to provide emergency secret exits from 2 to 20 miles apart.

FOOD—AIR—WATER

The person unfamiliar with salt mining will raise many questions about longtime survival if sealed up in such a vast underground space. Questions concerning the provision of comfortable living facilities for both the military and civilians including food, air, water, lights, and power are easily answered. But curiously enough, while the same problems apply to Cheyenne Mountain, they are more readily solved in the mine than in the mountain.

First, let us consider food. With area measured in hundreds of acres, a constant temperature and unchanging humidity, ideal storage is already provided for tremendous quantities of foods. For those needing refrigeration it would be simple to install, operate, and maintain huge refrigeration units. Enough space is available to store supplies for thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people for months.

As for water; the plumbing in a salt mine goes straight up. Water supply wells tapping vast underground water resources can be drilled straight up and cased. Thus simply by opening a faucet an endless supply of fresh water is available by gravity. Not even a pump is necessary and the water is so deep underground that it would never be contaminated with atomic fall-out.

In either a mountain or a mine, the power source should be electricity, generated by atomic energy which requires no oxygen for operation. Power and light facilities in either would be so similar that further discussion is unnecessary.

Providing air supplies for the vast reaches of the salt mines might seem like an insurmountable problem, but actually it is quite simple. First, considering air supply from a peacetime standpoint, where the outer air is not contaminated, ventilation is mostly by natural draft.

Following the simple law of nature, cool air settles and hot air rises. Thus, outside air by natural draft goes down one air shaft replacing the warm air rising in another shaft. Windmill fans are run in the mine to circulate air in dead-end tunnels. From this it can readily be seen that the greater the variance of the outside temperature to the 70 degree mine temperature, the better the air circulation within the mine. When outside temperature is also 70 degrees there is no natural draft and suction fans have to be employed to draw the outside air into the mine.

But what if the outside air is contaminated with atomic fallout? The air problem is still relatively simple. It is a known fact that the submarine *Nautilus* can remain submerged for a month or more. When it first submerges its hull encloses enough air to last the crew for one day. After this, either compressed air or compressed oxygen is released into the submarine to give the crew good fresh air.

Thus if the mine entrances were sealed, the acres and acres of underground space would enclose a considerable volume of air which would last much longer than one day unless the space were packed as tightly with people as is the *Nautilus*.

The *Nautilus* carries its own compressors and can compress air to 2,500 pounds per square inch. Atmospheric air normally contains about 21 percent oxygen and the air we exhale contains about 16 percent oxygen and 4 percent carbon dioxide. Thus, if we were breathing in an airtight space as the case would be after an atomic attack, the air around us would gradually contain less and less oxygen and more carbon dioxide.

The removal of carbon dioxide from the air is very simple. Soda lime or lithium hydroxide spread on the floor will absorb the carbon dioxide. Tons and tons of either chemical could be stored in the mine for use when needed.

Also fabulous amounts of either compressed air or compressed oxygen could be stored in the vastness of a salt mine to supply fresh air for months for thousands of people. Not only can compressed air or oxygen be stored in the mine itself but it could be stored nearby in what is known as salt caverns. These are the caverns formed by mining by the brine method and when they reach certain dimensions they are abandoned in favor of another nearby location. The caverns when abandoned are full of brine. By forcing compressed air into these caverns the brine would be forced out (and salvaged for table salt) making more fresh air storage in Mother Earth's lap.

These caverns could be connected by underground pipeline to the mine area and by opening a valve additional sources of uncontaminated air or oxygen could be supplied to the underground survivors. Once stored in either mine or cavern (or both) the compressed air or oxygen would remain indefinitely until needed because peacetime work-a-day operation would utilize air by natural draft.

There is still another oxygen supply source already stored by nature and available to the mine. Water is H_2O (2 parts hydrogen, 1 part oxygen) and it is reliably reported

that the Navy has learned to extract oxygen from sea water and can even do so underwater. With the unlimited reserves of fresh water available to the mine by gravity alone if all other supplies were consumed the water could be made to give up its oxygen to the people underground. Life-sustaining water would also become life-sustaining air.

SOME SALT MINE RESEARCH UNDERWAY

The Federal Government is researching storing of atomic garbage in salt mines. Authorities believe it may prove to be the ideal storage for atomic garbage because of rock salt's tensile strength and impermeability. These same qualities of strength and safety make the mines an ideal place to store human beings in an underground Noah's ark and thereby save at least a remnant of the people from the Armageddon of atomic explosions.

Also private enterprise is presently preparing the salt mines for storage—principally for documents and valuables. Vaults and shelving are being installed to provide safe storage from either natural or man-made disasters. The storage is completely fireproof and hence nothing can burn except flammable contents. With airtight vault doors on some of the caverns even flammable contents cannot suffer serious fire damage because if they did catch fire the oxygen supply in the airtight compartment would soon be consumed and the fire would automatically go out.

The recent costly fire in the Pentagon would have caused insignificant damage if the Pentagon had been in a salt mine with provision made for closing airtight doors when the fire broke out.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS COMPARED

Construction costs in a mine are not exorbitant and underground living and working conditions could be made as plush as desirable at modest cost, in fact, much cheaper than in many above ground locations.

Liquid or powdered materials such as oil or cement can be poured down into the mine through a pipe not even an elevator is needed to take many materials into a mine.

Shale rock floors are already there since salt is mined from the bottom of the salt deposits. If shale rock is not suitable for floors the rock can be overlaid with saltcrete. Saltcrete is the same as concrete except the rock salt is used for aggregate instead of sand or gravel. Underground where the temperature and humidity never vary, saltcrete is reputed to be as durable as concrete. With the saltcrete components (water and rock salt) already underground, except for the cement, floors and walls can be cemented at less cost than above ground locations.

Mother Nature has already provided the heating and air conditioning system in the salt mines so there would be no installation cost for these items, not even any operating cost, winter or summer. Even radios work well in a 1,000-foot-deep salt mine.

If, as the Rand Corp. recommends, we should spend $200 million exploring the possible for the ordinary citizen to protect himself in atomic warfare, then high priority should be given to spending an infinitesmal fraction of the amount to study the salt mines for this purpose.

Where else on earth can you find shelters already built and comprising hundreds of acres; 1,000 feet underground; surrounded with 300 to 500 feet of solid rock; and all without cost to the taxpayer except a fair lease price and installation of materials and equipment?

Norad, OCD and Pentagon officials should make a personal inspection tour of the American Salt Mine at Lyons, Kans. They would be amazed at the tremendous potential for providing underground Noah's Arks—at a very minimum of expense.

The 20th century will undoubtedly be recorded in history as the era when man occupied outerspace. It may also be remembered as a time when man inhabited the earth like a gopher.

Superhighways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the importance of superhighways to our urban, suburban, and rural areas cannot be overemphasized today. We depend upon them for a large part of our commerce and a great deal of our leisure pleasure. Each new major road should be an asset to a region and to the entire Nation.

And yet, it is becoming clearer with each passing year that all such road-building projects should be built as part of an overall plan. Citizen interest should be put to work in constructive fashion.

D. Louis Tonti, executive director of the New Jersey State Highway Authority, recently described in vivid fashion some of the difficulties which arise when local roads and superhighways supplement each other. He was describing the Garden State Parkway and the New Jersey Turnpike. Although these highways are toll roads, the conditions Mr. Tonti describes could increase as our Interstate Highway System gradually increases each year. I think that his words deserve careful consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record of April 25 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINKS TO SUPERROADS HELD KEY TO PROBLEM—SECONDARY ROADS ARE NOT KEEPING PACE, PARKWAY CHIEF TELLS SEMINAR

MADISON, April 25.—A superhighway doesn't solve all the traffic problems in its area, said D. Louis Tonti of Paramus, executive director of the State highway authority.

TALKS TO SEMINAR

Tonti was among those who addressed more than 100 planning board members, realtors, bankers, industrialists, and lawyers at a seminar sponsored Saturday by Fairleigh Dickinson University and the New Jersey Federation of Official Planning Boards.

Tonti said the Garden State Parkway and the New Jersey Turnpike represent the greatest contribution to the transportation needs of the State since World War II. He said there is an obvious incompatability between the modern superhighway and the county and State road built 25 years ago.

The superhighways are full of potential, but the inadequate arteries leading to them are hampering their usefulness, he declared.

Ratables in the 10 counties served by the Garden State Parkway increased $846 million, which is four times more than those in the 11 counties the parkway doesn't serve, Tonti reported.

Tonti said: "In today's economic society the formidable opposition to regional planning is dangerous because it obscures the vision and destroys the capacity of the average citizen to appreciate the fine works of their planning boards.

"All too often desperately needed improvements are delayed because municipal boundaries circumscribe the kind of provincialism which is out of step with regional characteristics of our society," the guests were told.

George Dieckmann planning director of the Bergen County Planning Board, told the group that unless more arteries are built in the area of shopping centers, traffic is going to strangle itself.

He said there are 96,000 movements of traffic each day at the two centers along Route 4. If the population of Bergen County increases, or the popularity of the centers increases, he said, roads leading to the centers will be unable to handle the traffic.

Dieckmann suggested marginal routes be built on the north and south sides of Route 4 to give better access to the two centers. He said it was impossible to widen Passaic Street, which will eventually hurt one of the centers.

Dieckmann said Bergen needs more roads before it chokes on its own traffic problems. He said the only way to get what the county needs is for all the towns to work together in solving the traffic problem.

The Use of Food for Peace

SPEECH
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the great tragedies of our time is the waste of American surplus food in a world in which one-half of the people go to bed hungry every night of the year.

That tragedy is compounded by the strange fact that we pay out more than a billion dollars a year for storage and related costs of handing this surplus food.

It is literally true that we could give away much greater portions of this food surplus, to the hungry people both inside our own country and abroad, and save money in the process.

In recent years we have made progress toward a more intelligent disposal of this great food surplus, which is one of the richest blessings our country enjoys. Millions of American children, and additional millions of people all over the world, have benefited through our surplus food disposal programs.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is an attempt to take a further step toward intelligent and effective use of this great weapon for peace—America's food surplus.

Most of the objections made to the proposal are either technical or haggling in nature; there is no real heart in the opposition to this amendment, and no real reason for the opposition, either.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and commend its author for the fight he has consistently waged to use America's surplus food in the cause of peace.

Seventh International Soil Science Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during 1960, the Seventh International Soil Science Congress is scheduled to be held at the University of Wisconsin.

I am particularly delighted and proud that this congress is meeting at a university—and within a State—that has contributed so much to progress in agriculture.

For the conference, about 1,500 to 2,000 delegates are expected to be in attendance, representing almost every country—including the Soviet Union—that has diplomatic relations with the United States of America.

Under the auspices of the International Society of Soil Science, these conferences are held on the average of about once every 5 years, alternating from country to country.

Historically, the first congress was held in Washington, D.C., in 1927.

Topics for discussion—including scientific papers presented by leading soil scientists—will include physics, chemistry, microbiology, fertility, mineralogy and other subjects significant to progress in agriculture.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Prof. Emil Truog, manager of the Soil Science Congress, a résumé of the program for the upcoming meeting scheduled for August 15–23, 1960.

Reflecting upon a constructive international effort in agriculture—in which we need not only creative efforts to resolve problems of production, but also of distribution—I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from a leaflet outlining the program for the conference printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL SOIL SCIENCE CONGRESS, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WIS., AUGUST 15–23, 1960

The Soil Science Society of America invites the soil scientists from all countries having diplomatic relations with the United States to attend the Seventh International Congress of the International Society of Soil Science in Madison, Wis., August 15–23, 1960. This Congress is sponsored by the Soil Science Society of America. The first International Congress was held in Washington, D.C., in 1927. Subsequent Congresses were held in the U.S.S.R. in 1930, England in 1935, Holland in 1950, Belgian Congo in 1954, and France in 1956.

The International Society now has about 3,000 members located throughout the world. Lately, interest in soil science has greatly increased everywhere as leaders recognize its close connection with food production, health, and the promotion of peace. The United States is producing a surplus of practically all its major agricultural products. This unusual situation is of great interest to the leaders in countries confronted with chronic shortages of food. Accordingly, there is a widespread desire among soil scientist of many other countries to come to the United States to observe our soils and study our methods of fertilizing and cropping them so as to get high production.

At the forthcoming congress, about 400 scientific papers will be presented by the world's leading soil scientists (about 50 from the U.S.S.R.) before an audience of 1,500 or more, representing the seven sections or commissions of the society; namely: (I) soil physics; (II) soil chemistry; (III) soil microbiology; (IV) soil fertility; (V) soil genesis, classification and cartography; (VI) soil technology; (VII) soil mineralogy.

Publications: In lieu of precongress publication of papers, all authors should have submitted by January 1, 1960, an abstract or factual and informative summary including, if desirable, data in the form of graphs and tables. The space limitations (including graphs and tables) are two sides of a sheet 8½ by 11 inches in size (22 by 28 cm), typewritten and double spaced (500 words or equivalent in space). These will be bound separately by commissions and available on registration at the congress. They will be accepted and reproduced in English, French, or German but are not to be considered as a part of the official congress literature.

The completed papers (each not over 3,000 words long) received by July 1, 1960, will be accepted and orally presented in English, French, or German. They will be published in the language presented in five bound volumes by early 1961. Prof. M. B. Russell, Department of Agronomy, College Agriculture, Urbana, Ill., is chairman of the program committee and all correspondence regarding presentation and publication of papers for the congress should be sent to him.

Tours: Field study tours have always been one of the outstanding features of these international meetings. They provide an opportunity to observe and study the soils of the host country in their natural setting. A representative committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Charles E. Kellogg, Chief of the National Soil Survey of the United States of America, has worked on the details of these three tours since 1956, and has prepared a tour manual for each tour which will be given to tour participants. The tours will provide an opportunity to study the more important soil types along the route, the agriculture which has developed on them, and the agriculture research and educational institutions serving each area. Travel will be in chartered air-conditioned buses. Whenever possible overnight stops will be made in college towns where dormitories provide rooms and food at reasonable cost. None of the tours will be repeated (run in reverse direction).

Field tour 1: This precongress tour is mainly for those entering the United States at New York City, where it will start from the Governor Clinton Hotel at 8:00 a.m. on August 5 and end at Madison, Wis., on August 13, covering a period of 9 days and a distance of about 1,929 miles. There will be overnight stops at Ithaca, Brookport, and Jamestown, N.Y.; Wooster and Cambria, Ohio; Lafayette, Ind.; Urbana, Ill. (2 nights); ending at Madison, Wis. The experiment stations at Ithaca, N.Y., Wooster and Coshocton (erosion control), Ohio, Lafayette, Ind., and Urbana, Ill. will be visited.

Stops will be made at Niagara Falls, and farms representing varying kinds of agriculture, including a peat farm, fruit farms, and the grain and livestock farms of the Corn Belt. Representative soil profiles will be examined en route, including the Sol Brun acide, gray-brown podzolic, Brunizem (prairie), and associated hydromorphic soils. The estimated cost, including travel fare, room, and meals, but not costs at the Governor Clinton Hotel in New York City, will be close to $110. There is no limit to number of participants for this tour.

Field tour 2: This postcongress tour, August 24–September 3, will go from Madison to Washington, D.C., via the Southern States, a distance of about 1,950 miles during 11 days with overnight stops at Monmouth and Springfield, Ill.; Sikeston, Mo.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville and Knoxville, Tenn.; Ridgecrest and Raleigh, N.C.; Orange, Va.; and Washington, D.C. Stops include observation of watershed projects, a dairy farm, a delta plantation with mechanized cotton and rice production, a bluegrass farm, a hardwood forest, the agriculture of the Mountain and Piedmont areas, and tobacco and peanut production on the Coastal Plains. Points of interest will include a margarine factory, a cigarette factory, and the TVA fertilizer plant. Soil profiles of the major kinds of soil encountered will be examined en route, including gray-brown podzolic, Brunizem, planosol, red-yellow, podzolic, reddish-brown lateritic, and related hydromorphic soils. Several experiment stations will be visited. The estimated cost, including travel fare, room, and meals, will be close to $140. This tour is limited to 125, of which only 25 may be citizens of the United States and Canada, if total of others reaches 100. Tour applications will be accepted in order of their receipt.

Field tour 3: This postcongress tour, August 24–September 7, 15 days, will go west from Madison to Berkeley, Calif., a distance of 3,200 miles. There will be successive overnight stops at Ames, Iowa; Lincoln and McCook, Nebr.; Fort Collins, Denver, and Colorado Springs, Colo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Flagstaff and Prescott, Ariz.; and Riverside, Fresno, and Berkeley, Calif. The tour will provide views of many scenic places, including the Grand Canyon. A corn-soybean hog farm, a watershed farm, forestry and range stations, and various experiment stations, including the Salinity Laboratory at Riverside, will be visited. A good opportunity will be provided for observing and studying dryland farming, irrigation, and the management of saline and alkali soils. There will be stops en route to examine the major kinds of soil, including gray-brown podzolic, brunizem, planosol, chernozem, chestnut, calcisol, grumusol, reddish desert, and noncalcic brown soils. The estimated cost, including travel fare, meals, and room, will be close to $200. This tour is limited to 125, of which only 25 may be citizens of U.S.A. and Canada if total of others reaches 100. Tour applications accepted in order of their receipt.

Local tours at Madison: To provide an intermission and relief from the confinement of lecture room activities, Thursday, August 18, will be devoted to tours in the vicinity of Madison. The main tour by bus (not designed for wives and children) leads from Madison to a nearby pushbutton hybrid seed corn and livestock farm. The next stop will be at the new University Experimental Farm, where fertilizer and other tests, particularly with corn, will be inspected. From here the tour leads to a large sand area in central Wisconsin where the Hancock Experimental Station is located. In this area, the ground water level is within about 15 feet of the surface, providing ideal conditions for irrigation which is extensively practiced at this station and surrounding area. Fertilizing and cropping practices adapted to sandy soils under irrigation will be observed and studied. The return route to Madison will provide opportunity for examining soils and farming practices, and viewing scenic

landscapes. The travel by bus and noonday lunch will be provided without charge.

Other tours in the vicinity of Madison are being arranged for Thursday and other days for those groups particularly interested in soil classification, forestry soil management, ecology, glaciation, and significant natural formations.

Exhibits: Space (about 20,000 square feet) is being provided for exhibits of wide interest to soil scientists, including soil maps, soil monoliths, scientific instruments, books, journals, equipment for irrigation, fertilizer placement, etc. All communications and inquiries regarding exhibits should be addressed to the chairman of the exhibits committee, Dr. O. J. Attoe, Soils Building, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis., U.S.A.

Wallace Malone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein several articles from a great newspaper in Alabama, the Dothan Eagle. We have some very dear friends at Dothan, Ala., the Oren S. Andersons, and just today I have received copies of the clippings from this newspaper, which has been writing about one of the greatest men I know. He is great in many ways. He has been so successful. He has been successful in raising a great family. He has been successful in business. He has one of the finest banks anywhere, and he has been operating this bank as long as I can remember. He was in the legislature there in Montgomery, Ala., the Capital of Alabama, where he made a wonderful success. He is in many businesses. He has an interest in the great Admiral Semmes Hotel at Mobile. I figure Wallace should give me a deed to that hotel, as I have paid for it many times, but it is worth it because it too is like one of its owners—a great hotel. Wallace Malone, I have known just always. I have known him so well, and I have never known a finer man, with more energy—a man that wants to do good on this earth, not only for the city of Dothan and the State of Alabama, but the whole Nation. These articles in this paper show where he has been traveling all over the earth and tell some of the things about this great man. I know my good friend, Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS, will wonder why I didn't let him put these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but Wallace is just too big for one great Congressman, and everybody knows that GEORGE ANDREWS is one of the greatest Congressmen in this Nation and in the Nation's Capital; but we all figure that we are just a part of Wallace Malone and his great work. Wallace Malone has been doing things as long as I can remember that will help all mankind. I wish that all of these people who are sitting here istening to me now, the men sitting in this room on the floor of the Congress of the United States, who represent every human being in America, could know my fabulous friend, Wallace Malone, of Dothan, Ala.

MALONE PLANE LANDS ON SOIL OF URUGUAY

(By Wallace Malone)

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY, January 19.—Uruguay is the smallest nation in South America—only a little larger than one of our States. As usual we were met at the airport by Government officials. The afternoon we arrived we were entertained by Ambassador and Mrs. Woodward. I found a man there who knew much about southern Chile and Patagonia. He was very reassuring concerning our proposed trip and wanted to go himself.

The people of Uruguay, like the Swiss, have always been ready to defend themselves against attack. Since Montevideo was for years the only deepwater port in this part of South America, it was attacked by Brazil, and later by Argentina.

During the middle of the last century the British attempted to capture and hold the port. Small as it was, Uruguay successfully defended herself. After the mouth of the Plata River was dredged, ships could go to Buenos Aires, which has now become the metropolis of South America. Montevideo is in third place.

It was here that the British Navy sank the German raider, the *Graf Spee*, during World War II. The *Graf Spee's* guns had the longest reach and should have been able to protect itself.

The reputation of the British Navy caused the German ship to retreat up the river where it stranded. After sending his crew ashore to be interned and sinking his ship, the *Graf Spee's* captain committed suicide. He had destroyed hundreds of Allied merchant vessels before the British got him.

Uruguay, like Brazil, is suffering from inflation. Business is off. Salaried people have a hard time making ends meet. The Government is trying to do much for everybody, much more than it is able to do. Uruguay has no president, but is governed by a nine-man council responsible to the people.

NO INCOME TAX

There is no income tax—can you believe that? The government is largely financed by taxes on gambling, which is present everywhere in many forms. The government owns the gambling casinos and makes a big profit from them. All luxuries, automobiles included, are heavily taxed. Twenty-four percent tax, for example, is added to hotel bills. Until lately Uruguay had the most radical social laws of any South American country. Early retirement and wage and hour laws. People do not work as they should. The astounding economic recovery of West Germany, which has no 40-hour week, should be a lesson to Uruguay—and to us. German-made goods are everywhere here.

WOMEN ARE PRETTY

In respect to racial origins and general outlook, the Uruguayans are very much like us. Spanish, English, Italian, German, and Irish stock. No Negroes. Physically, however, they are smaller than Americans. Prettiest women we've seen.

Referring again to the high cost of living caused by inflation, I talked to a Hungarian refugee, a woman of 44, who is cashier at a small shop in our hotel. When the Russians invaded Hungary in 1945, she fled to Paris, got away by the skin of her teeth. She is small, attractive, highly educated, unmarried and alone. Her family were all killed by a bomb during the last war. She says she can hardly exist on her salary—lives in a basement with only one window.

BEGS FOR HELP

She has been trying for 14 years to get to the United States. She begged me pitiously to help (not financially). Vowed she would scrub floors or do anything. I told her that the streets in the United States were not paved with gold and that there were always people without jobs. She said she had toured the United States before the family lost all to the Communists. The immigration quota for Hungarians is full. There is a long waiting list. She has no idea where she stands and has almost lost hope.

I was touched and promised at least to find out how far down the list her name appears, or if her application reached Washington. I told her that if she would marry an American she could enter quickly. But she said she would never marry except for love.

SCHOOLS ARE POOR

Another case is a handsome young Belgian with a wife and attractive children. He came here after the last war with money. Bought a ranch, raises cattle and fine horses, wants out badly. Schools are poor, he says, and he lost all he has except the land, trying to get to Canada. I have since found out that many Belgians who collaborated with the Nazis during the German occupation fled to South America and to Canada to escape punishment.

In addition to the floods last year, Uruguay is now in the throes of a severe drought. While I am strongly opposed to our giveaway program, it would seem that if we are foreign aid bound, perhaps more money should be channeled to such friendly neighbors as Uruguay instead of sinkholes like India, Africa, Communist Yugoslavia, and Poland.

We might at least send a couple of battleships to help the local powerplant for a while. So it goes. There is much trouble in this world.

While Americans are popular here and in Brazil, I have heard this is not so in Argentina. We will soon find out for we leave in a few minutes for Buenos Aires.

MALONE PARTY MAKES HIGH ANDES CROSSING

(By W. D. Malone)

SAN CARLOS DE BARILOCHE, CHILE, February 9.—We crossed the high Andes today, although the road wound through a pass—never over 3,500 feet above sea level. Though very high, some being snowcapped, these mountains are rather dry on their eastern side, not much vegetation except in the valleys, many small streams. Wish we had time to fish.

Between Villarrica and here we had to cross the border and go through the Argentine Customs. This is frustrating anywhere, especially at a mountain outpost. On the way to the border we came to a ferry. The ferryboat had just left, but on seeing us, it turned around and came back much to the dismay of two carloads of American women already on board. We thereby saved 1 hour, although we lost it later.

There were 5 or 6 women mostly from California, 1 man and an attractive young Chilean guide whom we had met at Temuco, Chile. These people were on a tour by air; but by reason of an Argentine airline strike they had to use automobiles furnished by the touring agency, who doubtless lost plenty on that trip.

PRESSED FOR TIME

We didn't make it to Bariloche that night, but had to stay at a small town right in the heart of the mountains. We are beginning to be pressed for time as I have to be in Punta Arenas by the 17th to catch a biweekly plane. Otherwise I will lose the benefit of a roundtrip ticket and may have to stay another week.

The Argentine roads are much better than those of Chile so we got here around noon the next day.

San Carlos de Bariloche is the mountain resort town of Argentina. Many tourists and resort hotels, souvenir shops, etc. We have managed to get hotel rooms. Duke and I usually have had to occupy the same room—and they say I snore, which I doubt.

GIVE CLIMBERS LIFT

At the border we picked up a couple of medical students from Buenos Aires, who had come to do some mountain climbing—with just barely enough money to get back home. A young man and a girl in their early twenties. Neither was married but they had taken a 3-week jaunt. They had no look of romance. The girl was badly sunburned—or snowburned. The man had a 2-week growth of beard. Both were badly travel worn. They, with 14 others, had climbed one of the highest Andean peaks and were trying to get back to Buenos Aires. They were pathetically appreciative during the 2 days. On parting at Bariloche they bought us some candy.

February 12: According to plan Roberta will fly home this afternoon to meet her husband returning from a Navy cruise across the Atlantic. Duke has been ill for several days. I think he should not try to make the 1,000-mile trip to Punta Arenas. He agrees, so I have hired a man born in Switzerland and an experienced guide to go with me the rest of the way. He is in his late thirties and has lived here many years. He has good recommendations.

So we three part this afternoon. Werner, my guide, and I leave for Patagonia, a wild country; and we hope to reach Punta Arenas, the extreme end of South America, in 4 days.

ESQUEL, ARGENTINA, February 13.—This frontier mountain town is 200 miles down the Andes south of Bariloche. It took from 3 p.m. until 10 p.m. to drive it, including stops for gasoline and photographs.

About halfway here a rock hit our gas tank and it sprung a small leak—as once before. We had previously been told that soap or chewing gum would temporarily remedy the trouble. At the next filling station I bought several packages of gum and we set about chewing it as fast as possible. Later we applied the gum. We then drove merrily on to this forsaken village.

The scenery and the roads are splendid, but the hotels are simply awful. At dinner last night a fly was cooked with my meat.

MOTOR CONKS OUT

We checked out at 1 p.m., drove about a block and the motor failed. This being Saturday afternoon, no one works. Tomorrow, is, of course, Sunday (two lost days). We went to the home of the mechanic who had worked on the car and talked him into coming to see the car. It developed that my fine guide (who, it seems, drinks a quart of wine at a sitting) is an alcoholic. Instead of filling the tank with gas, he let the gas station attendant fill it with 15 gallons of fuel oil. Well, it took 2 hours to get the motor and carburetor cleaned and the tank drained. It was all I could do to hold my temper.

IN TIGHT SPOT

Although he doesn't know it, Werner, the guide, has me in a tight spot. I can't afford to let him go, as I could not find anyone else who speaks English or could get off to make the balance of the trip. I will work it out some way, I guess.

For working the 2 hours on Saturday afternoon, the mechanic would not let us pay him anything. Fortunately I brought with me some children's toys and playthings, which I bought at a 10-cent store in Dothan. So when there are children around, as in this case, I distributed them. The mechanic had a boy about 8 years old with him. The best investment I ever made. We are leaving now—3 p.m., as usual.

TRAVELER MEETS AN OLD FRIEND NEAR VALPARAISO

(By W. D. Malone)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—As my daughter and I were getting on the bus leaving Vina del Mar (a seaside resort town near Valparaiso), our friend, Mr. Gutierrez, the former United Nations delegate from Chile, rushed in and asked us to get off. This man, who lives in Santiago, had driven his car all the way from there—125 miles—and insisted we stay over another day to let him show us around. Valparaiso was his former home. He had a cottage at Vina del Mar where his wife was spending the summer while he worked in Santiago.

We didn't get to meet his wife, but he drove us all over town and over many miles of beachfront. Being far south of the Equator, in summer here it is after 8 o'clock before it gets dark. Afterwards we had Mr. Guitierrez to dinner at an exotic restaurant perched on a big rock overlooking the harbor. It was after 11 o'clock when we parted.

EXAMPLE OF HOSPITALITY

I mention this only as an example of the hospitality we have experienced.

Mr. Gutierrez, a lawyer, is extremely well-informed about U.S. politics and has decided opinions about Roosevelt, Ike, Stevenson, Rockefeller, Humphrey, and others. When he realized Malone was an Irish name, he quoted Bernard Shaw, who said that "the Irish don't know exactly what they want to do—but they want to do it right now." Commenting on Russia's lead over the United States in the missile race, he said, "Well, it's because Russia's Germans are smarter than your Germans."

Since all of his opinions coincide with mine, I consider him smart.

We returned to Santiago the next morning by bus. Since this was the weekend (no work on Saturday or Sunday), the jeep was not ready to travel until the afternoon. It must have been dropped from the unloading derrick onto the dock—as it was damaged in several places. Spent the day replacing the tools, spare parts and camping equipment which was stolen while in the Customs warehouse before we arrived. This took exactly all day.

MANY CLIMATES

Because of its 3,000-mile length, Chile has many different climates and soils. The northern part is a desert. The middle, around Santiago, is a fertile valley with some rain in season but depends on irrigation. The snowbed short streams furnish the water. The Spaniards were ideal people to settle Peru and Chile. Since Spain is a dry country, they already knew how to irrigate when they came here in the 16th Century. The southern one-third of this country is mostly islands and very damp. The rainfall averages 100 inches per year. Only 2 months of good weather—a dreary land. There are many German settlements in southern Chile. The Araucanian Indians also have their homes there. These Indians were very courageous and have only recently been controlled and pacified. Southern Chile has tremendous virgin forests.

LITTLE FOOD RAISED

Because of the aridity of most of the cultivatable land, Chile does not grow enough food—about one-half of all food consumed has to be imported. For instance, Chile imports Irish potatoes from Denmark, which is not one-twentieth as large as Chile. This is compensated for by the export of minerals, such as copper and nitrates. Before the synthetic method of making nitrogen from air, Chile had a monopoly on nitrate of soda for fertilizers and explosives. Synthetic nitrogen nearly ruined the nitrate of soda industry. When it does get water, the central valley is very productive and grows nearly every known crop. Farming methods are rather old fashioned. The farms are owned by a few people and are quite large. As in Argentina, by far the larger part of the population lives in towns and cities.

All of the Latin peoples in South America love night life. The usual hour for the evening meal is 9 p.m. Bedtime is 11 p.m. or later. Stores open at 9:30 a.m. and close from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. The night closing time is 8 p.m. This is most inconvenient for shopping tourists—always in a hurry.

You simply cannot hurry these people. The smallest transaction becomes very complicated. Patience is a supreme virtue here.

Duke, my companion, my daughter, and I leave tomorrow morning—early we hope—for the south. We've never yet been able to get off any time near the planned hour. For an early departure one should check out at the hotel cashier's window the night before. Our route is 600 miles south, in Chile—thence over the Andes into Argentina where 1,200 more miles await us. Little paved road, though good hotels, we hope.

LONG WAY FROM HOME, MALONE COUNTS WOES

(By W. D. Malone)

PUNTA ARENAS, CHILE, February 22.—This was the day I hope to get back home but I am a long way from Dothan, Ala. According to the map, it seems to be about 7,000 miles by air, but much longer the way we came. The map also shows that South America extends much farther south than any other continent.

We are far south of the southern tip of South Africa, Australia, or New Zealand. As a matter of fact, if I had a plane I could fly to Antarctica in 3 or 4 hours. We are nearer there than we are to Buenos Aires. The only land between Punta Arenas and Antarctica is the island of Tierra del Fuego. I have been promised a plane trip to a town on that island—weather permitting.

POPULATION ONLY 30,000

Punta Arenas, which means Sandy Point, has a population of 30,000. The soldier at the Customs on the Argentina border 100 miles east of here told us the other night that the population was 3 million.

After sleeping most of the day of our arrival. I went to find the jeep dealer to see the prospects of selling what is left of it. He had a good Scotch name of Mario McLean (McLain is usually the way it is spelled in English).

I felt that since he was a Scotchman he would help me make a good trade. To my surprise I found that he was rather discouraging. This being a free port and there being no Customs duties to pay (as in the rest of Chile), and also because there is no U.S. Federal automobile tax, you can buy a new jeep here as cheap or cheaper than you can in the States. He didn't see the car but I described it to him. He has promised to try to help me sell it. The Peruvian who was also going to help me took a good look at it and he didn't come back. While it doesn't look good, all the running gears and the motor are practically new and it has many more years of life ahead.

ATTENDS ROTARY MEET

On Saturday I attended the Punta Arenas Rotary Club meeting at the hotel upon the invitation of my friend, Mr. Arthur. The meeting began at 1 o'clock and lasted 3 hours. There were many prominent people there for one reason or another. I was introduced to an admiral of the Chilean Fleet, the governor of the state, the mayor of the city and other distinguished people. There was one talk on space medicine by a member of the Chilean Air Force. Part of what he said was translated to me by my friend. The meeting lasted 3 hours and nobody seemed to be tired as such a meeting is not at all unusual.

I told one of my best jokes (which probably hadn't yet reached Chile), that I hoped would be humorous. I also told them I came to Patagonia looking for a place to park

my car and I hoped the authority on space would figure out some way to park cars in space, sooner or later. Whether through politeness or not I would get quite a few laughs. I, of course, brought them greetings from Dothan's civic clubs and from the United States.

They had evidently had another American visitor because a Rotary banner, bearing the name of a small town in Ohio was on a stand in front of my seat. I was just getting warmed up when I heard the bell tap and I sat down promptly. Pardon me if I mention the fact that I did get a reasonable amount of applause, further politeness. There is no question whatever but that our international civic clubs are doing wonderful public relations jobs for the United States. Doubtless more effective than the billions and billions we have given away, and this good will doesn't cost anything.

HOMESICKNESS STRIKES

Yesterday, Sunday, I was very lonesome. There was nothing to do but listen to the wind and hang around the hotel. About 7 p.m.—broad daylight—I heard some distant chimes. I listened intently and realized that the tune was that of "Jesus, Savior, Pilot Me." I just didn't believe I would hear chimes playing that song in this Catholic land. We had heard many church bells but no chimes.

I walked toward the music on unpaved sidewalks up a steep hill. When I was something over half way, the tune changed to "Lead Kindly Light." After climbing seven blocks, I came to a little church on a side street and entered. There I saw a blond young man about 6 feet 2 inches speaking in Spanish to an audience of 25 to 30 people. He introduced another man who had the appearance of an evangelist, but was a Chilean, and appeared to be of pure Spanish blood. The second man preached a sermon for about 45 minutes (too long) and although I couldn't understand any of the words—he was certainly a powerful speaker.

GREETS MISSIONARY

After the service I went up and introduced myself and found his name was Clyde Tucker. He was from Virginia, and his wife, who was there, was from North Carolina. The other man was a visiting pastor from another part of Chile. The church was Methodist and was operated by the Foreign Mission Board of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. I was invited over to have a simple Sunday night supper next door where the young pastor and his family lived in an upstairs apartment; clean but rather primitive and plain. My heart was really touched by this handsome young man devoting his life to religious work thousands of miles from his home and bringing his wife and children there to that desolate place to live. I have never had a more friendly and sincere reception and I got over my homesickness promptly.

GIVES JEEP AWAY

I decided to give the jeep to this little Methodist Church for use on Tierra del Fuego. I assume I could get around $1,000 for it but I had rather give it away.

The next thing for me to do now is to try to get a plane seat for Santiago. I have just visited the office of Lan Chile, the only airline which the Government owned. There is a plane leaving here for Santiago twice a week and the next one leaves tomorrow. The manager was very sympathetic but told me that they were booked up solid for 4 weeks in advance. This is a short summer and those who can want to get up to the capital for a little holiday.

This news really made me sick. I doubt my sanity after 4 weeks here.

STROKE OF GOOD LUCK PUTS MALONE ON PLANE

(By W. D. Malone)

SANTIAGO, CHILE, February 24.—While I have had some bad luck, yet I have also had enough good luck to last me the rest of my life.

When I wrote the previous article I was deeply concerned over getting started from Punta Areanas back home. Other than flying the only way is by ship and it takes 12 days to get here to Santiago. On top of that, no ship was due for some little while. I stayed around the airline office—next to the hotel—all day yesterday. I explained that I had a bad case of sore throat and was really not well. Much sympathy but no results.

HAD GOOD IDEA

Finally I had what turned out to be a good idea. I first made friends with a little girl back of the counter who was trying to learn English and whom Clyde Tucker, my Methodist friend, was teaching. As soon as she can speak well, she is going to have the thrill of being transferred to the Miami office. I told her I had some friends in Miami. The manager of Lanchile could speak some English and promised me he would do all he could to get me a seat on the next plane.

I asked him, "What is the longest ticket you have ever sold in this office?" He said they were mostly all to Santiago, but he had sold one to Lima, Peru.

I said, "I want a ticket to the United States," and he was very much impressed, as he gets a commission on each ticket.

He then said, "If any person with a reserved seat does not show up by 10 tomorrow morning I will give you his seat on the 2 p.m. plane."

Brother, I was there by 9:30 a.m. and at exactly 10 o'clock he came out and said everything was okay. I felt so lighthearted that I felt I could fly to Santiago myself that morning. I caught the plane and I am now back in Santiago after a 5-hour flight.

We flew here right on top of or just to the left side of the snow-capped Andes Mountains the whole 1,500 miles. On the other side was the blue Pacific Ocean since Chile is very narrow. I never expect to see such gorgeous scenery or feel so good.

VISITS U.S. CONSUL

So I am here now and have been to see the U.S. consul and the Chilean Automobile Association to help me get the right papers to transfer the jeep to the Methodist Church and get the title out of me and into them, as well as get straightened out regarding the importation of it.

The commercial attaché at the consul's office, Mr. Victor Algrant, was very helpful although he was really in high gear that day in preparation for the visit of President Eisenhower the first of the week. He hardly had time to talk but he called in an assistant, Raul Gautic, a very intelligent young man.

Raul went with me to see the Automobile Club group and he looked up the law. He drew up a bill of gift in Spanish and then dived right into the red tape. When I get home, all I have to do is send him the legal name of the Foreign Missions Board of that church and I will be through with the jeep.

SEES DUKE AGAIN

At the consul's office I accidentally ran into Duke Cassels-Smith, the young man who went with us part of the way down. He had spent several days fishing after he left us, but had poor luck. The weather was too warm for mountain trout. He was still a little under the weather from his illness.

We were really glad to see each other again. He goes home by the East Coast and I fly in a straight line to Miami. I already have my reservation and will be home before this letter could possibly reach Alabama. I invited my friend, Mr. Ramon Gutierrez, the former delegate from Chile to the United Nations, to have lunch with me today. He told me that the President of Chile had asked him to be the Chilean Foreign Minister, but that he didn't think he could do it because of the strain involved and of his age. I told him he ought to think of what President Eisenhower has done.

While I can never forgive Eisenhower for Little Rock, yet I do admire his being willing, with his bad heart and previous operation, to travel over a large part of the world building up tremendous good will for the United States. There is no question but that these tours he has made have been of untold value to us and the free world and certainly have badly discouraged the Communists in their plans to take us over.

SERVES GOOD PURPOSE

His trip has given the lie to all these false statements about Americans being unpopular. My own experience in foreign countries has convinced me that we are popular.

I am sick of all this talk about our relations with the colored race being resented in other countries. I happen to know that they understand our problem quite well and all to whom I have talked think the South is right in insisting on continuing the remarkable racial adjustment we have made over the last century.

HEARS OF ACTION

Today I just learned of the action of the State Democratic Committee in junking the infamous loyalty oath. It has permitted many good men, otherwise forbidden, to run for public office in our State. All we have to do now is to nominate and elect 11 presidential electors pledged to neither party.

If other Southern States will follow our lead we might be in a position to determine who will be the next President and I do believe that it will result in our being let alone by some of the South-hating politicians who are looking only toward the exaggerated political power of the Negroes and some doubtful Northern States.

Except for one written from Miami, this will wind up these inadequate descriptions of my trip to Patagonia.

TRAVELING DAYS OVER, MALONE BACK AT HOME

(By W. D. Malone)

MIAMI, FLA., February 25.—Well, I almost had to stay in Santiago after all. When I got to the airport and presented my passport it bore a notation that I had brought an automobile into Chile. The Customs official told me I could not leave Chile without carrying the automobile out.

This happened at 2 and the plane was due to leave in 15 minutes. I couldn't stay over any longer because the hotels had reserved all their rooms for those accompanying the President on his visit to Santiago on the first of the week. My hotel had notified me I would have to give up my room the next night. Furthermore, there was no flight to Miami for the next 2 days. One hundred and sixty newsmen and photographers had already registered at the Carrera Hotel. My guess was that at least 500 or 600 would come to Santiago during the President's visit.

A DESOLATE MAN

Well, they checked and okayed everybody else's passport but mine and I sat down on top of my suitcase, a desolate man. I brought up every known argument and reminded

them that Punta Arenas was a free port and I could sell the car there without paying any duties, etc.

The customs man was adamant. I looked at my watch and it was 2:15, the exact time for the plane to take off anyway. In fact, I saw it there. I asked the immigration officer, who appeared friendly, to please call the U.S. consul's office and ask for Mr. Raul Gautic or Mr. Algrant who would explain the situation and would be able to clear up the matter of the car shortly.

I also told him that the customs officials at Punta Arenas knew all about the car and had sent me to Santiago to complete the deal. He came back and said that the line was busy. I heard the motor start on that plane. Brother, I was really sick at heart. I asked him to call at least one more time so I could at least get cleared for next week, although I might have to sleep in the street.

HE MADE IT

I ran around the corner to the Lan-Chile desk and asked them to please not let the plane leave for 2 or 3 more minutes. Then the immigration officer came running back and waved to me that everything was OK. I grabbed my baggage as fast as I could and just managed to get on the plane before it took off. I thanked my lucky stars for that.

General impressions of South America:

Their inability to consistently have good government; the best people refuse to enter politics. Great undeveloped resources—little capital. Cruel inflation, falling mainly upon the workers and the savers (I tipped the waiter 250 Chilean dollars (pesos), which cost me 25 cents). Unhealthy concentration of population into cities. Few small cities or towns.

People courteous, though excitable. Quite a bit of northern and western European stock. Everyone extremely friendly and, on the whole, as honest as we are. Quite civilized; they know the good things of life but they are unable to acquire them since there is little manufacturing and a shortage of foreign currency to import things they need and want.

LOOK AT BRAZIL

Brazil: Larger than the United States, mostly undeveloped, mixed racial strains, Industrialization crippled by inflation.

Uruguay: Very progressive, the playground of South America. Highly Americanized. Cost of living very high with consequential suffering.

Argentina: The most stable, and agricultural base. Their money the best of any in South America—but also somewhat inflated.

Chile: A long narrow land shaped like a toothpick. Called the United States of South America. Very friendly to us. Present government curbing inflation as much as possible.

Foreign travel by the right people is gaining us many friends over the world. Eisenhower proved this, at great physical cost and with danger to his health.

Conclusion: How the free world does look to the United States for assistance, guidance and security.

I asked a highly educated Catholic priest, flying from Santiago to Lima, Peru, if he thought communism would conquer the world. He said that is impossible because of the strength and of the heart of the United States. We have a terrific responsibility. Awesome.

We must live up to it if we are to survive. This is indeed the golden age of America. To you who are uninterested in the future I would say, "Enjoy it while you may," but to those who are concerned over the welfare of their fellow men, their children and their grandchildren I say, "It is time to take stock." This Nation was built through the sweat and honest toil of Godfearing men and women. I have seen no foreign coin with the motto, "In God We Trust."

FABRIC BEING GNAWED

Yet our moral fabric is being gnawed around the edges by Godless people, pornographic literature, and demoralizing TV and radio programs. We southern people are the victims of some dissension created by the efforts of a few fanatics, with the blessings of Communists, and by some dishonest politicians who are trying to upset the finest adjustment between two totally different races that this world has ever known.

We are indeed strong and mighty, but unless we instill into the hearts and minds of our children the high ideals upon which our nation was founded, we will fall and great will be the fall thereof. Therefore, in this Golden Age let us remember Kipling's prayer:

"If drunk with sight of power we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
Such boastings as the Gentiles use
Or lesser breeds within the law,
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget! Lest we forget

"Far called our navies melt away.
On dune and headland sinks the fire
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre
Judge of the nations, spare us yet!
Lest we forget! Lest we forget!"

My appreciation to anyone who may have taken the time to read these poorly worded, and hastily written, reports. If you liked them, drop me a card to Dothan, Ala.

As for me, I think my traveling days are over. I expect to sit on my front porch and read the newspaper for a long time hence. The best sight on my whole trip was the Dothan airport and my wife and family waving to me as I landed.

Minnesota Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the variety and vigor of life in the State of Minnesota is captured in the "Minnesota Story," by Angelo Cohn in the Voyager, March-April 1960.

The industrial, educational and scientific, cultural, and recreational resources of Minnesota are sketched in this article.

I ask unanimous consent that substantial excerpts from the "Minnesota Story" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA STORY

(By Angelo Cohn)

Minnesota is where the sophisticated world meets the wilderness.

It is a State where some of nature's most violent forces are intermingled with man's most gentle works.

It is a State which was blessed with timber and iron—two resources that symbolize power—and has found latter-day wealth in electronics, the science of machines with delicate "nerves."

The extremes of Minnesota were demonstrated by an incident during the lifetime of Henri Verbrugghen, a dapper and worldly Belgian who was conductor of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra.

Verbrugghen used to relax in the State's northern lake region near Park Rapids, where his brother operated a fram and summer camp. Leroy Matson, an enthusiastic outdoorsman and later a justice of the Minnesota supreme court, was visiting the maestro there once. When the two men decided to go fishing, Verbrugghen placed his Stradivarius violin casually on the mantlepiece. Matson, one of the few persons who knew that a special air-conditioned hotel room and vault were rented in the city to store the precious instrument, protested to his friend.

"But the purpose of music is to enjoy it," replied the maestro. "If I have to worry all the time about that violin, there's no enjoyment. Let's go fishing."

That little known story is not important except as it reflects Minnesota's way of life, a life of fascinating contracts.

The Indians are another example. In one part of the State they still harvest and thrash wild rice by the age-old methods of their tribal ancestors. Yet some of these same Indians are eagerly sought to work in the booming electronics plants because they have developed skilled fingers through doing decorative beadwork.

In a sense, these contrasts also reflect the relatively brief history of modern Minnesota, which in 1957 marked its hundredth year as a State with a season of pageants and community celebrations.

The French came to Minnesota in the sixteen-hundreds, priests and fur traders together pushing large canoes upstream into the Indian country. They left names upon the land: Duluth, a city that is more than 1,000 miles from salt water yet has become one of the world's great seaports; St. Croix, a river whose glacially-formed valley is 100 miles of spectacular beauty; Mille Lacs, a lake of sinister Indian legendry and fabulous fishing in both summer and winter.

After the French and British had finished their scrapping over that territory, there was a quiet period in explorations. Then, in 1820, the American phase of Minnesota history may be said to have started. The significant event was establishment of a military post, later Fort Snelling, where the Minnesota River flows into the Mississippi. It was a fur traders' crossroads in northern reaches of the Louisiana Purchase.

From a corner of old Fort Snelling that is preserved as a historical shrine, you can walk a short way westward to the end of a 10,000-foot runway being built as part of the jet-age preparation of Wold-Chamberlain Airport that serves Minneapolis and St. Paul. Eastward, on the bluff across the Mississippi, the redskinned tribes used to pitch their tepees when they came in spring to trade with the white men. Today, a sprawling new building on the plateau houses the Univac division of Remington-Rand, a symbol of the State's newest major industry, electronics.

The two giants of Minnesota employment, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, are heavily involved in electronics also, as is General Mills, a versatile maker of breakfast foods. And not long ago, IBM opened a plant in Rochester.

Until the advent of IBM, Rochester was a one-industry town. But uniquely, its single industry was health, centered about the Mayo clinic and numerous surrounding hospitals. The clinic's reputation brings patients from around the world, and its influence has given a strong research quality to all Minnesota medicine.

It is no accident that in this experimental atmosphere a team of young surgeons at the University of Minnesota developed "open heart" operations to prolong the lives of stricken youngsters. Almost every day now some airplane brings a child from a faraway place, often from a foreign country, for the life-giving surgery.

The one-industry town also prevails in the northern part of Minnesota, on the Iron

Range. There, however, it is anything but a place for gentle hands. The iron ore is Nature's gift of power to Minnesota. In all the history of mining there has never been anything to equal the Mesabi Range as a source of iron ore, and historians give it major credit for victory in two World Wars.

There is another giant in northern Minnesota's power structure. He is Paul Bunyan, a legendary lumberjack of amazing size and accomplishments. Where he came from nobody knows, but Paul Bunyan stories are tall, tall tales and real American folklore.

One story, for instance, has it that the 10,000 lakes (accurate aerial maps have raised the number officially beyond 11,000) were formed by the footsteps of Babe, the Blue Ox that was Paul's pet. Then, there was the winter of the Blue Snow which wouldn't melt. Paul finally took his shovel and, with a single mighty heave, cleared the State by tossing the snow over his left shoulder. The snow landed atop the Rocky Mountains and gave those peaks their caps of perpetual glaciers.

Exaggerated, perhaps, but not lies, those yarns. If there's anything a true Minnesotan resents, it's the corruption of Paul Bunyan stories into ordinary, unimaginative lies.

Paul Bunyan is now well established in legend, and the nickname "Giants of the North" is still carried by Minnesota-born descendants of Scandinavian loggers or Bohemian and Slovakian miners whose muscles cut the pattern of the State's economic life only 80 years ago.

Muscle is still in high demand in the woods, the mines, and the farms, but more hands are required to do nimble fingerwork on small machine assemblies. One of the early secrets of Minneapolis-Honeywell, the State's biggest single employer, was the fact that it had managed to hire more skilled watchmakers than the industries of Switzerland.

Whether they were loggers or watchmakers, however, people who came to Minnesota arrived with strong purpose, ready to meet challenges as well as to seize opportunities. One challenge is the weather. The books tell us simply that Minnesota has a northern temperate climate with low average-mean temperatures. That's a pale, academic description of the dramatic changes that occur during a year in this part of the country.

* * * * *

Natives have learned to joke about it, but they have never allowed the extremes of temperature to interfere with extreme enjoyment of the good things available only under such conditions. They live close to nature in a thousand wonderful ways, yet surround themselves with the urbanities of the world.

Symphony concerts and hockey games go on in adjoining buildings on the same night. One house is filled with people listening to a world-famous visiting string quartet, while the place next door is the starting point of a sleighride around storied Lake Minnetonka on a crisp winter evening.

Summer has its contrasts, too. While 1,000 people sit in the grassy courtyard of Walker Art Center enjoying a concert, other thousands watch softball games around five or six lighted fields at the Parade, a sports park just across the street and within a short walk of downtown Minneapolis.

Lake Harriet, 1 of 11 lakes within the Minneapolis city boundaries, is the scene of outdoor operettas and other musical events. But a lot of the younger culture seekers hold fishpoles with baited hooks dangling in the water. The pursuit of culture and the pursuit of fish are ingrained in the life of the State.

Minnesota's cultural fountainhead is the State university, fourth largest in the Nation with 26,500 students. Its main campus is on the east bank of the Mississippi River just below St. Anthony Falls. Early day millers and lumbermen who lived on that side of the river when it was still the fashionable part of town established the university in territorial days, following the pattern of colleges in Yankee New England from which most of them had come.

* * * * *

The Metropolitan Opera regularly schedules a Minneapolis visit, and draws 20,000 in only four performances at massive Northrop auditorium on the university campus.

Even more impressive is the way the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul turn out 15,000 to 17,000 strong on a Sunday afternoon to hear an erudite discussion by T. S. Eliot or Walter Lippmann. The Minneapolis Star and Tribune sponsors these discussions as a memorial to Gideon Seymour, its late world-minded editor.

Duluth uses the scenic lure of the north shore to attract world-famed artists-in-residence each summer; Rochester keeps its doctors and their families busy relaxing in an art program of phenomenal proportions which was stimulated by William Saltzman, a young abstract painter who directs its art center.

Much of Minnesota's relaxation is tied to the weather, and seasons are more important than calendar dates. For many, January 1 is just another holiday. The new year really begins with spring. That's natural enough in an agricultural area, but fishing also has something to do with it.

Here's a State with slightly more than 3 million people and at least 2 million active fishermen. The statistics: 271,154 individual fishing licenses for residents; 390,879 combination licenses that cover man and wife plus children from 16 years to legal age; 301,868 nonresident licenses. Youngsters under 16 fish without licenses, as do the blind and recipients of old-age assistance.

A music critic once observed that you can tell when it's spring because the symphony audience has gone fishing. The hardier folk among the music lovers might skip the last concert or two for a whirl at early trout fishing in the fast-water streams which roar and tumble into Lake Superior. Often as not, these early-birds cast their flies while standing in snow, for winter lingers long in the shady evergreen woods that line the great cold lake.

In the weeks that follow, cabins in the lake country are opened anew. Freshly-painted boats are slid to water, outboard motors are tuned up, and tackle is cleaned. Minnesota is ready for the high season of its special way of life.

It is actually a multiphased activity, for canoeing, camping, water skiing, poker playing, outdoor cooking, and many a cottage sorority party are part of the fishing season.

Life on the lakes carries well into the autumn, which is also hunting season. Seldom does a duck hunter take to the wild rice marshes or flyway passes without putting a little fishing equipment into his car. Just in case there's "bluebird weather" and the ducks aren't flying, he can wet a line once more.

October is autumn's golden peak, and armies of hunters take to the field for pheasants or other game birds. Of a quarter-million hunting licenses isued annually, about two-thirds are for birds and small game. It's sport for women and girls as well as for men and boys.

The season ends with the business executive in the gray flannel suit turning into the man in the red flannel jacket, and he's not playing Santa Claus. Although the deer-hunting army has increased in recent years, so has the number of deer. Animals are thriving on marginal farms which have been abandoned in the north.

Even more exciting is the resurgence of the moose, a magnificent giant among North American animals, who seemed headed for extinction but has staged a comeback. It is far from a rarity for canoeists, hikers or hunters to sight one of these nowadays, and a thrill it is to see a moose swimming across a lake or crashing through the woods.

Nature has given Minnesota one other distinction—the State is the source of rivers flowing in three directions to three oceans: The Red River of the North to Hudson Bay and the Arctic, the border streams into Lake Superior and the Atlantic, and the mighty Mississippi, father of waters, flowing south to the Gulf of Mexico.

These rivers are a key to Minnesota's way of life, since they have made the area a refuge for fish and animals in abundance.

Upper stretches of these rivers, particularly tributaries of the Mississippi and St. Croix, also were the headwaters of the lumber industry in its heyday. Old timers still living today remember when the Mississippi above St. Anthony Falls at Minneapolis was lined solid with nothing but lumber mills for 5 miles.

In those days, a quarter million men—far more than the resident population—used to roar through town in early winter on their way to the logging camps and roar down again after the spring log drives to spend their season's earnings in wild roistering.

Lumbering made northern Minnesota one huge camp 80 years ago, and it is still that in many respects today. Only now it goes by the more pleasing name of "resort country." But even the most deluxe cabin resorts retain a camplike personality and appeal to the family trade rather than to glitter seekers.

Visitors, however, generally see the State's more sophisticated side first, because so many enter Minnesota at or near the Twin Cities.

To the unacquainted, however, it must be explained that "twin" refers only to a close physical proximity of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The togetherness usually associated with twins is otherwise replaced by intense rivalry in business activity, cultural affairs, sports, and social striving.

* * * * *

St. Paul boasts of its status as the State capital, but Minneapolis can always come back and point out that it is the location Minnehaha Falls. It is a near-dry cascade these days but enjoys the immortality of Longfellow's poetry, which made the falls a byword of the English-speaking World.

So the cities continue to argue, for they wouldn't be part of Minnesota if the contrasts were ever wiped out.

Censorship by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an item prepared by the National Associated Businessmen, Inc., of Washington, D.C., which is a most timely discussion of a vital problem confronting the free enterprise systems in America:

CENSORSHIP BY TAXATION

"Absolute freedom of the press to discuss public questions is a foundation stone of American liberty"—Herbert Hoover.

FOREWORD

The regulation nobody wants

Business, labor, and Government agree on the viciousness of the present tax regulation which taxes business or job related expenditures—even institutional advertising—which the tax collector decides may tend to support or oppose Federal or State legislative proposals, local ordinances, or referendums. For tax purposes, it puts these expenditures in the same class as bribes—which are disallowed because contrary to public policy.

This tax penalty was not enacted by Congress—but was put into effect by internal revenue regulations. The hotly contested, amplied internal revenue regulations issued in December 1959 provide:

"(C) (1) Expenditures * * * for the promotion or defeat of legislation * * * or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) * * * to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation is not deductible as a business expense, even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business."

These also provide, with respect to dues and other payments made to an association or union which is substantially engaged in the above activities, that—

"(2) Deduction will be allowed only for such portion of such dues and other payments as the taxpayer can clearly establish is attributable to activities other than those so specified."

This memorandum highlights the scope, development, and practical results of this regulation, and the need for speedy enactment of corrective legislation like H.R. 7123. It provides background material, for editorials, advertisements, speeches, letters to Congress, and so forth, without which censorship by punitive taxation will continue simply because of congressional inertia. Our friends in Congress must have this backing if legislation like that proposed by H.R. 7123 is considered and adopted at this session.

The Time Is Ripe

Bills to correct the situation are before both Houses of Congress. The initial such proposal, advanced by Congressman HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, a key member of the House Ways and Means Committee, is H.R. 7123. Companion bills have been introduced by Senator VANCE T. HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana; Congressmen WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican of New York; EDWIN B. DOOLEY, Republican, of New York; JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., Republican, of Pennsylvania; and OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas. This legislation can be enacted in 1960—but only if the wide ground swell of citizen support is demonstrated to Congress.

Fairplay

Elementary rules of income tax justice should permit deduction of business expense—including advertising or dues paid by a taxpayer to his trade association or union. Yet this elementary justice is presently denied taxpayers on such expenditures made with respect to enactment or defeat of legislation, even though the legislation may vitally affect their businesses or jobs. A proposed city ordinance may, if enacted, put a taxpayer out of business, but his expense of advertising the situation and defeating the proposal by an aroused public opinion is disallowed by IRS even though this expenditure keeps him in business and on the tax rolls.

Fairplay demands that this unfortunate situation be corrected.

ABRIDGMENT OF THE RIGHTS OF FREE SPEECH AND PETITION

Basic to preservation of economic and political freedom is the full exercise of the right of free speech and the right of petition. That these fundamental rights are abridged by denial of normal tax treatment to those exercising these rights is recognized by the Supreme Court. As recently stated in *Speiser* v. *Randal* (357 U.S. 513):

"Denial of a tax exemption for engaging in certain speech necessarily will have the effect of coercing the claimants from the proscribed speech."

Extent of abridgment

Multiplied thousands of proposals involving broad economic, financial, and social issues are pending in Congress and in State and local legislative bodies. It is virtually impossible to comment publicly on any of these issues, through institutional advertising or otherwise, without the grave risk of the expense of this communication being disallowed by some Internal Revenue agent as being "propaganda (including advertising) * * * to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation * * *."

As was vigorously pointed out by their various spokesmen at the hearings on the new regulations, the very purposes of chambers of commerce, trade associations, professional societies, and labor unions often require them to press for or against legislative proposals important to their membership and to the public at large. Also, as they testified, it is to the public interest that their views and arguments be freely disseminated. Furthermore, they are exercising the constitutional right of free speech and the right to petition on behalf of their membership.

But exercise of these rights by an active organization, under the present censorship rule, is abridged by imposing a tax penalty on the organization's members—partial or entire loss of their normal deduction of dues and contributions. In fact, the regulations place the frequently impossible burden of proof on the taxpayer to prove that part of his donations and dues were not spent in connection with furthering or opposing legislative proposals, referendums, etc.

Good legislation, equally with good court decisions, requires the unabridged right of all parties concerned to present their case. In recognition of this, our tax laws properly permit deduction of expenses in presenting one's side in business or job related court proceedings. It is just as important that this rule also apply to legislative proceedings. Yet, expenses of an individual, a business, or contributions to a business or trade organization or union, are not deductible if for the promotion or defeat of legislation even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business.

The Secretary of the Treasury freely admitted in his letter dated February 26, 1960, to the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee of Congress, that:

"Existing law as developed has frozen concepts relating to expenditures in the area of legislative process which are quite distinct from generally accepted attitudes in regard to expenditures related to fields of administration and juicial processes."

Also that:

"The present rules have created problems of enforcement since it is difficult to 'police' advertising campaigns and expenditures by unions or trade associations in an effort to identify degrees of attempts to influence legislation. * * *"

Treasury clearly does not oppose and Commerce actually supports proposals like H.R. 7123.

Law by Regulation and Congressional Inaction

Over the years Internal Revenue has progressively sought to strike down business deductions under various theories. It has long been prone to so construe the deduction for "ordinary and necessary business expense" as to deny deductions for expenditures which it felt were contrary to public policy. In some circumstances these actions have been sustained, and public-policy deductions, including advertising, have grown. As stated in *Commissioner* v. *Heninger* (320 U.S. 249):

"Where a taxpayer has violated a Federal or State statute and incurred a fine or penalty he has not been permitted a tax deduction for it. Similarly one who has incurred expenses for certain types of lobbying and political pressure * * * has been denied a deduction. And a taxpayer who has made payments to an influential party precinct captain in order to obtain a State printing contract has not been allowed to deduct their amount from gross income."

The Court in the Heninger case, however, allowed deduction of an attorney fee paid by him in defending himself in a post office fraud order case, for violating certain statutes. The Court said that:

"To allow the deduction would not frustrate the policy of those statutes."

Again, in *Lilly* v. *Commissioner* (343 U.S. 90), deduction was allowed for kickbacks to doctors by an optical firm, overruling the Tax Court's ruling of nondeductibility on the grounds that "the contracts violated public policy."

The Court severely curtailed some types of public-policy action when it laid down the rule in this case that "the policies frustrated must be National or State policies evidenced by some governmental declaration of them."

But nevertheless the Supreme Court last year, in *Cammarano* v. *U.S.* (358 U.S. 498), held to be nondeductible expenditures for advertisements by a taxpayer presenting his views on a referendum which critically affected his business.

Here are reasons advanced by the Court:

"Since 1918 regulations promulgated by the Commissioner under the Internal Revenue Code have continuously provided that expenditures for the 'promotion or defeat of legislation * * * are not deductible.'

"Here the deductions sought are prohibited by regulations which themselves constitute a sharply defined policy."

The Court pointed out the failure of Congress over the years to change the provision "ordinary and necessary business expense" despite the interpretative lobbying regulations and stated that "under these circumstances we think that the regulations have acquired the force of law." This law by inactivity must be corrected by adoption of legislation such as H.R. 7123.

Is Advertising and Otherwise Presenting Views, Contrary to Public Policy?

The unfortunate public policy interpretation just described has been made despite the very opposite position Congress took in enacting the so-called Lobbying Act in 1946. That act in no way prohibits lobbying, applies only to organizations and persons who collect lobbying contributions or lobby for pay, excludes even these if they merely appear to testify, has a court construed limit to direct contact with Congressmen, and requires no move even of those covered than that they make reports of their lobbying purpose, collections and expenditures. In fact, the report made clear that even persons hired as direct lobbyists serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose. The purpose of the Lobbying Act was thus solely to create a disclosure obligation of certain persons and organizations engaged in attempting to influence direct lobbying, so the record would be clear as to the interests actually represented by them. Thus Congress specifically recognized that the public interest and basic principles of representative government are served by the presentation of views and so wrote simple fair play information requirements.

But in contrast, Internal Revenue, sustained by the courts, has built up a theory that these free speech activities are against public policy—and point to the fact that

Congress has not specifically acted on their administrative rules as evidence that Congress believes that presenting views to them or to the public on any legislative matter is wrong and should be penalized taxwise.

Public policy must be truly stated by the enactment of legislation like H.R. 7123.

Historical background of treatment of "lobbying"

Over a century ago, in an early case, the *Trist* case (21 Wall, 441), the Supreme Court decided that an equity court should not give an injunction to enforce an influence peddlers' contingent contract to get a private bill through the Congress. The reversal was on several grounds, one of which was that the agreement "* * * was for the sale of the influence and exertions of the lobby agent to bring about—the payment of a private claim by means which if not corrupt were illegitimate." The Court said: "To legalize the traffic of such services would open a door at which fraud and falsehood would not fail to enter."

In a similar situation over 50 years ago, the Court in the *Hazelton* case (202 U.S. 71) refused to uphold an equitable remedy sought by a lobbyist who had a contingent contract for lobbying through a private bill for purchasing a particular tract of land for a site for a hall of records. The opinion cited a statement in *Marshall* v. *B. & D.* (16 Howard 314) "that all contracts for a contingent compensation for obtaining legislation were void."

In 1941, when we were approaching the brink of a second war with Germany, the Supreme Court dealt with another contingent lobbying contract—involving lobbying for the restoration of property to former—and in 1941, prospective—enemy aliens. This was the *Textile Mills* case (314 U.S. 326). One question involved was the income-tax deduction of various lobbying expenditures made in fully getting the property back for the German interests in the 1920's.

The situation presented as to tactics employed in this lobby was such that the court, citing the Trist and Hazelton cases, stated that:

"Contracts to spread such insidious influences through legislative halls have long been condemned. Whether the precise arrangement here in question would violate the rule of these cases is not material * * * the general policy indicated by those cases need not be disregarded by the rulemaking authority in its segregation of non-deductible expenses. * * * The general policy being clear it is not for us to say that the line was too strictly drawn."

Thus, the saying, "Hard cases make bad laws," was exemplified by a broad ruling sustaining a regulation in which the court's decision went beyond the "general policy" in dealing with situations such as presented by the Trist, Hazelton, and Textile cases.

As has been stated, last year the Supreme Court, in the Cammarano and Strauss cases, ruled nondeductible the amounts taxpayers contributed to save their business by advertising their side on the issue presented by a State initiative referendum.

It could not say in that case, as it did in the alien property case, that "contract to spread * * * insidious influences * * * have long been condemned." This case was essentially merely advertisements stating the taxpayers views.

And the court was faced with the tax deductions it had upheld in the *Henninger* case (320 U.S.) for attorneys fees incurred by a mail-order dentist in successfully resisting a Post Office fraud order for 2 years, and the deduction of kickbacks paid doctors by eyeglass companies in the *Lilly* case (343 U.S.) in which the court stated that:

"Assuming * * * that under some circumstances business expenditures * * * may not be deductible * * * when they 'frustrate sharply defined national or State policies prescribing particular types of of conduct' * * * the policies frustrated must be national or State policies evidenced by some governmental declaration of them."

National policy must be clearly expressed by enactment of legislation such as H.R. 7123.

Need for corrective legislation

After the blanket validation of the IRS "lobbying rule" regulations as a "rule of law" by the Textile Mills and Cammarano decisions of the Supreme Court, IRS was hardly in a position to modify its basic rule on "lobbying" in the absence of congressional legislative action—despite the "public policy" statements respecting lobbying in the reports on the 1946 Lobbying Act and the definition of lobbying in the interpretation of that act by the Supreme Court in the Harris case.

The Boggs bill

H.R. 7123 was introduced by Representative Boggs on May 15, 1959 to amend the business expense section (162) of the Internal Revenue Code, which permits tax deductions for "Ordinary and Necessary" business expenses, by adding this short paragraph:

"Expenses lawfully incurred in supporting or opposing or otherwise influencing legislation in the Congress or in a State legislature or other local government agencies or in submission of proposed legislation to the voters, shall be allowed as proper deductions from gross income."

"Carried to its ultimate conclusion, a purchaser of advertising in a newspaper or magazine, a local chamber of commerce, a trade association, national, State, or local education and civic or voters groups all may be denied the right of professional and political activity or expression of views which is and must remain the sinews of our democratic way of life." as Congressman Boggs so ably puts it.

The Washburn case

This very situation is dramatically brought to mind by the plight of the editor of a small daily newspaper in Hope, Ark.

Alex H. Washburn used his newspaper in an attempt to prevent a sales tax from driving business from his hometown, Hope, Ark. He spent $6,024.96 in defending his newspaper business from the tax. This $6,024.96 has been disallowed in toto by the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department. Any newspaper could be next.

The remedy is enactment of legislation such as the Boggs bill, H.R. 7123.

Tax Penalty and Loyalty Oaths

It is unfortunate that the Supreme Court in the Cammarano case did not follow the freedom of speech reasoning it employed in striking down a loyalty oath requirement imposed by California as a condition to a tax exemption. In this 1958 decision, *Speiser* v. *Randall* (357 U.S. 52), the Court said:

"The vice of the present procedure is that, where particular speech falls close to the line separating the lawful and the unlawful, the possibility of mistaken factfinding—inherent in all litigation—will create the danger that the legitimate utterance will be penalized. * * * To deny an exemption to claimants who engage in certain forms of speech is in effect to penalize them for such speech."

The Court in the Cammarano tax case, involving a businessman fighting for his business, was hard pressed to distinguish his situation from the Speiser situation.

Justice Douglas stated in the Cammarano case that "I find it hard to say that those who were fighting for their lives in opposing the initiative measures were not exercising first amendment rights. If Congress had gone so far as to deny all deductions for 'ordinary and necessary business expenses' if a taxpayer spent money to promote or oppose initiative measures, then it would be placing a penalty on the exercise of first amendment rights. That was what the State did in substance in *Speiser* v. *Randall* * * *."

First amendment rights must be safeguarded by legislation like H.R. 7123.

WHAT EDITORS SAY ABOUT "CENSORSHIP BY TAXATION"

Editor & Publisher:

"In all of the discussion on the Internal Revenue Service rulings which result in curbing business expenditures for opinion advertising, nothing has hit home with such impact as the Tax Court's decision against A. H. Washburn of the Hope (Ark.) Star.

"Mr. Washburn crusaded to obtain a vote by the people on a question of a State sales tax—only to find that he must write off the expense (about $6,000) as a bread-and-butter item. He can't charge it up to 'ordinary business expenses' and claim it as a deduction in figuring his income tax.

"The entire question of tax allowance for 'lobbying' expenses, including advertising costs, is on the agenda of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has already held hearings. The American Newspaper Publishers Association argued that nondeductibility amounted to censorship of ideas.

"Our advices from Washington this week were that a floodtide of grassroots pressure will be needed to get any of the corrective bills—six in the House and one in the Senate—out onto the floor before adjournment of this session. Representative HALE BOGGS, Louisiana Democrat, has made a strong plea for his bill on the ground that Congressmen rely on opinion (lobby) advertising for indications of back-home sentiment."

New Orleans States-Item:

"Timely and fair is a bill by Representative HALE BOGGS asking for classification as legitimate expenses those sums spent by industry to speak in mind on Federal legislation.

"He is on sound ground when he says that any business which feels a particular measure is deleterious to its interest must be allowed to say so without being penalized income tax wise.

"If the cost of being heard in the interest of self-preservation isn't a necessary business expense, then what is?"

Wall Street Journal:

"If you look at Representative HALE BOGGS' bill one way, we suppose it could be called a proposal to help Washington lobbyists. Why, one might be inclined to ask, should the law be changed to permit an individual who wants Uncle Sam to ease up on his taxes, or pass a measure that will help his business, to deduct the costs of his attempts to influence legislation from his income?

"The argument sounds reasonable enough. But if you'll take the trouble to look at the other side of the proposal of the Louisiana Congressman, his bill takes on a far different appearance.

"The problem lies, first of all, in the inequities of the tax laws that result in a privilege to some and a penalty to others. In this case, the constitutional right of petition granted all the people is affected.

"Here's how it works: A great many tax-exempt organizations and a lot of pressure groups are permitted—and rightly so—to engage in lobbying efforts to influence legislation without losing their tax-exempt status. And Government agencies, which of course pay no taxes, are among the biggest lobbyists in the Nation's Capital.

"But, says Representative BOGGS, present Internal Revenue Service regulations prevent like deductions by individual people. 'Even the expenses of a businessman's appearance at a public hearing before a congressional committee considering legislation affecting his business may be disallowed.'

"Mr. Boggs' petition for fair play is based on the pretty sound idea that the right of any and all citizens to petition for good laws, or to oppose bad laws, as they see those laws, should not be diluted by punitive taxation.

"Hence his bill to allow expenses legally incurred in attempts to influence legislation to be as tax deductible as expenses of foundations, tax-exempt lobbies, and Government agencies.

"And when you get right down to it, the way the regulation works now it means that if a bill is before Congress and John Smith wants to have his say in opposition to some pretty powerful tax-exempt interests, John Smith has to pay taxes on what he says."

Washington Evening Star:

"In effect, even if not so intended, these limitations amount to censorship by punitive taxation. By the exercise of the taxing power, they inhibit—even if they do not prohibit—a free expression of views on matters of public policy and interest. In urging nonpartisan support of his amendment, Mr. Boggs points out that this free expression of views—'the right of the people to petition the Congress' for example—is as old as the Constitution itself. Congress cannot legislate effectively if insulated from public opinion. And as Mr. Boggs says further, 'If we dilute by punitive taxation the right of our citizens to petition for good laws, we deny them the right of self-protection from damaging and destructive legislative action.'

"The Boggs proposal would lay down 'precise and definite guidelines,' which the Treasury Department and the IRS apparently feel are now lacking, for junking this offensive regulation. The agencies are raising no objection and acknowledge that little loss of revenue would result. Congress should not neglect its responsibility for seeing that correction is made."

Fairview (Iowa) Ledger:

"If somebody wants to spend the country into bankruptcy, if somebody proposes to tax a business out of existence, if somebody proposes to outlaw a labor union, the parties against whom legislation is proposed are now told they can't publish their grievances and permit the Government to pick up a part of the tab by way of deductions on tax returns.

"The proponents of big Government will not be alarmed about this. For those who may be alarmed there is something they can do. They can write a letter to their Congressman asking him to support a couple of bills which will restore their right of petition without a tax penalty."

Sioux Falls Argus-Leader:

"It has always been a part of the American way to let each side have its say. To interfere with that expression of opinion by increased taxation is not in keeping with our ideals. Why intefere with a business, a labor union, or anyone else who wants to protect his own interest by lobbying or advertising?

"Legislators cannot operate in a vacuum. To say that they should be insulated from the ideas of business, labor, or anyone else undercuts the American way."

Representative Carl T. Durham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ERWIN. Mr. President, on March 19, 1960, the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington, D.C., honored two of North Carolina's ablest sons, GRAHAM A. BARDEN and CARL T. DURHAM, who are retiring from the House of Representatives after most devoted and distinguished service to their districts, State, and Nation. On that occasion, Dr. E. McG. Hedgpeth, of the School of Medicine of the University of North Carolina, paid well-merited tribute to CARL T. DURHAM. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Dr. Hedgpeth's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished members of the North Carolina delegation, ladies and gentlemen, when I was extended the invitation to be present here tonight, to say that I did not feel considerable reluctance would be to use the truth as loosely as it is routinely used in some parts of the world today, for I certainly felt inadequate to do justice to this assignment. I was assured that the only prerequisite was that the person to do this should be a close personal friend of our distinguished Congressman from the Sixth District. I could meet this criterion; and although most appreciative of the honor, I still feel a genuine inadequacy to do justice to this occasion.

My associations with CARL DURHAM first began in the early 1920's, when I was a freshman at the University of North Carolina and he was a young pharmacist in Eubank's Drug Store in Chapel Hill. Since then I have had the privilege of associating with him in a number of capacities: as my friend and counselor; through the professional relationships of physician and pharmacist; and probably the most satisfying of all, as members of a very select organization known as the Riverside Hunting Club, where we have spent many hours together and found many mutual ties and interests. I have shared with him the excitement of listening to the melodious voices of his famous red-bone hounds as they expressed their enthusiasm along the banks of the Haw River trying to put the ring-tailed coon up a tree; we have felt our pulse quicken and our blood pressure rise as we listened together to the call of the greatest of all North American game birds, the wild turkey; we have experienced the thrill of seeing a fine setter flash to a point when his nose told him by that invisible thread of a scent that a covey of the sporting bobwhite quail lay just ahead; and we have laughed together at the staccato voices of a pack of little beagle hounds in hot pursuit of Chatham County cottontails. I have spent many pleasant and profitable hours sitting before an open fire listening to him discuss world affairs.

In all these associations, I have never known CARL DURHAM to show anything other than those fine basic traits of character, understanding, and leadership which have marked the great men of our times.

The Durhams of our area are known for their native intelligence, their determination, and their leadership. CARL has exemplified those qualities in such a fine manner that the people of his district and community feel some personal share in his attainments.

It would, of course, be unbecoming of me to attempt to review here CARL DURHAM'S accomplishments in this greatest of all legislative bodies in the world today, for you are in a much better position to judge these than I am. However, I believe that Daniel Webster's remark about his political opponent and friend, John C. Calhoun, would also apply to CARL DURHAM. If my memory is correct, Mr. Webster said during the famous debates on the Compromise of 1950:

"There was nothing groveling, or low, or meanly selfish that came near the head or heart of Mr. Calhoun."

This, I am sure, is equally true of CARL DURHAM.

We of the Sixth District, as manifested in every Democratic primary and elections since 1938, believe in CARL DURHAM and have the greatest respect and admiration for him. He has served us, the State of North Carolina, and the United States of America in the finest of traditions.

And so, CARL, I bring to you from your many friends of the Sixth District our sincere appreciation and affectionate esteem, with genuine regret that you have decided to withdraw from these responsibilities but, at the same time, with the happy realization that you are coming back home, where we will have the privilege and opportunity of enjoying and profiting by your companionship on a day-to-day basis. May God bless you and keep you.

Big Five Indictment Points Up Antitrust Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1960, I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news release of the Department of Justice concerning the indictments of electric manufacturers charging conspiracy of price fixing, rigged bidding and contract allocations. In that insertion I referred to the rising cost of Federal power projects and the possible effect on the national budget and the American taxpayer of such price rigging and competition-destroying tactics described in these indictments.

There is another and perhaps deeper danger inherent in these alleged conspiracies. They point out a great need for effective and dynamic antitrust action against the ever-increasing monopolistic tendencies of certain business interests.

In this regard I have noted a recent article in the Cincinnati Inquirer by Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business entitled "Big Five Indictment Points Up Antitrust Need: End Era of 'Join or Else.'"

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wimmer's article be reproduced in the RECORD. The article follows:

BIG FIVE INDICTMENT POINTS UP ANTITRUST NEED: END ERA OF "JOIN OR ELSE"

The Justice Department took another major step in its fast moving antitrust crusade, when it charged General Electric, Westinghouse, Allis-Chalmers, I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co., and Federal Pacific Electric Co. with "allocating business among themselves; fixing prices, alloting territories, and a refusal to sell certain equipment to other electric manufacturers."

There were other charges by the Department, and denials of guilt were immediately issued by GE and Westinghouse, with Allis-Chalmers stating verbally that the company had ordered its employees to—"tell the truth to the investigators regardless of the

consequences." Said Allis-Chalmers president, R. A. Stevenson:

"* * * pricing must be determined by sound informed judgment, and customers must be earned by quality products and aggressive salesmanship. Any easier cartel-type methods lead only to stagnation, Government regulation, or both * * *. We will dedicate ourselves to the end that the present situation will never rise again."

Although 14 companies in all have been handed complaints, the above 5 mentioned were accused specifically of meeting in luxurious hotel rooms in Atlantic City in 1958 to allocate bids for switch-gear sets to Federal, State, and local governments among themselves.

According to the charges, GE was to get 39 percent of the business. Westinghouse 35 percent. I-T-E 11 percent. A-C and Federal Pacific 7 percent. Allegedly, agreements on high voltage circuit breakers were also reached, and Federal Pacific and I-T-E were allowed to quote below list prices to private industry.

Both Federal Pacific and I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co. are the smallest among the "big five" in the electrical distribution equipment business, but each is the result of several mergers that speeded up the cartel pattern which has marked this and so many other industries. There has been a feeling for a long time, among smaller concerns in the electrical equipment industry, that the whole case boils down to one of joining up with someone bigger or getting out, and this was particularly true when it came to dealing with the Federal Government. You were either big or you had to get big, or give up; a case of "when you can't lick 'em join 'em," as the cops said in Chicago during the days of Al Capone.

We have no idea what the Federal Grand Jury will do in Philadelphia, and we are making no premature statements about the guilt or innocence of the defendants. What caught our eye in this matter was the statement of Mr. Stevenson of Allis-Chalmers, concerned with cartels and methods of selling, which is all that any honorable, progressive, independent business in this country is asking for. We have sought laws for no other purpose than that of assuring any business an atmosphere of fair competition in which to make its race, and we have been insistent that the smalls, as well as the bigs, shall follow methods based on something that at least resembles a live and let live formula.

Antitrust laws, when properly administered, act the same as the electric distributor involved in the case against the big five. This piece of equipment holds back excess electrical energy; regulating the flow and allowing just the right amount to be fed into power equipment: a home light bulb, an atomic energy plant, or any other electrical installation.

If the distributor assembly should fail, the electrical energy flowing through the power lines would pour into plants and homes in chaotic amounts, and this same hold-back regulating principle can be likened to our antitrust laws. Without them, chaos would have resulted in the market place, and often as the Government may be wrong in its many approaches to the monopoly problem, too many attempts cannot be made to end for all time this business of "join 'em or go broke." * * * whether it is electric distribution equipment, pullman cars, credit cards, trading stamps, labor unions, panties, or pocketbook makers.

Bill of Rights for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the following letter from the sixth grade teacher of the Roger Sherman School, New Haven, Conn.:

DEAR MR. BOWLES: The youngsters in my sixth-grade class have just completed writing a bill of rights for children the world over. This is the culmination of almost a year's work.

In addition to their required work, they read more than 200 articles, several U.N. publications, and more than 50 reference books by way of background preparation. They also tune in on the news every day.

At some points their bill of rights parallels the universal declaration, but by and large it supplements it with an intimacy and warmth that only children can so candidly express.

When I asked the children what they considered the most important message they wished to get across, one youngster replied simply and profoundly, "We care."

In all humility, and with complete faith that in a democracy even the smallest voice will be heard, they would like you, if at all possible, to present to Congress their bill of rights.

These youngsters have a sense of historic destiny and a social conscience that I hope will warm the hearts of our lawmakers, as mine has been warmed, whether or not they believe in all of these proposals.

Appreciatively,

ANA R. MASKEL.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying their teacher's letter was a document from these Connecticut sixth graders which has touched me as deeply as anything I have received from my home State since coming to Washington. These children have said what they want to say in an imperishable way. Tony Lin begins by explaining how the bill of rights was formulated, and the document itself follows. I am honored to present it to the Congress and the American people:

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CHILDREN

Since the beginning of the year, we have been studying the food, income, land, health and educational problems of the world. We have studied the U.N. in action, and its attempts to solve these problems. We also discussed war, prejudices, and unequal rights. We have found that two out of three children are hungry and unhealthy. Half of the world's people are illiterate.

We have read over 200 articles from newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, and U.N. publications on the world situation. We have listened to countless news reports over the radio and television. We have also read over 50 books.

We decided to divide our bill of rights into three sections: love, health, and education.

Miss Maskel, our teacher, asked each child to write his views on each topic. These compositions were not used but just to get us started thinking. Through discussion we would get at a problem from all sides. We would arrive at an answer and Miss Maskel would write it down on the blackboard. If we didn't attack it from all sides, Miss Maskel would ask us questions to get us to think again. If anyone thought of a better way of saying something, and if the class approved of it, Miss Maskel erased the old statement, and put in the improved one.

We have written this bill of rights not for ourselves, for we have most of the necessities of life, but so that the other children of the world might benefit from it.

TONY LIN,
Roger Sherman School.

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CHILDREN THE WORLD OVER

We, the children of grade 6, room 10, Roger Sherman School, New Haven, Conn., would like to present our own recommendations for a bill of rights for all children.

I. Every child needs love. Without love, children would suffer despair. Their health would also suffer. Love gives children a feeling of wanting to do things better.

1. Therefore, every child should be loved regardless of creed, color, sex, nationality, or occupation of parents.

2. Every responsible adult should be concerned about all children. Every child should have some adult with whom he may discuss his problems.

3. Children who are orphaned should be protected and cared for by adults who would treat them kindly.

4. Adults should treat children fairly if they want children to respect them.

5. Some parents like one child better than the others. If so, they should treat all the other children in the family the same.

6. If parents show love for their children, children should return this love with gratitude. Children should help in every possible way voluntarily and when asked.

7. Teachers must respect children, understand them and let the children know that they are loved.

Children should respect their teachers. They should feel that teachers are their friends. Children should cooperate so that there will be a happy, atmosphere in the classroom. Children and teachers will be able to work together better.

8. Every child should be given something to love and care for so that he can assume responsibility.

9. Every child should have the joy of planting and watching live things grow.

II. Every child is entitled to the kinds of living conditions that will produce good health.

Six hundred million of the world's 900 million children are unhealthy because of lack of proper food, clothing, shelter and medical help.

Asia with more than one half of the world's population has less than one fifth of the world's food.

Western Europe, North America and the U.S.S.R. compose one-third of the world's population, but they consume three-fourths of the world's food.

The "have" nations should share more generously their blessings with the "have not" nations.

In the world today there is not enough of tillable land to feed, clothe, and shelter all the people in the world.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that each person requires 2½ acres of good land to provide for his physical needs. Today there are only 1⅗ acres of tillable land for each person, but this land is not evenly distributed. Almost 1½ billion acres of new land could be brought into use.

Scientists should explore the vegetation and fish of the seas to increase food supplies.

In another 25 years the world's population will be almost doubled. Animals for food will be more scarce. We will have to turn to the sea for most of our food.

1. Every child should have enough to eat.

2. He should have proper clothing according to the climate and weather.

3. Everyone should have adequate shelter. Slums should be redeveloped into properly equipped houses with play areas on green grass.

4. Medicine should be distributed by governments where needed. If governments cannot afford to do this, the United Nations should do so.

People who can afford to pay for themselves should do so.

5. Countries who have an excess of doctors should let volunteers go to countries in need of doctors. These doctors should receive an extra degree from the U.N.

Education for doctors and nurses should be free in every country so that there will be enough doctors.

There are 900,000 doctors in the world, but we need twice as many.

We need more nurses and trained helpers.

6. Children and adults should be taught to practice cleanliness.

7. Children and adults should be taught how to control pollution of water.

8. They should be taught that various insects carry various diseases, and learn how to protect themselves by spraying with proper insecticides.

The "have" governments should give insecticides to the "have not" people, because they do not have the factories and the materials to produce these chemicals.

The United Nations should send experts who know how to speak the local language out into the villages to instruct the people in the use of these medicines.

9. There should be hospital facilities for all people who need them. Some of these could be traveling hospitals.

III. More than one-half of the world's population of 2½ billion don't know how to read or write.

If all people knew how to read and write, they would be more prosperous. They could read and write directions.

With proper tools they would be able to work better and make more products.

They would learn how to practice good health habits.

They would know about other people. Perhaps people would understand each other better.

Other countries could not take advantage of them. They would know how to defend themselves.

They would get more enjoyment out of life by knowing how to read and write.

People need an education to run their own government well.

We are living in an atomic age. People need to know much more about science.

As the population of the world multiplies it will be much harder to earn a living. We will have to discover new ways of saving and using our natural resources. For this we will need people who have an education and scientific imagination.

To survive, people will have to study how to get along with others. People will have to learn about the well-being of others.

That is why we are concerned with children the world over, not just ourselves.

1. Therefore every child should be taught how to read and write.

2. No child should be denied the chance to receive an education.

3. Every child should be given the chance to develop all of his abilities.

4. Every child should be taught about the world and its peoples, and their problems.

5. Every child should be taught how to work with his hands as well as his mind.

6. Every child should be taught not only facts, but also how to think for himself and express his opinion.

7. Every child should have the right to play for physical development and for pure pleasure.

8. Children should not be overworked to help support a family.

9. No one should be permitted to take advantage of children.

10. No one should interfere with the child's time for learning.

11. Each country should provide many kinds of education according to its ways of life. Their standards of education should be developed according to the progress of the world.

12. Every child should have the opportunity of a free education through college, if he qualifies.

13. All people should be permitted to worship as they please without interference.

In school every child should be taught to respect each other's beliefs.

14. All people should be taught about other religious beliefs in the world so that people may understand different ways of thinking, different customs, and many kinds of wisdom.

15. Everyone should have equal rights because no one race is superior to any other.

Everyone should have equal rights to a full education, according to his abilities. With proper education harmful prejudices could be abolished.

16. No child should be permitted to call any other child insulting names. Ridicule should not be permitted in any classroom. This should be a standard of citizenship for adults, too.

CONCLUSION

In our classroom we are a class family. Three religions and three races are represented. All the children work together, play together and visit each other's homes. We help each other.

This is the way we would like life to be. In our classroom this is our daily life. We wish that the outside world would enjoy our freedom.

You, the adults of the world and heads of governments, are responsible for our safety, our lives. Children never started wars. Adults did, but children suffer the most from them.

If our Declaration is to reach all the children of the world there must be global peace.

De Gaulle Refreshingly Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial entitled "De Gaulle—Refreshingly Frank" appearing in the morning edition of the Peoria Journal Star of Tuesday, April 26, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DE GAULLE REFRESHINGLY FRANK

Isn't it refreshing to hear a great national leader who isn't worrying about elections and political pressures speak up? General De Gaulle has made some of the plainest, frankest, and most useful comments of any world political figure in a long time.

It is most unusual in this age of tippy-toe diplomacy, and great consideration for the feelings of others, for a world leader to make a speech outlining his views just before going into conference with President Eisenhower.

Usually one goes in mum, and comes out with some sort of a carefully worked over joint statement which reveals nothing about the basic feelings and position of the visitor.

Not so De Gaulle. He made an excellent talk, standing on his own two feet, which should serve to make it very clear to the Soviet Government and to the world that he is not following any U.S. policy. Instead, his own strong point of view is that if Russia makes a fuss over Berlin again, the summit meeting is a waste of time.

In short, that no bluffing will be acceptable to De Gaulle, and if Russia tries to put on the pressure again they can go to the devil.

This is a strong position. It shows more assurance and strength of will than we are used to seeing in our cold war maneuvers. And yet it is backed by strong statements, and realistic ones, that the only road for us to follow is toward real disarmament—and an easing of tensions must come first.

This puts it squarely up to Khrushchev to ease tensions and not invent new crises.

Such action may serve well to smooth the road of the months ahead, and discourage the bubbling Soviet Premier from any pre-summit adventures.

We would wish our own Government were as forthright. We would certainly wish that the British Government would take a leaf from De Gaulle's book and show some small sign of boldness.

And we can be encouraged that De Gaulle-Eisenhower plans for the summit seem to be going smoothly—because we know what De Gaulle's attitude is, and presume Ike must see things much the same way.

Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an essay written by Ann Harycki, a student of the Maria High School, Stevens Point, Wis., on the subject of "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity." Miss Harycki was a winner in the Statewide 1960 contest sponsored by the Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and I am sure the House of Representatives will join me in congratulating this student on her excellent essay, which is as follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY

(By Ann Harycki, Maria High School, Stevens Point, Wis.)

"Food, clothing, and shelter, the necessaries of life, the things by means of which man has expressed his unity with the universe and his creativeness, his love of his fellow men and his love of God, his delight in the physical world and his ability to collaborate wtih God in creation. The object of work is wholeness."—Eric Gill.

A glimpse into history reveals a panorama of man expressing himself at work from the beginning of his existence. The caveman carving the first crude wheel, the Biblical

shepherd tending his flocks, or the first scientist probing the mysteries of the physical world was laboring in the dignity of his wholeness as a rational and spiritual being. He perceived his unique worth as a human person; as caretaker of the earth he mastered situations and met the needs of those who depended upon him.

Two hundred years ago our democracy was founded on the truth that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness." These rights are summarized in the right of every man to what Eric Gill calls the means to living, the right to work.

The secret of a man's dignity lies in this right because at his work he functions as a whole person. He uses all the powers of a human being to express his wholeness—the power of his mind to think, the power of his will to make decisions, the power of his body to serve his fellow men, and to collaborate with God in creating. Work makes him a whole man; no physical lack can diminish the inherent dignity of his wholeness.

Yet we would rob some men of their God-given right. We would stifle their thinking ability, forbid them to serve others, and sterilize their creativeness. In short, we would strip them of their dignity, their right to live, to work, as whole persons, and abandon them—destitute foreigners in their own hometowns—all because of a mistaken idea that a physical deficiency makes a man less a man. Who can tell how many lives have thus wasted away? How many times has an employer's embarrassed "No" denied some person the means to living?

Actually, the handicapped man is as totally a person as his brawny neighbor. Only when he is denied the expression of his personality in a worthwhile job does he become truly handicapped. Only then does he begin to doubt his true worth, his dignity. Only then does he become alienated from a world of whole persons, and then a job is the only passport that will allow him to walk through that world unhampered—not as a stranger, but in all the dignity of a whole person.

The so-called handicapped persons I have met and come to know have proved this to me. Each person's enjoyment of his inalienable rights hinges upon the degree to which he is granted a genuine passport to work for the necessaries of life.

Even as a little girl I never considered my grandfather handicapped, or anything less than a whole person. Over the years his passport has dimmed the memory of the second arm he possessed in his youth. For 24 seasons on his farm "Granpa" has collaborated with his Maker and has delighted in the earth's annual drama of producing food. Now retired and living in town he has taken his official passport along. At 66 he is literally building a house singlehanded, a notable task he has successfully undertaken three times in the past.

From my grandfather's untiring dedication to his work has sprung the undeniable dignity of his manhood. I visualize him running his strong fingers through a bin of fragrant new oats or over a freshly planed surface of lumber and I am aware of the stature of a man in all his worth—a man creating, a man imprinting on nature the stamp of human personality. I see a man secure and proud in his ability to provide for his family and handle major problems, a man who can serve his neighbor because he has the means to do so.

Jobs for those we label handicapped do not always meet such an ideal, but they can still serve as passports. The cripple at an office job exercising his ability to reason and reach decisions is asserting his nobility as a person, a rational being. His passport opens vistas of the mind where only the human can travel, and where the human travels in all his dignity.

Even the handicapped person offered the slightest bit of work by which he can serve others receives the magic formula which allows him to respect himself because he can give himself. Only a whole man can give of his wholeness to others; this is the source of dignity which raises his outlook to a new perspective.

The handicapped truly need jobs. Realizing this need, they want jobs. The employer who unjustly deprives any person of the opportunity for occupation is actually depriving him of the means to living as every free person deserves to live. And in a democracy the employer who deprives anyone of the means to living is suspending a free person's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus he is contradicting the very principle that democracy was founded upon. He is weakening its foundation.

This we cannot tolerate. For our America was, and is, "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We believe that all men were created whole persons, born to think, to will, to serve, to love. Therefore we must grant to every person, regardless of his physical disabilities or limitations, the opportunity for him to express his personality in a worthwhile job. Using to the fullest capacity all his powers of mind, body, and soul, every man can then realize the true source of his human dignity.

And to those we have so blindly and unwisely alienated we must grant passports, the means to living. Then will America's strength be embedded in her people, people who are truly and wholly persons, because they work in the full glory of their God-given dignity.

Amendments to Small Business Investment Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, held hearings on proposed amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 with particular reference to S. 2611 and various House bills, including H.R. 8096 which I introduced on this subject. The experience achieved under the act indicates that certain amendments are necessary in order that the program may be properly effectuated. During these hearings extensive testimony was given by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, the very able chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee; and as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee I also presented a statement.

Because of the importance of this program I include, under leave granted, Senator SPARKMAN'S and my own statement in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statements follow:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ALABAMA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON S. 2611

Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, thank you for your kind invitation to appear before you today to discuss amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. It is always a pleasure to take part in the continuing cooperative efforts involving the Banking and Currency Committees and the Small Business Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, you and I have long been ardent advocates of the capital bank or investment company concept and I am hopeful that the hearings held 2 weeks ago by our Small Business Committee and these hearings this week by your subcommittee will inject a new burst of enthusiasm and activity in the 18-month old small business investment company program.

The honeymoon is over on this program, and has been for about 6 months. Bitter and disillusioned attacks on the administration of the act have emanated from leading financial writers since that time, replacing an era of hopeful good feeling which occurred during most of the year following the enactment of the legislation in August, 1958. The program has been called an appalling flop, strangling in redtape.

About 6 months ago, the Senate Small Business Committee decided to conduct a field study of the program to check on this criticism. In addition to discussions with the Administrator and his aids, our counsel have traveled over most of the country discussing the act and its administration with the small business investment companies licensed under the act, prospective organizers of the SBIC's and with the regional personnel of the Small Business Administration, and particularly with its investment division officers in each region.

During our hearings last month, a broad cross section of the small business investment companies and the proponents testified, together with the administrator and his aids. The committee presently has a report in an advanced stage of preparation, but it, as well as printed copies of the testimony, will not be available for another week or so.

Consequently, my testimony here represents my own views at this time, although I believe that most of the members, at least, of my committee, will share these views after they have had an opportunity to review the hearings, staff field memorandums and the draft report.

May I say just a word with respect to our findings on the charges that redtape is ruining the new program and that it is an appalling flop.

The caution displayed in late 1958 because of fears the "fast buck" boys would invate the program was not only understandable, but also commendable, to my way of thinking. But, as I said at our hearings, this caution has tended to degenerate into an ultraconservative approach to administration as conditions now stand. There is now no phalanx of shady operators trying to knock down the gates. A high type of men, of great vision and courage, are, generally speaking, in control of the SBIC's.

Obstacles have been placed in their way needlessly. The law has been strictly construed; the rules adopted by the SBA have been similarly stringent. Worse than that, however, these rules, or redtape, have not been "currently published in the Federal Register" as required by law.

This failure to publish the rules of the game, as much as the restrictive contents of the regulations themselves, has created an undercurrent of resentment and has produced unnecessary delays.

Turning to the overall state of the program, I feel it is no longer quite fair to characterize it as a complete failure. A hopeful beginning has been made. On the other hand, it is certainly not yet the outstanding success we all visualized and desired when we passed the act. It needs both

legislative shoring-up and courageous, flexible, and imaginative administration.

Therefore, I am sure that our committee will make it clear that we expect those responsible for officially guiding the program to proceed with both diligence and aggressiveness. If your group reaches similar conclusions, I hope you will join with us in making the legislative intent crystal clear.

S. 2611

Our committee strongly believes that the enactment of S. 2611 will mark real progress in removing some of the most obvious bugs in this new mechanism. We were delighted when the Senate passed it last September, and I wish to urge upon you the favorable consideration of the two major and two minor provisions contained in the bill.

During our entire study, we found no opposition at all to S. 2611. On the contrary, everyone was united in the belief that these changes would improve the program. The added flexibility given to SBIC's to negotiate any form of equity investment with small businesses and the removal of the requirement for companies receiving funds to purchase stock in the SBIC are both important, noncontroversial first steps in our legislative campaign to make the 1958 act live up to its full promise.

Further amendments to S. 2611

I am convinced, however, that the changes presently embodied in S. 2611 are in themselves not sufficient to spur any vast new activity in this most important program. At first blush, the figures on the fist year and a half of the Small Business Investment Act seem significant; studied more carefully, however, the $40 million of private funds now invested in SBIC's shrinks to Lilliputian dimensions when measured against the $800 million of section 7 loans SBA has made and against the $6 billion which, according to the Federal Reserve Board, has been invested in the 1 million new businesses added to the business population since the end of World War II.

In the pages to follow, I shall spell out five specific recommendations which, I strongly believe, will convince small business investment companies and their organizers of the financial soundness of the program and give them every incentive to bend their efforts to closing the critical equity capital and long-term credit gap which has for so long hobbled successful and worthy small businesses. I shall also make one legislative proposal designed to keep usury out of the program.

Briefly, I recommend these positive steps:

1. The leverage of SBIC's should be bettered through increasing the amount of SBA funds available under sections 302 and 303.

2. Restricted stock options should be allowed by law so SBIC's may attract and keep the highly qualified managers they require.

3. The inherent risks in this program should be recognized through a statutory tax deductible bad debt reserve allowing a measure of tax deferral.

4. As is the case for mutual funds, SBIC's should be allowed to pass through capital gains.

5. Perhaps SBIC's should be enabled to utilize their skills and offset administrative and fixed costs by participation in SBA loans.

These changes should make it easier and more profitable to organize and operate small business investment companies. Therefore, I strongly urge legislative action to remove the taint of usury from the program. SBA now allows investment companies to charge up to 15 percent interest from small business borrowers. I cry out against such unconscionable rates and propose to set a legal maximum.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to spell out each of these six recommendations.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE L. EVINS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to testify in regard to amendments to the Small Business Investment Act which the committee has under consideration.

As you know, I have the honor to serve as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Select Committee on Small Business which is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration. I have been asked to appear and present a statement before you in my capacity as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1.

During May and August of last year, extensive hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1 on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration with especial attention being given to the administration of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. As a result of those hearings and subsequent investigation by the subcommittee staff, our subcommittee issued a report (H. Rept. 1252), which was unanimously approved by the subcommittee and by the full committee and submitted by our chairman—Chairman PATMAN—to the Speaker on February 8, 1960. Chapter II of this report deals completely with the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and contains the conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee.

I wish to discuss our committee's recommendations pertaining to amendments to the act as set out in the report. It is my understanding that this committee has before it S. 2611 and other bills to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I understand that one of these bills is H.R. 8096, which I was pleased to introduce on July 6, 1959, subsequent to our first hearings on these matters.

Let me state at the outset that, although the report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee and this statement will contain recommendations for some changes in the act, it is my feeling and it was the conclusion of Subcommittee No. 1 that there was nothing in the original act itself, if properly implemented which would have prevented this program from progressing as intended by Congress. The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was and is a good bill. The purpose and intent of the act is good. It offered and still offers an opportunity for great aid to the small business economy of the Nation. The authors of the bill used imagination and a sound basic philosophy in sponsoring this legislation.

As this committee knows this act is not working out quite as most of us imagined and hoped. I think that when this legislation was introduced in the first place, we thought that groups of small businessmen or local development companies might take advantage of this legislation to organize investment companies using their own funds partly and partly using SBA funds as provided in the legislation. Such an investment company would have been sort of a small business cooperative and all of the small businesses involved undoubtedly would have been pleased to own stock in it. Furthermore, these purchasers of stock would have served to provide an influx of working capital and would have guaranteed that they would have always operated with small business in mind.

As we know, the SBA did not see fit to encourage this type of what are called pro bono publico companies. Instead, it has encouraged the formation of these banker type investment companies. Some of them are completely owned by banks. I am advised that 29 of the first 79 licensed investment companies are owned wholly or in part by banks. The SBA advises that 12 of these are actually owned by banks and the remainder of the 29 are tied in with banks through common top officials and, of course, this number does not take into consideration those which might be tied in with banks through other common interests.

Now, I still think and believe that the pro-bono publico type of investment company should be encouraged and I certainly hope that we will see the development of some of these kinds of investment companies yet. Meanwhile, we are faced with the fact that we have established now a number of these private investment companies and we are also faced with the problem of trying to make them work effectively. I think it must now be realized that with the type of companies that have been organized the major incentive is profitmaking and these companies will have to make money if they are going to be of any benefit to the small business economy of the Nation.

The testimony we have received from these investment companies and the SBA is unanimous that they need certain changes to be effective. Our subcommittee has, therefore, in order to supply the SBA and the investment companies with the tools they say they require, made some 10 recommendations pertaining to the Small Business Investment Act—3 or 4 relate to administrative changes. Our committee is recommending some six changes affecting amendments to the act.

Recommendation I is solely administrative and as a result, I will pass over it.

"Recommendation II: The Investment Company Act of 1940 and filings with the SEC: Consideration should be given to amending section 307 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 in order that subsection (c), which provides for certain exemptions under the Investment Company Act of 1940, be deleted and a provision inserted therein providing that these small business investment companies are not to be construed by law as being subject to the Investment Company Act of 1940.

"Meanwhile, the SBA and the Securities and Exchange Commission should continue efforts to coordinate their jurisdictional and administrative functions in such a way as will eliminate redtape and duplications of effort in order to facilitate the purposes of the act in the public interest."

It is recognized that the Security Act of 1933 with its disclosure mandate is a necessary control over the investment companies. But the Investment Company Act of 1940 is essentially a regulatory act and it is felt that it was not the original intent that it should apply to the type of investment companies which are created under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The constant day-to-day control that the SBA has over the investment companies should be sufficient regulation, the type which would be provided by the Investment Company Act of 1940.

H.R. 8096, which is now before you, contains an amendment which would exclude these small business investment companies from the Investment Company Act of 1940. S. 2611 does not contain such a provision.

"Recommendation III: Financing under section 302(a) and 303(b)—interest rate: The SBA should discard any policy it might have which would give preference to the licensing of small business investment companies which do not request Government funds for initial capitalization; and further that the SBA discontinue discouraging the furnishing of Government funds, authorized and appropriated by Congress, to these investment companies as expressed in the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act.

"Consideration should also be given to amending section 302(a) and section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act to provide that the funds advanced by the SBA

to small business investment companies should be furnished at a rate equal to the rate charged the Small Business Administration by the U.S. Treasury for said funds, plus a fraction of 1 percent for overhead cost. It is recognized that this would probably entail a change in the bookkeeping method by which the SBA is financed through the Treasury Department.

"It is further recommended that the SBA not consider the increasing of the interest rate on section 302(a) and section 303(b) funds because of the increased market. It is the opinion of the subcommittee that since the rate was set at 5 percent when the cost from the Treasury was 2⅜ percent, the initial and interim increase should be sufficient and the line held if the provisions of the act are to be meaningful and effective."

Concerning this matter of interest rates on funds supplied to investment companies by the SBA, the present rate of 5 percent is not now out of line. But, at the time this rate was first established by SBA the situation was somewhat different—the interest rate being paid the Treasury by SBA under section 4(c) of the act was set at 2⅜ percent for fiscal year 1959. As we all know, with the drastic jump of interest rates during the past year and with the Treasury now charging the SBA 4⅛ percent for the money it obtains during the fiscal year, the 5-percent rate now charged by SBA is now more realistic and the provision in H.R. 8096 which would provide for pinning the rate the SBA would charge down to one-half of 1 percent above the cost from the Treasury is no longer of great concern; that is assuming that the SBA will not raise the rate of interest which is charged the small business investment companies. But, it is feared by some that if the SBA would set that rate at 5 percent when the cost of the money from the Treasury was 2⅜ percent, then they might increase this 5-percent rate since the rate charged now by the Treasury is 4⅛ percent. It is hoped that this will not be done. Also it is hoped that the interest rates will decline sometime within the near future and when they do so if the SBA still insists on maintaining a 5-percent rate then the principle incorporated in this proposed amendment (H.R. 8096) would then again become of extreme importance. In short, the need of the amendment is no longer immediately necessary, but the principle on which it is based still exists.

"Recommendation IV: Provision of equity capital for small business concerns under section 304: Section 304 should be amended in such a manner as to give the investment companies more flexibility in supplying equity capital to the small business concerns. An acceptable method should be sought whereby a small business concern might repurchase its equity from the investment companies.

"Consideration should be given to amending section 304(c)(2) in order to provide that the small business concerns will agree not to incur any additional indebtedness except open account or short-term indebtedness without first securing the approval of the investment company and giving this company the first opportunity to finance this indebtedness. The only change that this entails would be the insertion of the word 'additional' and the phrase 'except open account or short term,' in the appropriate section of the act."

Much testimony was adduced before our subcommittee to the effect that in addition to convertible debentures, the investment companies should be allowed to purchase from the small business concerns debentures with stock purchase warrants and perhaps even preferred or common stock. As you know, S. 2611 contains a provision which would amend section 304 to delete the portion concerning convertible debentures and to provide that the investment company should supply equity capital to the small business concerns "in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix with the approval or otherwise of the administration." This would place the matter of equity financing on open negotiation between the investment company and the business concern. I am advised that this would provide for greater flexibility and marketability.

But, when giving consideration to this suggested change, there are other things to be considered; more especially the interest of the small business concerns and their attitude of giving up partial ownership and perhaps control of their company. At the present time, under section 304(b), the business concern can at least cause the investment company to make a decision as to whether it will convert its stock now rather than holding it over the head of the concern for a number of years. This can be done by calling the debentures on 3 months notice. Under the proposed change this would be deleted from the act and would be left to open negotiations. Of course, open negotiations in the marketplace are a desirable factor, but many feel that when a concern must have money and there is but one place to get it, there is no real open market and the negotiations are unilateral. It is the feeling our subcommittee that an acceptable method should be sought whereby a small business concern might repurchase its equity from the investment companies. Of course, this is a very difficult field in which to legislate. Caution is desired because no change would be better than a change which would curtail the flow of equity capital into these business concerns. Repurchase provisions or other redemption factors could dmaage the marketability of this stock and a secondary market is certainly desired. On the other hand, the lack of repurchase options might well prevent small business from securing the equity financing needed. Fortunately, the testimony at our hearings indicates that some type of repurchase provision could be worked out that would be acceptable to both the small business and the investment companies. It should be pointed out here that there is nothing in the law at the present time to prevent repurchase options. In fact, testimony at our hearings indicated that some of these investment companies will be giving repurchase options.

The new section 304 proposed in H.R. 8096 contains such a repurchase provision. S. 2611 does not.

"Recommendation V: Compulsory purchase of stock in investment companies by the small business concerns: Section 304(d) of the Small Business Investment Act should be amended to provide that the small business concerns may have an opportunity to become stockholder-proprietors of the company by investing in the capital stock of the company in an amount equal to not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount of capital received from the investment company. This proposed change would make this stock purchase optional rather than mandatory.

"It is further the opinion of our subcommittee that at the time the act was passed it was the intent of Congress that the small business concerns should invest in the investment companies, and that the regulation adopted by the SBA which allows the investment companies to have a 30-day repurchase option on this stock was a modification of the act. That portion of section 107.304–1(h) of the regulations which provides for this repurchase option should be deleted and discontinued in practice by the SBA. It is the opinion of our subcommittee that if the Congress desires to amend the compulsory stock purchase requirements it will do so, but as long as it remains in the law it should be complied with fully. The SBA should give the appropriate committees of Congress its recommendation concerning the effect of this provision of the law in the operation of the program."

The testimony at the hearings before our subcommittee was unanimous that the present requirement which makes it mandatory for a small business concern to buy stock in the investment companies when they obtain capital from the investment companies is a handicap.

On one hand, it was testified that the small business concerns see in this provision just an added cost. I understand that the cost of financing through these investment companies is often well in excess of 10 percent and if the small business concern also buys stock in the investment companies the effective total cost very often will be increased to 15 or 20 percent. On the other hand, the investment companies themselves, of course, do not want their own ownership of the investment company diluted; and they say that more investment companies would be organized if this provision were removed. Our subcommittee has recommended that the present mandatory requirement be removed. However, we do feel that the small business should have the option or opportunity to buy stock in the investment company if they desire to do so. Subcommitee No. 1 feels that this compromise is a realistic one which will, to some extent, preserve the basic philosophy upon which this act was based and at the same time help to make the present investment companies operate more effectively.

As you know, S. 2611 would completely eliminate this stock purchase provision whereby H.R. 8096 would eliminate the mandatory requirement but would retain in this stock purchase provision a requirement that the small business concern should be given an opportunity to purchase stock in the investment company.

"Recommendation VI: Direct loans to small business concerns and aid to unincorporated small business: Section 305(a) of the act should be amended in such a manner as to indicate that the making of loans to small business concerns is also a 'primary' function of these investment companies just as is that portion of the act that provides they will supply equity capital.

"The subcommittee is of the opinion that the SBA should change its policy which prohibits the participation by the SBA with the small business investment companies in making loans. It is felt that, as the act is presently worded, there is nothing to prohibit this participation. Participation by SBA is provided with banks in its financial assistance program. A deferred or immediate participation by the SBA would have the practical effect of supplying a source of supporting funds for these investment companies and should encourage the making of loans to sound small business enterprises."

Section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act provides that it should be a "primary" function to provide equity capital and section 305 of the act provides for direct loans, failing to indicate that this was "primary."

Subcommittee No. 1 feels that the loan program under section 305 of the act is a vital and important function and should be on an equal plane with the equity financing portion under section 304.

S. 2611 would eliminate the word "primary" from section 304. I believe it would be preferable to leave it in and add to section 305 that it would also be a "primary" function to provide direct loans.

"Recommendation VII: Rediscounting agency: Consideration should be given by Congress and the SBA to the establishment of a rediscounting agency or refinancing arrangement for the purpose of rediscounting loans made by the small business in-

vestment companies and creating a secondary market for convertible debentures or stocks obtained from small business concerns by the small business investment companies."

A readily available secondary market or rediscounting agency is a necessity if the small business companies are going to survive and prosper as intended by Congress. There is some evidence that the investment companies will be in danger of becoming "locked in" unless a readily available secondary market is open to them. It is, of course, hoped and expected that private funding sources will be available to these investment companies but it is also felt that it would be an error to provide machinery for establishing equity capital and long-term credit for small businesses unless consideration is given to providing facilities for the necessary financing with which to culminate or effectuate the program. The creation of a rediscounting agency similar to the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank might be desired.

"Recommendation VIII: Geographical limitation of the act: The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 should be amended to provide that the geographical limits of the act would include the territory of Guam.

"This could be provided for by an amendment to section 103(4) of the Small Business Investment Act to provide that the term 'United States' include, in addition to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States."

Other recommendations pertain to administrative matters.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this completes my statement. These matters are dealt with more extensively in the text of chapter II of our report, a copy of which has been made available to each of you.

Maritime Unions Sharpen Issue on Arab Blacklisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, I addressed this body on the need for a firm, a moral U.S. policy in the matter of meeting United Arab Republic President Gamal Nasser's program of boycott and blacklisting, in violation of international law and justice.

This is not a matter that is academic; Nasser's actions and policies are affecting the jobs of our seamen who recently demonstrated, as a final recourse, against Nasser's blacklisting activities.

In a press release issued on April 14 the Seafarers International Union charged that:

President Gamal Nasser of the United Arab Republic has brazenly flouted international law and created a blacklist of American ships, thus threatening job opportunities for American seamen and others whose livelihood depend upon the American merchant marine.

The release also relates why a protest demonstration was held by members of the Seafarers International Union and International Longshoremen's Association, both AFL–CIO affiliates, when the Egyptian-flag passenger-cargo ship *Cleopatra* docked in New York.

The position and action taken by these two unions and their members brought a warning from the State Department, a warning based on the view that the situation was embarrassing the conduct of our foreign relations. I am also inserting the April 27 New York Times story relating the views of the State Department and some background information on the picketing undertaken by the two AFL–CIO unions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, so that the record may be complete, I insert a press release issued by the Seafarers International Union in answer to the State Department charges.

The press release, I think, correctly points out that:

It would appear to us that with the American flag being affronted, American ships being harassed and American seamen being mistreated, the source of the State Department's "embarrassment" should be its failure over the years to have prevented this situation from existing, rather than being "embarrassed" because of possible diplomatic repercussions.

The three items follow:

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, APRIL 14, 1960

NEW YORK, N.Y.—American maritime workers charged today that President Gamal Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, has brazenly flouted international law and created a blacklist of American ships, thus threatening job opportunities for American seamen and others whose livelihoods depend upon the American merchant marine.

The maritime workers also called upon the U.S. Government to notify Nasser that it will use all the resources at its command to restore international law and freedom of the seas.

They demanded that, if necessary, the Government should put into force a twofold program as follows:

1. Order the U.S. Navy not to purchase oil in any port where American ships are blacklisted, since sufficient oil is obtainable in Venezuela, Iran, Indonesia, and in Texas, where oil producers have been working at half capacity for over 2 years.

2. Halt the shipment of Government-financed farm surplus cargoes to any nation which blacklists American shipping.

The charges and demands were made during a protest demonstration by members of the Seafarers International Union and International Longshoremen's Association when the Egyptian-flag passenger-cargo ship *Cleopatra* docked at Pier 16, East River.

The Egyptian ship was greeted by union members who carried signs denouncing Nasser's policies. The signs made it clear that the demonstrators had no quarrel with the ship or the Egyptian seamen who were welcome here. But they also charged that American seamen have been abused and vilified in Egyptian ports.

Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union, summed up the purpose of the demonstration by pointing out that the U.S. Government, despite paying lip-service to the principle of freedom of the seas, has done nothing to oppose Nasser or to ease the economic and personal hardships suffered by American ship operators and American citizens who man these ships.

"The Government may do nothing," he asserted, "but we don't believe the American public will swallow this without a murmur." Certainly, American maritime workers do not intend to take this sitting down.

Thomas "Teddy" Gleason, general organizer of the International Longshoremen's Association declared, "As members of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, and the International Transport Workers Federation, our organization is participating in this protest to help restore full freedom of the seas for the benefit of our brother maritime workers all over the world. As longshoremen, we are vitally concerned with the preservation of freedom of the seas as essential to the flow of cargoes and the livelihood of our members. We are also vitally concerned with the preservation of the liberties of maritime workers wherever they may go."

Mr. Hall asserted that Colonel Nasser has denied freedom of the seas and the right of unrestrained passage through the Sucz Canal by placing many American-flag vessels—as well as the ships of other nations—on a blacklist. This was done, he said, because at some time these ships have carried cargoes to or from Israel, or called at an Israeli port for food or fuel. As a result of this blacklist, American ships in some instances have been denied the right to even carry U.S. Government cargoes to and from Middle East ports.

"Our Government," he asserted, "is on record against interference by any nation of a ship's right to move freely in all parts of the world. Yet official agencies of the U.S. Government have, in effect, supported the blacklist."

Mr. Hall noted that President Eisenhower, at a recent press conference, has declared that it is "certainly not our policy" to assist or support blacklists or ship discrimination by any government against American-flag or other vessels.

"Yet," Mr. Hall asserted, "American Government agencies are continuing to follow policies which, in effect, make it impossible for American ships to obtain Government cargoes if they have ever touched an Israeli port."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1960]

UNITED STATES WARNS PICKETS OF UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC SHIP HERE

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The State Department said today that the picketing of the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* by seamen in New York was "embarrassing" the conduct of U.S. foreign relations.

The State Department expressed concern that if the picketing became protracted there would be widespread reprisal action against U.S.-flag vessels by labor unions in Arab countries.

The 8,193-gross-ton *Cleopatra*, owned by the Khedivial Mail Line of Alexandria, United Arab Republic, arrived at pier 16, East River, from Mediterranean ports April 13.

Immediately the Seafarers International Union put pickets at the ship. Members of the International Longshoremen's Association refused to unload her.

The seamen's union said it was acting in protest against the boycott by Arab countries of ships that had traded with Israel or called at Israeli ports.

The United Arab Republic has barred such ships from its ports and from transit through the Suez Canal.

Representatives of the ship's owners and the United Arab Republic protested that the picketing was for a political purpose and that no legitimate labor dispute was involved.

Paul Hall, president of the seamen's union, insisted that many U.S. seamen had lost jobs because of the Arab boycott.

RIGHTS ARE RECOGNIZED

In a statement today the State Department said it recognized the right of Americans to free speech and "the special status to labor union picketing in labor disputes."

The Department said it also understood the union's position that the Arab boycott

was "discriminatory against American shipping and seamen."

"From the foreign policy standpoint, however, it should be made clear that the picketing is regarded abroad as a political demonstration related to the United Arab restrictions against Israel," the statement continued.

"The U.S. Government has repeatedly emphasized that it does not condone the Arab boycott, which is one of the many unfortunate outgrowths of the whole Palestine situation.

"However, with such complex questions involved, an effort by a private group to apply pressure publicly with a view to bringing about shifts in the policies of foreign governments is, of course, embarrassing to the conduct of our Government's foreign relations and may have unfortunate consequences."

Asked to specify what these consequences might be, a State Department spokesman observed that unions in the Middle East were contemplating widespread reprisal action against U.S.-flag vessels if the New York picketing continued.

"We would hope that the situation would not proceed to the point at which there would be strong counteraction against American shipping and American seamen in foreign ports," the spokesmen said.

Dispatches from Lebanon yesterday said Syrian dockworkers had refused to unload two U.S. cargo vessels in Latakia or to load two American tankers at Baniyas.

PICKETING CONTINUES AT PIER

Picketing of the *Cleopatra* by members of the Seafarers International Union and the International Longshoremen's Association continued yesterday.

The owners of the vessel have sought a preliminary injunction in Federal court to bar the picketing.

Meanwhile, Capt. Behaldim Mandour, master of the *Cleopatra*, has ordered a sundown curfew for his 103-man crew.

The order was called as a precaution as a result of an assault by an unidentified man on Mahmoud Ezz-el-din, a ship's steward, near the pier Tuesday night. The steward is in Bellevue Hospital for treatment of a lacerated left eye.

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, APRIL 22, 1960

Statement by Paul Hall, president, Seafarers International Union, in reply to State Department announcement of April 21:

"The State Department yesterday announced that it was concerned about the threat of widespread blacklisting of American merchant ships by the United Arab Republic. As a matter of fact, the picketing of the SS *Cleopatra* arises directly out of our concern with the same problem, the blacklisting of American ships.

"The decision to picket the *Cleopatra* was taken after lengthy consideration and only after other efforts to obtain relief for the American-flag vessels and crews involved had been unsuccessful.

"This latest threat by the United Arab Republic is merely an extension of an existing blacklist of a very considerable segment of American shipping, over 100 ships in all, which has been in effect for several years.

"Before the Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, and the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, decided to resort to picketline action, great effort had been expended to obtain relief from our Government. We had protested to President Eisenhower that American vessels and maritime workers were being denied rights available to ships and seamen in times of peace under international law and treaty. As a result, we were advised by our State Department on March 2, as follows:

"'Our Government has never condoned the Arab boycott. The United States has consistently made clear to all parties concerned its strong disapproval of the boycott regulations.'

"Beyond expressing disapproval of the boycott, the U.S. Government has taken no effective action to protect the American flag in international trade. Furthermore, other agencies of the U.S. Government directly connected with shipping, such as the Department of Agriculture, have said that the boycott is no concern of theirs.

"The situation reached an acute stage a month ago when crews of vessels under contract to this union, began notifying us that they were abused, mistreated and, held virtual prisoners in Egyptian ports. The crew of the SS *Westport*, a ship on the Egyptian blacklist, were restricted aboard their ship for 22 days in Port Said, and their documents taken away. Similar treatment was accorded crew members of the *Valiant Faith* and the *Rockland*.

"It was at this point that the unions were compelled to take immediate action to protect the rights and job opportunities of the seamen involved and to secure observance of international laws designed to protect the rights of seamen and vessels everywhere.

"We must therefore point out that our Nation must act to preserve the principles of international law, freedom of the seas and the rights of American seamen and American ships.

"The State Department has expressed 'embarrassment' over this situation. It would appear to us that with the American flag being affronted, American ships being harassed and American seamen being mistreated, the source of the State Department's 'embarrassment' should be its failure over the years to have prevented this situation from existing, rather than being 'embarrassed' because of possible diplomatic repercussions.

"While our own members are directly affected, in our opinion it would be a great mistake to consider this problem as being restricted to maritime workers and their employers. It is a problem that should be of concern to the entire American community."

Past Presidents' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to sponsor legislation in previous Congresses authorizing the President to proclaim April 30 of each year as Past Presidents' Day.

The purpose of this legislation was to call the attention of our people via such a Presidential proclamation to the tremendous tasks and responsibilities of the Office of the President, as well as to the admirable, outstanding achievements of all of our great country's Presidents down through the years.

I am proud to call the attention of our membership to the action taken by Florida's distinguished Governor, LeRoy Collins, in proclaiming April 30 as Past Presidents' Day in Florida.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF FLORIDA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas the Presidents of the United States have been men of great integrity, bringing to the post of Chief Executive the quality of leadership that has made our country admired and respected throughout the world; and

Whereas the achievements of our past Presidents have advanced the progress and development of our Nation, contributed to the general welfare, and have led us to a position of world prominence; and

Whereas it is fitting that one day of each year be designated to honor those who have so ably led our Nation in peace and war: Now, therefore

I, LeRoy Collins, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 30, 1960, as Past Presidents Day in Florida, and urge all the citizens of Florida to consider the heavy responsibilities borne by our past Presidents and the sacrifices they have made in guiding the Nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 1st day of April A.D. 1960.

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have worked with WAYNE ASPINALL over the years know, of course, of the large role he has played in keeping an adequate Federal reclamation program going, not just for his State or area, but for the entire West. I am pleased to include in the RECORD as a part of these remarks an editorial which indicates that others are beginning to recognize the tremendous job he is doing and want to give some recognition now to his fine work. The editorial is from the April 20, 1960, issue of the Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo.:

NAME ONE FOR WAYNE

It is our considered opinion that one of the upper basin lakes to be constructed by a reclamation project such as the Curecanti, or one of the huge dams, should be named for Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL.

Certainly the West, and particularly Colorado, has no Representative who has done a small fraction as much for reclamation as WAYNE ASPINALL over the past decade. At present he is really the only man in Congress with the power to do so who is actively promoting reclamation projects.

Concerted action should be forthcoming from all over Colorado to promote the suggestion and see it carried through. Without doubt support would be forthcoming from Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming. These States probably appreciate better than Colorado does the role which ASPINALL has played and is playing in the development of the West. Any objection that it is not customary to make such a gesture during a man's lifetime could be overcome by concerted effort on the part of Colorado. Certainly the custom has been disregarded many times in the past for lesser reasons.

It is fitting that the first move for the plan should come from this congressional district. It recalls the fact that the father of the Taylor Grazing Act came from the same district. The act named for Edward T. Taylor of Glenwood Springs perpetuated his memory forever in the conservation annals of the West. Much of the reclaimed grazing land is actually the real monument to Ed Taylor.

By the same token much of the food supply of the United States and perhaps of the world will be a monument of WAYNE ASPINALL long after he is dead and gone and the time of farm surpluses will have been forgotten.

The West, and particularly Colorado, can never repay Congressman ASPINALL for the dedicated service he has rendered the reclamation and all development of western resources. Naming a reclamation dam or lake for him would be only a gesture. It would be one through which the West could tell WAYNE ASPINALL as well as the Nation that it recognizes the importance of his work and appreciates what it means to the future of the West, the Nation, and the world.

Thirty-nine Thousand Two Hundred and Fifteen Floridians Answer Rogers' Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in the past, I sent out a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Florida to seek their views on some of the issues expected to come before this session of Congress.

The results of this questionnaire should be of interest to all Members, and for that reason I ask that they be included in the RECORD today.

The questionnaire is printed in each newspaper in the district, and some direct mailing is done. It has grown during the last 6 years from an initial response of 3,000 to today's total of 39,215.

The poll represents the views of people in the 11 south Florida counties making up the sixth district..

On the gulf coast the fishing industry, farming, and cattle raising are chief occupations along with tourism. In this area there are several large developments of retired people from all over the country.

The central portion of the district includes Lake Okeechobee and the sugar producing area of Florida, in addition to some of her finest cattle ranches and truck farms.

Along the east coast of Florida the district includes citrus producing lands, tourist centers and one of the Nation's chief sources of winter vegetables and flowers.

In addition to farming, cattle, citrus, and tourism the district has industry of all kinds from the manufacture of boats to heavy jet and rocket engines. Deep water ports handle imports and exports to many areas of the world.

With these facts in mind I believe that the poll represents a good cross section of thinking of the American people throughout the country, represented by business, labor, farmers, ranchers, and the retired.

The results of the poll this year are as follows:

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS' ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE—TOTAL ANSWERS RECEIVED: 39,215

1. Do you favor a Federal fair trade bill which would authorize manufacturers of brand name merchandise to set minimum resale prices on such goods at the retail level? No, 22,747, 60 percent; yes, 15,165, 40 percent.

2. A Senate committee is presently investigating drug prices. Do you think the Federal Government should take action in this field? Yes, 32,699, 85 percent; no, 5,780, 15 percent.

3. Should the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds be raised? Yes, 19,302, 54 percent; no, 16,442, 46 percent.

4. Proposals have been offered to raise the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and extend the coverage of the present law. Do you favor such a proposal? Yes, 23,903, 63 percent; no, 14,039, 37 percent.

5. Do you favor elimination of Federal price supports to farmers? Yes, 31,030, 83 percent; no, 6,597, 17 percent.

6. Do you favor a cut in foreign aid spending? Yes, 32,046, 85 percent; no, 5,655, 15 percent.

7. Do you favor using Federal funds for: (a) school construction: No, 19,375, 51 percent; yes, 18,616, 49 percent; (b) teachers' salaries: No, 24,718, 66 percent; yes, 12,736, 34 percent.

8. Do you favor my proposal by which our national debt would be reduced by not less than 1 percent each year? Yes, 36,545, 97 percent; no, 1,130, 3 percent.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, efforts of the Communists to utilize the civil rights issue to discredit the United States in the eyes of the world were recently exposed before a South American audience by Dr. John A. Hannah, Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and president of Michigan State University. Dr. Hannah very ably outlined some of the problems involved in an effective civil rights program in discussing the matter at a convocation held by the Brazil-United States Institute in Rio de Janeiro.

The Michigan State University magazine reports on Dr. Hannah's remarks in its April issue and I present it for the consideration of my colleagues of the House:

CIVIL RIGHTS

President John A. Hannah has returned from a trip to South America in which, as one of his tasks, he sought to give a clearer picture of civil rights in the United States.

His trip, on which he visited Michigan State projects, especially the Institute of Business Administration at São Paulo, was sponsored by the Federal Government. He met President Eisenhower at São Paulo and had an extensive talk on foreign aid with the President's brother Milton.

As Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, Dr. Hannah delivered an address on the subject at a convocation held by the Brazil-United States Institute in Rio de Janeiro.

The decision to give the speech abroad was made, Dr. Hannah says, because "the Communists are discrediting us all over the world by magnifying Little Rock."

"We're not perfect," he told the Brazilians, "but we are making strides in civil rights."

A knowledge of certain fundamental characteristics of the United States is essential if we are to understand our civil rights problems, Dr. Hannah asserts. But these points are often overlooked even by Americans, he adds, "so it is not to be wondered at that they are not generally understood elsewhere in the world."

American history and tradition are deeply involved in the civil rights picture Dr. Hannah mentions.

First, he says, State sovereignty must be considered, for "the historic constitutional issues in our country have arisen over disagreements as to the extent of Federal powers to regulate the lives and activities of citizens within their respective States."

Included in State sovereignty and the delegation of governmental power, the MSU president explains, is the breakdown into school districts—as in Michigan with its 2,250 independent school systems.

In most school districts a local board of education has charge of curricula, teachers, salaries, and textbooks.

"All of this is essential," Dr. Hannah says, "to an understanding of why we in the United States have been wrestling with the problem of school integration—the admitting of Negroes to schools attended principally by white children.

"It has long been the practice in the Southern States of our Union to educate Negroes in separate schools of their own, and whites in their own schools.

"In some countries, the practice could have been ended by a decree from the central government accustomed to imposing its control on schools throughout the nation. But not in the United States—local control of education is a tradition in our country and one we would be reluctant to give up."

The Supreme Court ruling that no American child may be denied admission to any school because of race or color, Dr. Hannah continues, had the effect of opening all-white schools to Negroes, with many Southern States protesting it was a violation of States' sovereignty.

"When the law and the issues are clear, Federal coercion of the States is a final and extreme resort to which we seldom turn. Hence, in many of the Southern States there developed what has been called 'massive resistance' to the Supreme Court decision."

Dr. Hannah says, however, that there has been a noticeable lessening of resistance to the Court's ruling.

The second pertinent fact about American history and civil rights, he explains, "is that from the time our country was founded there has been a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of extending the principle of equal opportunity and justice to all men."

Slavery was in existence when the Government of the United States was founded, he says, and it was necessary to compromise to achieve a union, although the founders of the country believed slavery would wither away.

"That they were wrong, we know now. Slavery persisted, and was not ended until we had suffered the agonies of a great civil war."

Achievement of our theoretical ideals, he says, has always been measured principally by our success or failure in dealing with the Negro problem.

In theory, Dr. Hannah continues, constitutional amendments after the Civil War extended full and equal rights to all citizens, including Negroes.

"In practice, we had turned into the mainstream of American life as free men and women some 4 million human being descended from ancestors who had been torn from their roots in Africa. They had been kept in slavery, and they had almost no education or training for the full citizenship they were now to enjoy."

It is of great significance, he says, that no additional civil rights legislation was passed by Congress between 1875 and 1957, when it was decided that an objective commission should be created to investigate allegations that civil rights were being denied because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Commission on Civil Rights was ordered to investigate charge that some citizens were denied the right to vote, and authorized to make other studies concerning denial of equal protection of the laws for all citizens.

Voting, education, and housing were studied in the Commission's first period of activity, he relates.

"Sworn affidavits and public hearings soon revealed what had long been suspected —that in some sections of our country large numbers of Negroes were indeed being denied the voting franchise. It was humiliating to find that disenfranchised Negroes were often heroic veterans of our country's wars, and that many of them were professional men and women holding the highest academic degrees.

"It was indefensible that a great majority of them were paying taxes for the support of government whose officials they could have no voice in choosing."

The Commission reported its findings to President Eisenhower and Congress, with recommendations for corrections.

In education, Dr. Hannah says, "the Commission has been able to document the instances of discrimination." But:

"Against the stories about Little Rock and about school bombings, I could set many instances in which men and women of good will sat down together and worked out solutions to their community problems in the best interests of all."

Both in voting and in education he believes the prospects are encouraging for the achievement of American ideals.

In housing, however, he says the problem is more complex.

For one thing, initiative and authority rest not with governmental units but with individuals.

Another reason housing is a more complex problem is that Negroes alone are not involved. Dr. Hannah lists Puerto Ricans, as in New York; Spanish Americans, as in the Southwest; Oriental Americans, as in the West; and American Indians to a minor degree.

Hearings on the problem have been held in Atlanta, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco, with patterns and principles beginning to evolve, Dr. Hannah adds.

"We are beginning to understand better than ever before how essential decent, respectable housing is to the development of good citizenship in a democracy. Education and voting rights are of little value if minority groups are forced by any circumstances to live in slums, are crowded together beyond the limits of decency, and are denied any hope or prospect of improvement in their lot."

The Commission's task is not a pleasant one, he asserts.

"No American, proud of his country, enjoys turning the pitiless searchlight of truth upon its shortcomings and deficiencies.

"We are sustained in our unpleasant task by the belief that only by disclosing our weaknesses can they be corrected. As a people, we are historically and traditionally intolerant only of injustice and inequality."

Speaking about willingness to confess America's faults and the soul-searching over civil rights, Dr. Hannah notes that, "All of our history, speaking generally, reflects a constant concern that we have not as yet achieved the ideals to which we officially and traditionally aspire."

Dr. Hannah mentioned that the Swedish scholar, Gunnar Myrdal, stresses the fact that American self-criticism sometimes amazes and pains our friends and gives aid and comfort to our enemies, as when communism seeks to capitalize on our struggles with racial problems.

"We are not perfect, nor do we claim to be," he says. "We just happen to think that honesty is in the long run by far the best policy, even in a world where there is so much international duplicity and deceit."

Dr. Hannah gives examples of achievements already made toward declared goals in the field of human rights and liberties.

At the end of the American Revolution, he says, the Nation numbered 3,250,000 persons, of which only 120,000 could vote. The others were slaves, women, those who did not own property of sufficient value, were not of proper age or for some other reason were denied the voting franchise.

"The lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which we are proud."

In 1950, he continues, there were slightly more than 97 million persons of voting age, with 5 million Negroes of voting age in the South where restrictions are most often encountered.

"We think 4 percent is still too large a proportion of those entitled to vote—but we could as well be boasting that 96 percent exercise the voting franchise freely."

In education, about 8.6 percent of the schoolchildren in 10 States are causing us active concern, Dr. Hannah says, and they represent a minute fraction of all the children in all public schools.

"Thus our penchant for self-criticism holds us up to world censure because of a small percentage of our schoolchildren, when we should have the world's applause for having come so close to extending full and equal opportunity to all schoolchildren of whatever race."

President Hannah gives an amusing example of how, even in the United States, strides to wipe out discrimination are not fully appreciated.

He relates that Michigan State University recently received a questionnaire from the staff of the Commission on Civil Rights, asking for a report on the number of those in minority groups within the student population.

"The university of which I am the president could not reply to the Commission of which I am the Chairman," he says, "because we do not keep such statistics, nor have we done so for many, many years."

Students at Michigan State, as at most other public universities in the United States, are not asked to disclose their race, religion or nationality when making application to enroll.

"We simply do not care whether they are white or black or brown or yellow," Dr. Hannah asserts, "whether they are Catholic or Protestant or Jewish, whether they are native born or have emigrated to our country. We are interested in their mental capacities and moral character and nothing else.

"All of us—indeed, the whole Western World—pay deference to the ancient and noble idea that the individual human being is of supreme worth, that his person and his dignity should be secure against degradation. This is what civil rights are all about."

Goals for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, at the Democratic Midwest Conference, which was held at Detroit, Mich., on March 26, 1960, outstanding leaders of the Democratic Party dedicated themselves to the consideration of national issues in order to inform the American public as to the goals of the party.

Among the splendid statements submitted, the following on metropolitan problems was presented by Mr. William Coleman, chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee of the State of Ohio. Mr. Coleman made a concise and well-considered presentation of the needs of urban communities.

The statement follows:

METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1950 defines a standard metropolitan area as including 1 central city of not less than 50,000 population for the entire county in which it is located along with adjoining areas which have dependent economic and social populations. At the last census there were 174 such areas in the continental United States comprising more than half of the Nation's entire population. Metropolitan area population has consistently shown a more rapid growth than the national population.

Within the metropolitan areas figures show that the greatest population growth occurs in the suburban areas, at a rate of more than 2 to 1 over population increases in the central cities. The 1960 census is expected to show remarkable increases of the above figures. This has been established by a number of surveys during the 10-year period which all point to the fact that the population growth of metropolitan areas has been proceeding at a very rapid pace.

The Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission reports that U.S. population has increased more than 20 million since 1950, with nearly 95 percent of this increase occurring in the Nation's 174 metropolitan districts.

It is important to note here that these growing population areas with the emphasis on suburban area growth, are spilling over county and State lines. In 1950 there were 24 metropolitan areas in the United States which crossed State lines. The Council of State Governments reports that 29 other metropolitan areas have, or soon will become interstate.

Using these figures it can be said that more than a fourth of the Nation's population is living in metropolitan areas that are interstate or soon will cross State lines.

Two articles in February editions of the Saturday Evening Post under the title of "Our Urban Revolution," report on "the biggest migration in our Nation's history—the great outpouring from the cities into the suburbs—and the profound social, economic, and political problems that we face as a

result." These articles describe a great "strip city of nearly 30 million people that is beginning to spread for 600 miles along a narrow belt of northeast coast, from north of Boston to south of Washington."

Even before we have begun to solve our metropolitan problems, the sociologists are envisioning a "megalopis" comprised of many metropolitan areas.

The Post article says the great migration that is filling up the space between the cities is not, therefore, a movement of people only. It is a movement of industry as well. Factories no longer tied to ports and harbors and railroad junctions, can be set up wherever the highway runs and the cloverleaf of the great expressway will become a center of sprawling city of tomorrow.

The problems attendant to these gigantic population concentrations stagger the imagination. Even now, there has been relatively little real effort made to meet the problems of our metropolitan areas which are concerned with cities over 50,000 population.

The Council of State Governments reports that the number of local governmental units averages 96 in each metropolitan area. Furthermore, as metropolitan areas grow, local governments have in most cases increased in number.

Perhaps the major problem arising from this situation is the inability of limited-jurisdictional units of government to deal with the overall problems of their areas.

The Government Affairs Foundation, Inc., reported in 1958 that a total of 112 general metropolitan surveys have been made in the United States since 1923. Of these 79 were initiated during the 10-year period 1948 to 1957.

A review of these surveys by the foundation showed that the studies generally agreed that the following four results seem to occur almost universally as the aftermath of mushrooming metropolitan growth:

1. The serious consequences of the absince of any areawide instrumentality to cope with areawide needs and problems are probably the greatest point of agreement among the survey findings. The question is how a multitude of local governments of varying size and competence can cope with areawide problems.

2. Inequities in financing local government services in the metropolitan area also are the concern of most surveys. An example of this is city services and public facilities financed from city taxes, which benefit the nontaxpaying suburbanites.

3. The inadequacy, or absence, of certain governmental services in parts of metropolitan communities.

4. The existence of barriers to democratic control of government in metropolitan communities. Complexity, duplications, and overlapping jurisdictions have caused dilution of citizen control of government.

The Council of State Governments says the metropolitan problem unquestionably is one of the most critical domestic difficulties facing an increasingly urban United States. "It presents a major challenge to the ingenuity of the people of our democratic societies * * * local governments are increasingly incapable of satisfying public needs that extend beyond individual governmental boundaries or range of authorized functions."

The council recommends that each State should establish legal authorizations for the creation of general metropolitan units that will be adequate in functions, financing ability and structure.

The council recommends three types of metropolitan government—the multipurpose metropolitan district, the federation arrangement, and the comprehensive urban county form.

The basic features of all three plans are the establishment of a metropolitan level of government to assume areawide functions and the retention of local governments to perform strictly local activities.

This committee believes that citizen participation on every level of local government is most important and must be retained in any governmental superstructure devised to meet these new problems.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California has appointed a 19-member commission on metropolitan area problems. He directed the group to make a serious study of metropolitan government.

"Explosive growth," he declared, "knows nothing about manmade boundary lines. The role of the commission will be to give statewide study and thought to the problems before they overwhelm us all."

The Governor listed five areas of inquiry for guidance of the committee in its work:

1. Transportation, freeways, rails, and streets, "how best can we move millions of men to and from work?"

2. Housing, redevelopment and land use planning, "how can we keep the central areas of cities from becoming slums?"

3. Maximum economy in handling the tax dollar, "do we have too many overlapping jurisdictions?"

4. Prevention of air pollution and water contamination, "what new measures are necessary to prevent poisoning of air in metropolitan regions?"

5. Larger governmental structures or districts, "what are the values and limitations of supergovernmental agencies?"

He declared that inflexible ideas should be abandoned and thinking should be in terms of meeting the needs of the communities of that State.

The 1955 Wilder Foundation report on Cincinnati, Ohio, clearly pinpoints the problem of the core areas of cities when they are deserted for suburban residential communities.

The Wilder report says the core cities of metropolitan areas have thus been forced to cope with increasing burdens of poverty, disease, and crime in blighted areas whose taxable wealth has exhibited a constantly decreasing ratio to the cost of administering them.

The Wilder report also points out that the core city is losing its most intelligent citizens who are best qualified for city government in the immigration to the suburbs.

The Wilder report and other surveys point to a fact that annexation has failed for the most part as a means for the core city to expand. The borough plan or federation of large communities has failed to receive public acceptance and therefore it does not present a solution. The city-county consolidation plan has gained little public acceptance because it represents the elimination of many incorporated areas and the vesting of all local autonomy in a single government usually remote from the localities within its jurisdiction.

The Council of State Governments believes the transforming of county governments into metropolitan units offers the greatest possibilities for effective metropolitan government. They point out that county lines usually more closely approximate the limits of metropolitan areas than do the boundaries of general local units. They argue that county governments have been growing stronger and that the conversion is easier to accomplish rather than create new general governments of metropolitan jurisdiction. They also point out that most other metropolitan approaches have been rejected or have proved unsatisfactory.

However, the Council of State Governments fails to explain how the county metrogovernment setup would be in any less difficulty in a few years than the present smaller governing units are now. The council admits that a major reorganization of county government structure and processes would be necessary before the county could assume metropolitan government responsibility.

It would seem to us that the use of metropolitan special districts or authorities offer the best solutions to the metropolitan problems which we will continue to face in greater complexity in the future. In many instances metropolitan districts now in operation are the closest thing we have to actual metropolitan governments. It is true they are not yet dealing with all the problems in their area and are generally limited to one or two specific functions such as supplying water or sewage facilities. The many successes of special metropolitan districts or authorities leads us to believe that this system could be highly successful on an expanded basis to include many of the services demanded by residents of metropolitan areas. However, a study of the metropolitan district or authority type of governmental unit suggests the need for more representative control by the units which it serves.

In setting up metropolitan districts or authorities it would seem to us that they would need to be empowered with more than one purpose for two reasons: one, it would keep the number of government units down and two, it would keep each authority from adopting too narrow a view.

I think we should emphasize here that metropolitan units—districts or authorities—must be confined to dealing with special services. For instance a metropolitan park authority would be responsible for planning, maintaining, and envisioning the future park needs of an entire metropolitan area which might encompass several counties. All communities in the area would be represented on the park board and contribute financial support in proportion to the size of their various respective communities. It would not seem farfetched to us, if this park board were to be given the problems of recreation. Police and fire protection might constitute another metropolitan board. Water, sewage, and garbage collection might form the basis of another.

Control of these various metropolitan boards could be in the hands of the people if each community elected its representatives to the board at regular elections. Overall policy decisions would be left to the various governmental units backing up the metropolitan area who would instruct their board representative on how to vote in matters requiring representative policy decisions.

We believe in this way actual democratic representation would be effected while increasing the effectiveness of public services.

It is important to note here again that the creation of metropolitan special districts would not destroy the basic governmental units of a community which require citizen participation and which we believe are so important to the continuance of our democratic government.

Some of the problems which we believe metropolitan districts would be better equipped to deal with are mass transportation, garbage and refuse disposal, flood control, air and water pollution, public health and safety, fire and police protection, water supplies, education, and certainly long-range planning.

In view of the magnitude of these services to meeting megopolis of the future which is already racing over county and State borders, we believe that certain steps must be taken not only by State and local government but by the Federal Government to create enabling legislation, financial support, and awareness of the immediate and the impetus to act.

The Saturday Evening Post article concluded: "Some new forms of government, greater than the city, less than the State,

must be evolved to link city and hostile suburbs together to their mutual benefit."

Therefore we recommend that a "Metropolitan Point 4" plan be established. This plan would first be acted on by the Congress of the United States with legislation creating metropolitan study committees for all communities whose dependent populations had extended beyond their state boundaries. These communities would be made up of representatives of Federal, State and local governments in varying ratios determined by the particular geographic and population sizes, with the majority representation going to the units involved.

The metropolitan point 4 program would supply funds for surveys, recommendations, and long-range planning. The metropolitan point 4 plan would be a continuing program which would costantly seek more efficient ways to supply services and deal with future growth. One of the most glaring deficiencies in local government is its inability to plan ahead under our accelerated population growth. Even those communities which attempted, usually in sporadic fashion, seldom effected coordination with adjoining communities resulting in unorganized confusion. Most communities, other than the largest cities, are unable to bear the cost of comprehensive master planning. Those who have completed master planning, in some instances have had to negotiate with adjoining communities over such long periods that the plan was outdated before it became a reality. We therefore believe that the financial burden should be shared by the Federal, State and local units in establishing and maintaining the metropolitan point 4 planning committees. While we believe this is essentially an interstate problem and involves the responsibility of the Federal Government, we think it is necessary that the greater responsibility rests with the State and local units of government. The decaying core areas of many of our larger cities has resulted in Federal assistance to blighted residential areas. We believe that the decaying business sections must also be given some attention if we are to preserve the city as a cultural institution which has always supported our great libraries, museums, theaters, along with our municipal universities, hospitals, welfare institutions, etc.

Metro point 4 would offer a coordinated plan to rejuvenate the entire core areas of the central metropolitan city in the metro population center. In areas where private capital is unable to meet the challenge of this revitalization program the Federal Government would be asked for assistance. In interstate areas metro point 4 committees would be set up by interstate compacts operating with representatives from each State.

An inportant function of the metro point 4 planning committee would be recommending local, State, and Federal legislation to solve the problems of metropolitan growth for their respective areas. We believe the problems of metropolitan government are very serious. They have gone unrecognized in many areas until only recently and have been dealt with in an expedient manner designed only to correct immediate problems. There has been almost no planning on a preventative basis designed to avoid future problems. We cannot continue to muddle through. Such a course will only compound our present troubles. Therefore we believe this problem must be attacked on a national scale immediately by establishing a separate department of government to avoid chaos from the lack of suburban planning and great areas of our farm land becoming future slums and the extinction of core area city cultural centers.

Flood Control—Blackstone River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the general flood control project in the Blackstone River Basin in my district, I am informed that Gen. Alden K. Sibley, able and distinguished head of the Boston office of the Corps of Engineers, held recent hearings, March 29, 1960, at Uxbridge, Mass.

The purpose of the hearing was to determine the needs and desires of local interests relative to further measures for flood control and allied purposes in the Blackstone River Basin, in addition to the currently authorized and recommended projects.

I might mention at this time that the latter projects include West Hill Dam and Reservoir now under construction, the Woonsocket local protection project and Worcester diversion tunnel which are essentially completed, the Pawtucket flood wall which is presently in an inactive status, and protection for the lower section of Woonsocket which is currently being considered for authorization by the Congress.

I may also state that these projects and current studies are part of an overall program for the area which was inaugurated after the catastrophic 1955 floods, the basic projects of which have already been completed, or are under construction.

The additional projects projected at the hearing, and contemplated by those of us who have been interested in the completion of flood control for this area, include additional work protection projects, clearing, widening, and deepening the Blackstone River in several localities, and construction of additional reservoirs.

Channel improvement projects were suggested for the Blackstone River from the Rice City Dam in Uxbridge to the Rhode Island State line, the Rockdale and Riverdale sections of Northbridge, the Skull Rock Bridge area in Uxbridge, and in the vicinity of the drive-in theater in Lonsdale, R.I.

Suggestions and proposals also included installation of crest gates at the Rice City Dam in Uxbridge and the Kupfer Bros. Dam in Northbridge, enlargement of the storage capacity behind the Kupfer Bros. Dam and construction of a floodwall to protect the mill at that point.

Increased bridge capacity at Millville Road and Mendon Street in Uxbridge was also recommended. Additional flood control reservoirs in the Mumford River and tributary brooks in Uxbridge and Douglas were also requested.

In my capacity as chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation Subcommittee on Flood Control and Protection established after the 1955 floods, I have given most careful attention to the overall program and proposed new projects which, we hope, will, in effect, provide necessary safeguards against future floods.

In that connection, General Sibley of the Engineers has given extended and most effective attention to all these problems, and has assured me that the suggestions for additional improvements will be given careful consideration in his report on the Blackstone River which is scheduled for completion this year.

I may state again, as I have done so many times before, that without the cooperation and invaluable aid of the Army Engineers these tremendously vital projects could not have been completed in such a timely and effective manner, and I am privileged indeed to extend once more, in behalf of my constituency, as well as other people in our State and area, and I am sure for the Massachusetts delegation, our profound gratitude.

Certainly an overriding factor in the completion of the general flood control program in the area has been the consideration and timely assistance rendered by the House Appropriations Committee, as well as its counterpart in the other body, and I am proud indeed that the Members of the House and the Congress have expressed their confidence in the overall program and have given us assistance and unwavering support, thus making possible the great progress that has been made in protecting our State and neighboring States from the ravages of flood waters that periodically visit the area.

It is my hope and expectation that, with continuing cooperation by all of the agencies and officials concerned at local, State, and Federal levels, we will continue to make substantial headway toward maximum protection for the entire area, and that is surely an end which will not only have the wholehearted approval of our people, but will be very deeply appreciated by them.

Mutual Security Act of 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three observations about the Hardy-Carnahan amendment we are about to vote on. First, the prohibition on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or set-asides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or

constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various proposals with prospective borrowers, or internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in Section 202(b) of the act that the Fund "in its operations shall recognize that development loan assistance will be most effective in those countries which show a responsiveness to the vital long-term economic, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures—." Obviously assistance to projects and programs in such countries are to be given priority.

Secondly, the amendment clearly calls for such data on the various types of projects and programs which the Fund finances as is appropriate to a preliminary judgment on the particular project or program.

Thirdly, the amendment does not constitute a limitation on the types of projects and programs which the Fund may finance although the data that the Fund will require on these will vary, depending on the Fund's share in the total financing and the existence of reasonably reliable evaluations that may already have been made.

I think it is important that the record be clear on these points. The amendment's purpose is not to put the DLF in a straitjacket, but to make sure that commitments are not made for projects before they have been studied sufficiently to insure that loans made for them will in fact be in accordance with the purposes of the DLF and reasonably certain of accomplishing its declared objectives.

"Attracting Industry Southward": Remarks of Hon. W. Cooper Green at Princeton University Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding men of the South today is the Honorable W. Cooper Green, former mayor of Birmingham and currently executive vice president of the Alabama Power Co., whose headquarters are in my district. He is a man thoroughly acquainted with every aspect of our region's social and economic life and thus when he speaks on the subject his words are well worth our closest attention. Recently, Mr. Green addressed a conference at Princeton University on the industrial development of the South. His speech, "Attracting Industry Southward," is one of the finest I have ever read, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body:

ATTRACTING INDUSTRY SOUTHWARD

(Remarks of W. Cooper Green, executive vice president of Alabama Power Co., Birmingham, Ala., Princeton University Conference, Princeton, N.J., April 13–14, 1960)

I am honored and proud to be here as a visitor, and appreciate the privilege of speaking to you regarding my beloved southland. Gentlemen, I am not going to philosophize with you, endeavor to be a statistician and bore you with figures, or make comparisons in my talke to you on industrial development of the South. Anyone can philosophize, depending on his theories or beliefs—everyone has access to figures, and can prove or disprove a number of things depending on his point of view—and comparisons can be offensive depending on which good side of the track you were born. I am simply going to talk about what I know best—industrial development in the South, what has taken place, why, and the reason this industrial revolution will continue in our area.

Industrial development in my State and the South is big business, and a most competitive one. Throughout our Nation it has been estimated we now have 7,000 people full time in this field of endeavor. There is naturally a nationwide scramble to grab off the proposed plants of new and expanding industries producing new and improved products. This is especially true in the South where community is bidding against community, State against State. But never has there been so much teamwork among local business interests, teamwork within the States, local improvements, innovations, and minds at work devising new ways to attract this business.

Certainly this effort is a major occupation with all chambers of commerce, State governments, railroads, banks, southern utilities, and other organizations. Our area is showing again the competitive spirit which is the hallmark of America's progress.

Much has been written about the various methods and procedures used by industrial development organizations to attract industry to the South. There are no secrets unless they be research, hard work, teamwork, persistence and patience. None of us are responsible for the raw materials and other resources with which God endowed the South. A lot of our industry is just coming home where it always belonged. It is natural that textiles should be close to their source of supply—cotton, and the chemical industry that supplies basic materials for synthetics. Likewise, the woodpulp and paper industry belongs to the South, the area with the fastest growing timberlands in America. The chemical industry is just taking advantage of the natural mineral resources that have been there all along. When a region has 56 percent of all minerals produced in the United States, 33 percent of the forests, 70 percent of the Nation's petroleum, 80 percent of the natural gas, 22 percent of all coal, 75 percent of the graphite, 40 percent of the phosphate, 100 percent of the bauxite, and 61 percent of the Nation's navigable waterways, it is only logical for industry to move in that direction.

This movement to the South is one that was inevitable because of the richness of the region and its undeveloped potential. What organizations such as ours have done is to help uncover this potential and present our resources in a factual way to industry that could turn them into profits for itself, and at the same time give jobs to our people who would in turn enjoy a better way of life.

Because of this new payroll money and the population explosion, a great market has developed that calls for new industries to supply it. The South has at last entered a regenerative phase of the industrial cycle—the phase that feeds on itself and grows out of its own demands and supplies.

The southern industrial revolution is a continuing dynamic upsurge because its leadership is convinced that apparently there are no visible limits to the variety or volume of human consumption; and the capacity of man to enjoy the fruits of his labors recognizes no boundaries. New processes, new techniques, new designs for plants, the ingenious use of raw materials and supplies of power and water * * * these are the demands of modern industry, and they are being met promptly and adequately in the South.

Over 2 million jobs in the South have been created in the years since World War II. This growth, this productive activity in the southeastern section of America, is an irresistible, undeniable fact; it is like an ever-rising tide which no one, even if he wanted to, can stem or turn back. The Deep South is truly living through an unheaval more profound in many ways than the secession, but one that is basic and enduring, rather than emotional.

You might ask, who are some of the manufacturers who have benefited recently from the utilization of raw materials that have been waiting for centuries to be put to work?

For example, five new chemical plants along the Mobile River in Alabama owe their existence to a University of Alabama professor, Dr. Stewart J. Lloyd, who several years ago discovered a large salt dome a few miles north of Mobile while conducting a natural resources survey. Olin Mathieson built a huge chlorine and caustic soda plant to supply the fast-growing paper mill industry and other manufacturers of the southern area, using the salt as raw material. Then Geigy Chemical & Calabama Chemical Co., because of an assured chlorine supply, built insecticide plants to supply agricultural areas in the Southeast. Courtauld's Ltd. of England constructed a multimillion dollar viscose rayon plant in the area because Mathieson could supply the caustic soda necessary for production of rayon. Then Courtauld's also needed carbon bisulfide, and Stauffer Chemical erected a new plant nearby to supply it. All this because of raw material that, up to 1950, we didn't even know we had.

Alabama Metallurgical Corp., a joint venture between Calumet & Hecla Co. of Chicago and the Brooks & Perkins firm of Detroit, recently went into production of primary magnesium, and became the second producer in this country because of a dolomitic ore in Alabama that had the right chemical analysis. Formerly this ore had been used as a fertilizer, aggregate for roads, and for lining furnaces in the Birmingham steel industry. Incidentally, this plan came into being because of a chance meeting of two men vacationing in Key West, Fla., Mr. T. W. Martin, chairman of our board, and Mr. E. Howard Perkins, chairman and president of Brooks & Perkins. Mr. Perkins told Mr. Martin of his dream to build a magnesium plant based on dolomite as the raw material, and Mr. Martin asked him to let our department conduct a study to see if Alabama could meet his requirements. Mr. Perkins agreed and wrote us a three-page memorandum listing his specifications, asking if we could meet his rather difficult and critical needs. I am happy to report that after 2½ years of extensive geological and feasibility studies covering every aspect of the proposed operation, the plant was located at Selma, Ala. From this story you can understand we get our prospects in many different ways and sources.

In the papermaking industry, Coosa River Newsprint Container Corp. of America, Marathon Paper (now owned by American Can Corp.), International Paper Co., Scott Paper Co., and Gulf States Paper Corp., have taken advantage of our extensive timber and water resources in our State. These plants and others make up a total of 80 pulp and paper mills in the South today

and they supply 40 percent of all paper sold in this country. Our area is the largest producer of chemical woodpulp in the world.

Another example is a fine company, F. C. Huyck & Sons, who built a multimillion-dollar "felt" plant to supply this growing papermaking industry. They are using our navigable rivers to bring in wool from Australia.

Alabama alone has 1,600 miles of navigable waterways, and over 531 square miles of inland water area. The South, with the largest water resources in the Nation, is using only 4 percent of its available water supplies while the rest of the country is using 18 percent.

Then there are names like Reichhold, Goodrich, Goodyear, Borden, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, National Gypsum, Westinghouse, General Electric, Chemstrand, and many others who are taking advantage of materials, manpower and market in the South.

All the foregoing have located in our State. Other Southern States have shown a similar growth, so you can well imagine the great industrialization that has taken place. Since the end of World War II, the General Electric and Westinghouse companies have established at least 20 new plants in the South, employing from 20,000 to 30,000 workers turning out products ranging from electronic tubes, fluorescent lamps and electric blankets, to large transformers and major appliances. The DuPont Co. has invested several hundred million dollars in more than half a dozen new southern chemical plants. Ford Motor Co. has four auto assembly plants in the South. Since 1946 Western Electric built three plants in North Carolina that employ about 10,000 people. The aluminum industry is largely concentrated in the South where it has nine primary producing plants.

The work of our department and others in the South is based on presenting to manufacturers the factors that we call the 3 M's—"materials," "manpower," and "markets." I have spoken at length on our raw materials. As regards manpower for construction, operation and maintenance, adequate and productive labor is essential. Actually our labor poci has only been tapped in the last 15 years. An evidence of our labor supply is that we are not only providing labor for our own industrial expansion, but we are contributing substantially to the labor supply of other regions.

The southern industrial plant has an advantage of being located at the source of an assured labor supply. Not only is there no recruitment expense to speak of, but there is a wider opportunity for selecting better quality workers. In times of labor shortages it is easier to retain an experienced labor force. Even when a plant is shut down, key workers do not readily drift away, and many of them have small farms which provide income to tide them over.

Our labor is not cheap, unless you call it cheap production-wise, and this is true because it is healthy and independent in spirit. Since World War II, good and plentiful labor has been a lodestone that has attracted industry, and there are no signs that show any lack of magnetism in our day.

For example, one Alabama plant which had only 700 jobs reported an active file of 9,000 applicants, and one with 2,000 unskilled positions has over 15,000 active applications.

Although a lot of firms were initially uncertain and skeptical about southern labor, their almost unanimous conclusion (from their own experience) has been an enthusiastic endorsement of the quality, quantity, and performance of southern labor. They have found a better selection of workers who are easy to train, have high productivity because of their cooperative attitudes, low rates of turnover and absenteeism, and in most instances good labor relations. Let me quote a former manager of General Electric's electronic plant in Anniston, Ala.: "We are proud of the intelligent and interested men and women who have joined our organization. We are deeply satisfied that it has been possible to offer supervisory opportunity to so many young people in the area—an opportunity to develop real careers in the rapidly expanding field of electronics."

How has our market developed, and what have been the results of this market? Primarily the original influx of industry was based on raw materials. The payroll generated by these plants gradually raised our standard of living. There was more money to spend and our people wanted more of the necessities along with some of the luxuries of life. As a result there was a demand for more goods, more services, and so industry came to furnish this demand. This new money generated by additional employment is why a large number of the new factories in the South have been built to fulfill the needs of our people.

The gap is fast closing between the South and the Nation in per capita income because of this rapid and amazing growth. In the 1939–58 period the Southeast had an increase of 361 percent as compared to the national average of 270 percent. My State had a 444 percent growth in income during those same years.

I am sure you will agree that there is hardly a more accurate barometer of commerce and industry and the standard of living than electric power consumption. In 1947–58 period the Southeast showed an increase of 194 percent, as compared to 115 percent for the country as a whole. The growth of our own company has paralleled the rapid economic and industrial development of its service area. To assure an adequate and economic power supply for the future growth that we believe is certain, our company is engaged in the largest expansion program of its history and this faith is shared in like manner by other southern utilities. The company that I work for is in the initial stage of a 10-year program that will double its facilities. In 10 years we expect as much growth as was experienced in the 40 preceding years.

One other thing I would like to mention in passing; some would classify the friendliness and cooperative spirit on the part of existing industries, community leaders and citizens as an intangible factor, but let me assure you that it is most tangible and has played a great role in our industrial efforts. One of the basic desires of men and industry is to be wanted, and manufacturers have found that they are sincerely appreciated in the South.

Several years ago a prominent New York executive seeking a southern location for his company had this to say: "A warm feeling of welcome from citizens and from State and local officials was given us wherever we went, and we have learned that this welcome does not wear off."

I can assure all of you that our governmental climate, at all levels, is a healthy one, and the highest type of cooperation exists between government and business. A favorable tax structure has been created, and maintained, that makes the South an ideal location.

What will be the South's industrial future is like trying to answer "what is electricity?" We know what it has done and can do, but what it will do, given the opportunity, is anybody's guess. The South is still a land of unrealized and unlimited opportunities, waiting for the initiative and courage of man to develop it. But we do know its development is assured because it is based upon the region's raw material, abundance of good and productive labor, excellent transportation facilities, a promising amrket for goods and services of all types, based on a higher purchasing ability, and the wonderful enthusiasm of its people.

Our success is not measured by any idle boasting, nor any utopian dream, but by facts, tangible facts such as industries now prospering in our area. Industrially and economically, there is no longer any basic difference between the South and the rest of the Nation, unless it is that the South is rapidly catching up. There is no iron curtain between the North and South to block off the sound of the industrial growth that is going on below the Mason-Dixon line. The sound is one that has grown steadily for the last 15 years with no indication of hands growing tired that beat the drums. For all those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, there is no doubt that the South has literally lifted herself by her own bootstraps. For a land that was destitute after the War Between the States, without money, without industrial know-how, without time to do anything except worry about the necessities, without any lend-lease or Marshall plan to put it back on its feet, the South has shown a phenomenal growth. As one man from Georgia recently put it, "A lot of things have been happening down here since General Sherman's soldiers got careless with matches back in 1864."

Thousands of words have been written and spoken about attracting industry southward. There is a certain amount of frustration in describing fully the methods, procedures and results because of the time allotted and the many facets involved. I do hope that my words have given you some indication of what we have done, are trying to do, and why we believe the South is the new industrial frontier offering unrealized profits to those who will come and grow with us.

In conclusion, I would like to leave you with a saying often used in my part of the country. It is this: "The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South."

We Dare Not Dawdle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville News-Democrat of Thursday, April 21, 1960, entitled "We Dare Not Dawdle":

WE DARE NOT DAWDLE

The alarming degree of national defense unreadiness was forcefully reiterated by Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, commanding the Military Air Transport Service, in testimony yesterday before a House Armed Services Subcommittee.

The disturbing truth is that MATS, which is depended upon to provide our Nation's strategic military airlift, can't deliver the goods. It has the will, high skill, and everything else it takes—except the necessary tools to do the job.

Hamstrung by the Air Force in the competition for defense dollars and bled by politicking commercial aviation lobbies which covet all airlift as their private province, MATS has been shamefully deteriorated. "The present (MATS) force is 90 percent obsolete and cannot meet the time

limitation established for airlift of Army forces," General Tunner said in supporting his plea for immediate modernization of MATS.

Of course, he wasn't telling the House group anything they hadn't already found out during a month of intensive probing of military airlift adequacy. Our own Congressman MELVIN PRICE is a member of this diligent subcommittee, which has determined that although MATS has a top priority job to perform, it is precariously poised on the bottom rung of the national defense ladder.

Announcing tentative conclusions, Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS described MATS as "the outstanding orphan of the Military Establishment," and suggested that it be reorganized as a separate command directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or else have its mission determined by statute.

This conviction affords insight into the high caliber of this penetrating and, in fact, long overdue investigation.

Most of all, though, the Rivers probe underscores the urgent necessity for immediate action to rescue and rejuvenate MATS. It is imperative that Congress act on this matter in this session. Continued dawdling imperils our national security.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Capitol Hill unit, Federal Bar Association, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Bar Association and other law associations on their efforts on behalf of the national observance of Law Day, U.S.A, on May 1, 1960.

It is certainly fitting and proper that this day be specially set aside to commemorate our great heritage of liberty, justice and equality under the law. We must always remember that while ours is a Government of, by, and for the people, it is a Government of laws, not of men. It seems to me that we lawyers on Capitol Hill have a special obligation, and that is to make our system of laws even more efficient. We should also rededicate ourselves to uphold the law in our service to this Nation and its citizens. I, therefore, call upon all the members of the Capitol Hill unit, Federal Bar Association, to take particular note of this day and to join wholeheartedly in its observance.

I also urge all citizens of our Nation to take advantage of this occasion to further their knowledge of the great benefits they are receiving under our American law.

In this regard, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement on the importance of Law Day, U.S.A. written by Mr. C. F. Brickfield, counsel of the House Judiciary Committee and a member of the Council of the Capitol Hill unit, Federal Bar Association. Mr. Brickfield's statement merits the attention of not only every Member of Congress but every person in America who is concerned with the formulation, administration, and enforcement of the laws of this Nation.

The statement follows:

LAW DAY—CAPITOL HILL UNIT, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

May 1 is celebrated across the Nation as Law Day, U.S.A. The purpose of this observance is (a) to strengthen the Nation's dedication to the rule of law as the foundation of our free society and (b) to freshen every American citizen's awareness of the rights and privileges he enjoys by reason of our system of law.

For the last 3 years, the Federal Bar Association has joined in the responsibility of helping to commemorate Law Day. Throughout the country chapters of the Federal bar have joined with the Federal and State judiciaries in remembering, through appropriate exercises, that our Nation's basic strength lies in the laws which protect the rights of its citizens.

The Federal bar has also joined with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in having prominent members of its bar address newly sworn citizens, impressing upon them the great benefits which our rule of law guarantees. In addition, because of its close relationship with Government lawyers, the Federal Bar Association has secured the aid of the general counsel of many of our Federal agencies who, in turn, have caused to be inserted in the bulletin for the month of each agency a description of what Law Day is and means.

Last year these activities of the Federal bar were carried out not only in the United States but in other parts of the world as well. In France, for example, the Paris chapter made special arrangements and held appropriate ceremonies in schools in the cities of Paris, Orleans, Poitiers, Verdun, and Chateauroux.

Happily, the Capitol Hill unit of the Federal Bar Association came into existence this year and has taken its place as a full-fledged unit of the Federal Bar Association. As such, it enjoys not only the benefits the Federal bar has to confer upon it, but also, and I might say properly so, the obligations which the Federal bar imposes upon it as a responsible member of its organization.

The Capitol Hill unit is therefore happy, as one of its first duties, to join with the other chapters and units in commemorating Law Day and, for its part, to remind lawyer-legislators on Capitol Hill of their role and responsibilities with regard to the rule of law.

One may wonder what is the relation of the individual lawyer to the great creature called the law and, more especially, what is the relation of the lawyer in the legislative branch of the Government to the enactment of legislation which becomes the supreme law of the land. Putting first things first, it is necessary always to be mindful of one of the prime tenets of our form of government—the dignity of the individual. The rights and privileges of each person in our great land are first and foremost. All of our instruments of government are created to secure those rights and are subordinate to those rights.

These rights are preserved and protected in the first instance through the laws of our Federal Government and of our States. The laws are enacted by lawmakers who are the elected representatives of the individuals whose rights are to be protected. These lawmakers are aided in this tremendous responsibility by persons trained in the precepts of lawmaking. These precepts include, of course, a knowledge of bill drafting and a knowledge of parliamentary procedure. But such knowledge is in essence concerned with procedures only. Just as important is the need for a thorough background in the substantive law which affects the rights and privileges of the individual. Without a thorough knowledge of the fundamental instruments of our Government, such as the U.S. Constitution, Federal Statutes, treaties, and without a proper training in the jurisprudence under the natural law as to what is right and just, no lawyer, especially a lawmaker, can adequately serve or adequately do the job of preserving and enhancing the dignity of the individual.

A lawyer, as a general practitioner, is, in lerge part, a businessman. He deals with businessmen and with other lawyers in a business way. In the final analysis only a small part of his total business and working hours are taken up with the drawing of legal papers and the researching of legal questions in law books.

The lawyer, as an elected representative, is essentially a political figure dealing in the policies of Government. Little of his time is devoted to bill drafting or parliamentary procedure. While it is true that he should be proficient in these subjects, nonetheless, like the general practitioner, he spends the greater part of his working day dealing with problems affecting human relations. The legislator consults with others to find out how better to increase the manifold benefits which the individual today enjoys; he seeks out abuses which exist and discusses with others, ways of eliminating such abuses. And the lawyer-assistant who help the legislator acts in much the same way for the problems of the legislator are in substantial part the problems of the assistant.

Without the basic understanding and acceptance of what is right and good, as those concepts are outlined and understood in our fundamental instruments, no lawmaker can adequately fulfill his role. So in this Law Day, when the Communist world is glorifying the supremacy of the State and the iron rule of the state, it would be well for us of the Capitol Hill Unit to remember our responsibilities as lawyers in the legislative branch of the Government and to renew our determination to strive to develop better the laws of our land so that they will remain a bulwark against totalitarian and Communist ideologies by holding preeminent the rights and dignity of individuals.

It Is Red China, Not the United States of America, Which Continues To Block Admission of American Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued by the State Department on April 20, 1960. It is strange how many still believe it is our State Department that prevents American reporters from carrying on their work in Communist China:

A year ago the Department of State, in announcing (Press Release No. 281 dated April 23, 1959) the extension of the validation of passports of American correspondents to travel to Communist China, stated:

"The Department has repeatedly made it clear that if any bona fide Chinese Communist newspaperman should apply for a visa, the Secretary of State is prepared to consider recommending to the Attorney General a waiver under the law so that a visa

could be granted. Not one Chinese Communist correspondent has yet filed an application. American law does not permit the Department to do what the Chinese Communists demand, which is to agree in advance to admit an equal number of Chinese Communists, even before their identities are known to us. If the Chinese Communists were indeed interested in reciprocity, they would have an equal number of Chinese newsmen apply for visas."

In the year that has passed the Department:

1. Added 2 more to the list of the 30 American news organizations authorized to send one representative each to Communist China, bringing the total to 32.

2. Removed from the validation the reference to the Communist controlled portions of China, which reference several American newsmen had indicated might militate against their receiving a visa to enter Communist China. These passports now have no time limitation other than the periods for which they are normally valid. In the same year, despite U.S. initiatives:

(a) The Chinese Communists have not granted a single visa to an American correspondent to enter Communist China;

(b) Not a single Communist Chinese correspondent has filed an application for an American visa to enter the United States;

(c) The Chinese Communists have continued to insist that, if there is to be travel of newsmen to each other's countries, an agreement must be announced for this purpose. This agreement must promise "equal and reciprocal treatment."

It should be noted that the United States has never had such an agreement with any other country. Nor has the Peiping regime apparently found it necessary to conclude such an agreement, even with those countries where it has no diplomatic relations and where journalists of its official New China News Agency operate, i.e., France and Cuba. It is obvious that Peiping is seeking to use the issue of news representatives in an effort to force the United States into a formal agreement to improve the prestige of the Chinese Communist regime.

The U.S. position is simply that ample provisions already exist under the law to permit the "equal and reciprocal" travel of newsmen to each country. The fact that the Peiping regime has not yet allowed any of their journalists to apply for a U.S. visa casts substantial doubt on their professed concern for reciprocity. In July 1959 one American news representative was refused a visa on the grounds that it was "not convenient at this time". It is also known that the requests of several reputable free world journalists other than American have been either turned down or ignored in recent months. Therefore, on the basis of the situation as of today, the Department of State is obliged to conclude that Communist China, despite its statements, has no serious interest at this time in either the travel of its own newsmen to the United States or the travel of American newsmen to the China mainland. The representatives of this Government will, however, continue to press for a satisfactory solution to this problem with representatives of the Peiping regime whenever the occasion presents itself.

The 32 American news organizations, accredited by the Department on the basis of the established criteria, announced on August 22, 1957, namely that they had demonstrated sufficient interest in foreign news coverage to maintain at least 1 full-time American correspondent overseas, and that they wished to be represented in Communist China for 6 months or longer, are the following:

American Broadcasting Co., American Universities Field Service, Associated Press, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, Columbia Broadcasting System, Copley Press, Inc., Cowles Magazines, Inc., Denver Post, Encyclopedia Britannica, Fairchild Publications, McGraw-Hill, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Mutual Broadcasting System, National Broadcasting Co., National Geographic magazine, Newspaper Enterprise Association Service, Inc., New York Herald Tribune, New York Times, Newsweek, North American Newspaper Alliance, Reader's Digest, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Saturday Evening Post, Scripps-Howard Newspapers, The Sun (Baltimore), Time Inc., United Press International, U.S. News & World Report, Wall Street Journal, and Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc.

Reciprocal Trade Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the November 8, 1959, edition of the Japan Times, published in Tokyo, entitled "Cottage Industries."

I hope that every Member of the House will read this revealing editorial and then inquire how American industry can possibly compete with foreign labor receiving $2.80 per month. I recognize that the national wage level in Japan is somewhat above that level, but nevertheless it is unquestionably low in comparison with our own high wage rates here.

We all want friendly relations with Japan and other nations of the free world, and all nations of good will, but it is clear that we can no longer afford to allow foreign goods produced at a mere fraction of the cost of production in our own country to flow into this Nation in large volumes, attacking our markets, undermining our wage standards and our conditions of work, and posing serious threats to the survival of a great many American industries.

This situation is getting worse every day, and I urge once more that Congress do something about it, before it is too late.

These cheap goods and materials of many kinds are flooding the American markets, and other markets of the world, so that high-priced American products cannot compete with them.

We will either find some way to regulate this cutthroat trade or we will face an economic debacle.

The article follows:

COTTAGE INDUSTRIES

A part-time worker doing contract labor for a rubber footwear company died in Tokyo the other day of benzol poisoning. The tragic death pinpointed anew the need for a cottage industry labor law.

This is not the first time that a debate has risen over legislation to protect workers in cottage industries. Poverty and unemployment have combined to drive a large number of people into badly crowded living conditions today and a large percentage of them have turned to accepting piecework in their ramshackle homes under contract to small industrial plants.

The law does not protect them, and the government has done little for them.

A labor ministry survey states that 330,000 families throughout the country are employed in bare subsistence work in cottage industries. This is not a small number by any means.

Moreover, even in families fortunate enough to work more than 6 hours a day, the monthly income comes to around 1,000 yen, give or take a little, according to the survey. How any family could survive on this sum—equal to $2.80—is a miracle. The word tragic does not even begin to describe the lot of these unfortunates.

At the root of this evil is the fact that the national labor law does not extend its protection to the workers in cottage industries. And the labor standards law does not apply.

Because of this, workers in cottage industries have no legal protection against accidents. They are not eligible to receive compensation, and they have no guarantee of minimum piecework rates.

The business firm which places the order with each cottage unit dictates the rates. It makes them or breaks them, and there is nothing the workers can do about them. And the longer the term of the contract, the worse these conditions are.

Without protection from the law, cottage industry workers have only two choices—to demand better working conditions and face the certainty of not eating tomorrow or to swallow their conditions silently and at least assure themselves of a little food in their rice bowl.

There is a minimum wage law. But it is applied only when there is danger that rate agreements between contractors would not be observed and small industrial plants would be placed at a competitive disadvantage. In effect, the minimum wage law has been protecting the businessmen, not the workers, in the cottage industries at least.

Piece rates for work farmed out to cottage industry units today are so low as to defy commonsense. That is why an effective cottage industry labor law is needed today.

Such legislation should include a minimum wage law with teeth in it, protection of end-contractors and their workers from unilateral cancellation, and rigid safety provisions for the workers.

Only by such means can we help the tragic people working in cottage industries and prevent further mishaps such as deaths from benzol poisoning.

TWUA Favors Enactment of S. 722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. William Pollock, general president, Textile Workers Union of America:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1960.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: We urge your immediate help in getting the proposed legislation for area redevelopment (S. 722) onto the floor of the House and we urge you to support such legislation.

You know well the plight of the textile workers who have been left stranded by mill closings in all parts of the country. Publicly announced mill liquidations are estimated to exceed 800 for plants employing over 220,000 people. Further shutdowns are likely to occur. These are reported in all parts of the country. Moreover, technological change has reduced employment so that there has been a net contraction in employment of over 400,000 production workers in the past decade.

Unfortunately, these mills have been located in communities where there were few alternative employments. Some of these towns and cities have tried valiantly to attract new employments. Some have been moderately successful but the overwhelming number of these areas remain distressed and have suffered this plight for many years.

The basic reasons for their difficulties is that the communities and facilities have to be modernized and redeveloped in order to make them attractive for the newer types of employment arising in many other areas. The distressed communities have been unable to finance these improvements and have not had the local resources and, in some instances, the leadership necessary for this gigantic undertaking. They have need of a helping hand to guide them in their programs and financial aid to initiate the renewal of their facilities and construction of the needed additional ones. Many communities must erect pilot industrial or commercial establishments to provide evidence to our economic leaders of their determination to reconstruct their economies.

The proposed area redevelopment legislation will provide this help to the hundreds of communities which need technical and financial aid.

We urge your endorsement and active support. This is the time when your help will count most.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
General President.

Another Incredible U.S. Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Wednesday, April 20, 1960, as follows:

ANOTHER INCREDIBLE DECISION

The decision of the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-4 vote, allowing a railroad union freedom to strike to enforce demands for a voice in management, is another milestone in an incredible series of decisions of the current High Tribunal.

The Order of Railroad Telegraphers in this case maintained that the Chicago & North Western Railroad must secure its approval before severing hundreds of surplus employees from the payroll.

These employees, mainly local agents along branch lines, worked as little as 12 minutes a day in their one-man stations, with a daily working average of 59 minutes. Pay for some ran as high as $300 per hour.

The railroad, in dire financial straits, sought to consolidate these offices under a central agency plan. The union threatened to strike to enforce retaining them and the railroad applied for an injunction.

The Supreme Court decision states that the railroad must secure the approval of the union and that the union can strike.

This decision vitiates the Norris-LaGuardia Act which, although it forbids courts to enjoin strikes in labor disputes, does not prevent Federal courts from issuing injunctions barring "unlawful conduct or strikes to force acceptance of unlawful demands." Thus, in effect, the demand of the union for a voice in managemet is a lawful one, according to the majority of the present Supreme Court.

The railroad did not invoke the Railway Labor Act in the belief that a demand for a voice in management was not within the realm of collective bargaining.

Under this astonishing decision, railroad unions can insist on the rights of management and enforce them by a strike, notwithstanding orderly provisions of law to avoid railroad strikes.

The Supreme Court decision tortures the interpretation of law. The only light we see is that the decision may make the railroad business so chaotic that the various unions which have steadfastly resisted all attempts to eliminate featherbedding and made work will finally, as a last desperate measure if anything is to be saved in their industry, agree to some orderly procedure for working out the problems which are strangling the railroads and costing the jobs of railroad workers.

How can any union in good conscience insist that an unnecessary job be maintained and paid at rates as high as $300 an hour?

For that matter, what justice is there in insisting on the retention of jobs which have been eliminated by technological improvements or by insisting that a workday consists of traveling 100 miles, just as it did in the 1880's when that was the distance generally traveled in an 8-hour day by wood-burning locomotives and hence the yardstick of a day's work?

Elimination of featherbedding and made work is certainly not antiunion nor is it promanagement. It is, rather, the only way in which the present disastrous trend in railroad employment can be checked and reversed—a trend which has seen a million jobs on the railroads vanish in the past two decades.

The unions have just as great a stake in the solution of this problem as the railroads themselves or the public. Eventually there will be no railroad unions if there are no railroads. Every time a train is taken off a run because it is unprofitable, that many more engineers, firemen, conductors, brakemen, telegraphers, pullman porters, and all others connected with that train lose their jobs.

How vastly much better it would be if the union, instead of sticking to an insistence on an outmoded system of operation, which demonstrably has been depriving them of thousands upon thousands of jobs every year, would work with management toward a solution of these problems.

In the end, there might well be more and better paying jobs, based on realistic standards of work, instead of $3 an hour for a telegrapher who probably doesn't take in that much money for his employer in a month's time.

The Supreme Court majority, consisting of Chief Justice Warren and Justices Brennan, Black, Douglas, and Harlan, has rendered a body blow to stable management-labor relations.

The resounding dissents of Justices Whittaker, Clark, Frankfurter, and Stewart, protesting the decision, may light the way to a stronger Court in the future.

As a sidelight, one of the greatest mistakes of President Eisenhower may well be his appointment of Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan to the Court. These two, more than any others, have consistently found themselves on the side of those who oppose strengthening the Nation, whether it be by intelligent bargaining in labor-management relations or, in an entirely different field, protecting the Nation from the Communist conspiracy.

Birmingham Commissioners Demand Retraction of New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Wednesday, April 27, 1960. The article includes the text of the Birmingham city commissioners' letter to the Times and relates to their plan to bring suit against the Times because of the libelous nature of two articles about the city of Birmingham penned by Times reporter, Harrison Salisbury. In addition to the commissioners' statement, the article also includes the comments thereon by Mr. Turner Catledge, managing editor of the Times.

I would especially like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the last two paragraphs of Mr. Catledge's statement:

The two articles about Birmingham constituted a story of the tension that our reporter concluded exists there. We recognize that the articles did not stress the obvious fact that an overwhelming percentage of the citizens of that city lead happy and peaceful lives in a growing and prosperous community. Nor did the article stress the equally obvious fact that this substantial element of the citizenry deplores any lawlessness that may exist in their city and is working in its own way to correct and reduce such tensions as exist.

Should further investigation by the Times indicate that any statement in the Salisbury articles is incorrect or inaccurate in any respect the Times will publish an appropriate correction.

It is interesting that the Times now concedes, as Mr. Catledge's statement strongly indicates is the case, that only one side of the Birmingham story was presented. Also, it would appear from his mention of "further investigation by the Times," Mr. Catledge even feels that one side of the story was not presented accurately.

We shall await further action by the Times to right the great wrong they have done a fine community and its elected officials.

The article follows:

THREE IN BIRMINGHAM ASK A RETRACTION—CITY OFFICIALS DEMAND ACTION BY THE TIMES ON ARTICLE—EDITOR ISSUES REPLY

The New York Times has received letters from the three city commissioners of Birmingham, Ala., demanding that it "publicly

retract as a whole" an article about race relations in their city published on April 12.

Identical letters were sent by Mayor James W. Morgan; Eugene Connor, commissioner of public safety, and J. T. Waggoner, commissioner of public improvements. Copies were addressed both to the Times and to Harrison E. Salisbury, the reporter who wrote the article.

A statement on the letters has been issued by Turner Catledge, managing editor of the Times.

COMMISSIONER'S LETTER

The text of the identical letters by the commissioners follows:

The undersigned member of the city commission, the governing body of the city of Birmingham, acting under section 914, title 7, Code of Alabama of 1940, hereby respectfully demands that you publicly retract as a whole the article defamatory of him published under the heading "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham" in the April 12, 1960, issue of the New York Times.

The undersigned member of the city commission, the governing body of the city of Birmingham, acting under section 914, title 7, Code of Alabama of 1940, hereby respectfully demands that you publicly retract the matter defamatory of him contained in the article entitled "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham" appearing in the April 12, 1960, issue of the New York Times, and particularly the false inference and insinuation that the undersigned has encouraged or condoned racial hatred or religious intolerance, contained in the following:

"Volunteer watchmen stand guard 24 hours a day over some Negro churches. Jewish synagogues have floodlights for the night and caretakers. Dynamite attempts have been made against the two principal Jewish temples in the last 18 months. In 11 years there have been 22 reported bombings of Negro churches and homes. A number were never reported officially."

The undersigned, a member of the city commission, the governing body of the city of Birmingham, acting under section 914, title 7, Code of Alabama of 1940, respectfully demands that you publicly retract the following separate and several portions defamatory of him, of the article entitled "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," published in the April 12, 1960, issue of the New York Times, viz:

1. "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham."
2. "Racial Tension Smoldering After Belated Sitdowns."
3. "Birmingham seems veiled in the poisonous fumes of distant battles."
4. "But more than a few citizens, both white and Negro, harbor growing fear that the hour will strike when the smoke of civil strife will mingle with that of the hearths and forges."
5. "It is not accidental that the Negro sit-in movement protesting lunch-counter segregation has only lightly touched brooding Birmingham."
6. "The reaction has been new manifestations of fear, force and terror punctuated by striking acts of courage."
7. "Every channel of communication, every medium of mutual interest, every reasoned approach, every inch of middle ground has been fragmented by the emotional dynamite of racism, reinforced by the whip, the razor, the gun, the bomb, the torch, the club, the knife, the mob, the police, and many branches of the State's apparatus."
8. "Telephones are tapped or there is fear of tapping."
9. "Mail has been intercepted and opened."
10. "Sometimes it [mail] does not reach its destination."
11. "The eavesdropper, the informer, the spy have become a fact of life."
12. "Birmingham's whites and blacks share a community of fear."
13. "By Birmingham custom, persons charged with vagrancy are not admitted to bail. They are held incommunicado for 3 days. In actual practice, such a prisoner is sometimes permitted to make one telephone call. But not always. A person arrested on a vagrancy warrant simply disappears for 3 days. His friends and family may not know what has happened to him."
14. "Police Commissioner Connor was elected in 1958 on race hate platform."
15. "He [Commissioner Connor] went into eclipse for several years, but made a comeback in 1958, running on a platform of race hate."
16. "'Bull is the law in Birmingham, like it or not,' a businessman said."
17. "He [Commissioner Connor] once said: 'Damn the law—down here we make our own law.'"
18. "On another occasion he [Commissioner Connor] declared: 'White and Negro are not to segregate together.'"
19. "A test of the forces symbolized by Mr. Connor is now in the making—a product of the seismic Birmingham reaction to the Negro student sit-ins."

CATLEDGE'S STATEMENT

The statement by Mr. Catledge follows:

The New York Times and its reporter, Harrison Salisbury, are threatened with a libel suit by three commissioners in the city of Birmingham, Ala., growing out of two articles written by Mr. Salisbury which appeared in the issues of the Times of April 12–13, 1960.

In accordance with Alabama statutes plaintiffs in a prospective libel action have the right to make a written demand upon the defendants for a public retraction and apology of the matter published. If the defendants publish within 5 days a full and fair retraction no vindictive or punitive damages can be recovered. The commissioners of Birmingham have made such a demand. It is being published in full in today's paper.

The stories from Birmingham were prepared by a reliable and experienced reporter. They were based on interviews with residents of Birmingham and in addition brought together material which had previously been reported in the Birmingham press and elsewhere. The Times standards require the reporting of the news in its fullest and most balanced form. In keeping with those standards the demand for retraction is being published so that our readers may know the elements of the Salisbury articles which the Birmingham commissioners feel are unfair.

In addition, we have invited William T. Engel, chairman of the Birmingham Committee of One Hundred, to prepare a statement of its point of view, which the Times will publish when it is received. The Committee of One Hundred is composed of leading Birmingham businessmen and has been in existence for a number of years to attract industry to settle in the Birmingham area.

The two articles about Birmingham constituted a story of the tension that our reporter concluded exists there. We recognize that the articles did not stress the obvious fact that an overwhelming percentage of the citizens of that city lead happy and peaceful lives in a growing and prosperous community. Nor did the article stress the equally obvious fact that this substantial element of the citizenry deplores any lawlessness that may exist in their city and is working in its own way to correct and reduce such tensions as exist.

Should further investigation by the Times indicate that any statement in the Salisbury articles is incorrect or inaccurate in any respect the Times will publish an appropriate correction.

National Science Foundation's Program of Summer Institutes for Science and Mathematics—Springfield, Mass., Receives 23 Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of us can point with pride to the National Science Foundation. It was established 10 years ago to promote the progress of science in America. It has done and is doing an outstanding job in this field.

All of the programs of the National Science Foundation are important and all are contributing to a remarkable activity in the development of scientific interest in America. This interest has been stimulated by the fantastic progress that has been and is being made on all levels of scientific endeavor. Atomic energy, missiles, and space technology have highlighted many of the Federal Government programs. These, of course, are the more glamorous efforts that catch the headlines. But scientific advances run the whole gamut of our national life. The Nation can continue to advance in this whole field only if it continues its herculean effort. This effort can succeed only if trained people participate. It seems to me, that participation must be predicated on an informed and educated people.

The National Science Foundation is one of our Federal agencies dedicated to and responsible for the task of stimulating interest in science and mathematics. It has developed a fine program to this end. All of us are pleased to know that it is producing excellent results.

Mr. Speaker, one of the program objectives is designed to improve the effectiveness of teaching in science, mathematics and engineering in American schools, colleges and technical institutes. This program is the Institutes For Science and Mathematics Teachers. The National Science Foundation-sponsored institutes began in fiscal year 1953 with two summer institutes for college teachers. The program was immediately successful, and the continuing evidence of success has resulted in rapid expansion. Institutes for high school science and mathematics teachers have been provided since fiscal year 1954. General enthusiasm for these has led to continued emphasis on the provision of such special training opportunities for high school teachers. The program for the coming fiscal year of 1961 will make it possible for approximately one-fifth, or about 28,000 of the secondary school science and mathematics teachers in the country to participate in an institute.

Mr. Speaker, one vital area which must be strengthened if we are to be successful in improving the teaching of science and mathematics lies virtually untouched. This is in the elementary schools. Studies show that elementary

school children ask more questions about science than any other subject. Their interest in the field is enormous. However, the typical elementary school teacher has a meager background in science, and is unable to answer the questions. Often times, the subject is poorly taught, if not shunned completely. By the time the children reach secondary schools, many have lost all interest in science, convinced that science is difficult and not for them. Many fear the science and mathematics they must take. Many potential scientists of high ability are lost to the field and to the Nation. Adequately prepared secondary school teachers can help in some measure to overcome this difficulty, but it is important to remember that much of the trouble is generated in the elementary schools.

I am convinced that the program, now in the pilot stages, of the National Science Foundation is one of the most needed in this area. In the fiscal year 1961 this program embraces some 12 summer institutes for approximately 500 elementary school supervisors and key teachers.

Mr. Speaker, all over the United States, communities are participating in these excellent programs sponsored by the National Science Foundation. I am convinced that it is one of the most worthwhile endeavors of this outstanding Federal agency. Its success means so much to the future of our Nation. Without the manpower to do the great job that confronts this country in the scientific fields, we would surely be doomed to failure. The programs of the Foundation will help immensely to meet the need and supply the manpower.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, a news clip from the Springfield (Mass.) Union of April 27, 1960 indicating National Science Foundation-sponsored awards to teachers in that city. I congratulate the recipients of the awards and am pleased to know that my community is actively participating in the program:

AWARDS GIVEN 23 TEACHERS IN SCIENCE STUDY—FOUNDATION'S FELLOWSHIPS GO TO RECORD NUMBER IN CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

A record 23 Springfield high school teachers have been awarded full tuition summer fellowships by the National Science Foundation under a program aimed at promoting better science and mathematics teaching in the Nation's secondary schools.

FROM TECH HIGH

Deputy Superintendent M. Marcus Kiley announced Tuesday that 11 of the recipients are from Technical High School, 4 each from Classical High and Buckingham Junior High, and 1 each from Trade High, Chestnut Street, Forest Park and Classical Junior High Schools. One woman was included in the group.

Winners were picked by the foundation on the basis of ability after evaluation of applications by a panel of scientists. The fellowships carry travel and tuition costs and a weekly stipend averaging $75. In addition, there is a dependency allotment of $15 a week to a maximum of four dependents. Studies at the universities normally run from 6 to 12 weeks. The teachers will take two courses in the fields of either biology, chemistry, mathematics, or physics.

Fellowship recipients and colleges they will attend:

Technical High: George O. Comer, 173 Navajo Road, University of Connecticut; James M. Curran, 672 High Street, Holyoke, Clark University; Norman P. Forest, 36 Valley Road, Brown University; John J. Haynes, 52 Woods Avenue, East Longmeadow, Oneonta College; Henry A. Hewitt, 209 Gifford Street, Clarkson College; William C. Kennedy, Jr., 322 Elm Street, East Longmeadow, Fordham University; William F. Dolan, 42 Carver Street, University of Vermont; Francis M. Lamoureux, 102 Miller Street, Ludlow, Brown University; David P. Lawrence, 95 Thompkins Avenue, East Longmeadow, Clark University; John V. O'Keefe, 115 Anthony Street, Agawam, Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

CLASSICAL'S REPRESENTATIVES

Classical High: Walter F. Szetela, Jr., 230 Hadley Street, South Hadley, Princeton University; Mrs. Beulah S. Towne, 27 Glenwood Circle, Longmeadow, Bowdoin College; Robert F. Wessman, 33 Marengo Park, Holy Cross College; William R. Young, 44 Myrtle Street, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Trade High: Boyd M. Afton, 35 Maple Street, Brookfield, Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Buckingham Junior High: Gerard F. Magee, 24 Dorne Street, Rutgers University; Robert B. Stevens, 203 Albemarle Street, Brown University; John A. Stone, 2111 Wilbraham Road, University of Connecticut; Ronald A. Whyte, 163 Breckwood Circle, Indiana University.

Chestnut Street Junior High: Leo J. Santucci, 11 Foster Street, Palmer, Williams College.

Classical Junior High: Kenneth E. Cook, Jr., Bald Mountain Road, Bernardston, Wesleyan University.

Forest Park Junior High: John J. Sullivan, 278 Franklin Street, Holyoke, Hamilton College.

Mission Accomplished?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in these times of bipartisanship, coverup, and censorship, it is most refreshing to see the Washington Evening Star raise questions about the conduct of our State Department in Korea. The State Department contributed to the violent overthrow of the Rhee government by raving mobs. If the State Department's objective in Korea was to get rid of the father of the Korean Republic, then their mission has been accomplished, but to raise up on a stable government in its place on the wings of violence and emotionalism is an entirely different matter.

The following is an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 22:

MR. RHEE IS THROUGH

The real objective of the Korean rioters—to get rid of President Syngman Rhee—now has been realized. Mr. Rhee has resigned, and there is nothing for the American people to do now except to wait and see what emerges in Korea.

Actually, the Rhee government was doomed a week ago when, at the peak of bloody rioting, our State Department issued a public rebuke to the Korean "strong man." This was in the form of a statement which termed the "demonstrations" in Korea a product of repressive measures "unsuited to a free democracy," which indicated apprehension concerning "repercussions abroad," and which called upon President Rhee to prevent "unfair discrimination against political opponents of a party in power." Inevitably, in our judgment, and despite after the event disclaimers, this was interpreted in Korea as indicating State Department sympathy with the objectives of the rioters. At any rate, after this State Department pronouncement, the rioting, once suppressed by martial law, flared up anew and brought down the Rhee government.

Now the question is: Who will govern in Korea? Will the shape of the new government be dictated by the students—by those who looted and sacked the home of the Korean Vice President, not to mention side excursions in burning, pillaging and vandalism? Or will it be possible to find some responsible new leader who will be able to assert and exercise the authority which undoubtedly is required—and this without regard to whether it is described as democracy or dictatorship? This is something for which the State Department has a large responsibility and with which it should be busily concerning itself. For there is much basis, we fear, for the reported feeling among some Asian diplomats that the United States has acted too hastily in this matter. It is one thing to bring down the head of a small and dependent state on grounds of wrongdoing or dictatorship. It is something else to raise up an adequate replacement.

Competition in a World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit a strong and important address by Edward A. O'Neal, Jr., president of the Chemstrand Corp., which was presented to the Charlotte (N.C.) Textile Club, on April 11, 1960. It is entitled, "Competition in a World Economy." I strongly recommend its careful reading.

COMPETITION IN A WORLD ECONOMY

(By Edward A. O'Neal, Jr., president, the Chemstrand Corp., Decatur, Ala., presented to the Charlotte Textile Club, at Charlotte, N.C., April 11, 1960)

We have moved into a new decade—a new decade by the calendar and the second decade for my company, the Chemstrand Corp.

We have just left the fifties, when despite a major recession our Nation's economy showed great growth and development and our science and technology continued to move ahead at a rapid pace.

Now we have entered the sixties—a decade in which the population is on the rise and within the next 5 years is expected to top 200 million in the United States. Consumer incomes are expected to reach new heights. Total national output of goods and services is expected to exceed $500 billion in 1960 and to continue that rising trend into this 10-year period.

It can be the brightest period in the economic history of the United States—if we do not allow its problems to outweigh its promise.

During the years which followed on the heels of World War II, we were conditioned to expanding markets which absorbed

all we were able to produce. The major problem we faced was to build production. Our own people in the United States were hungry for goods. Nations around the world, rebuilding war-torn economies needed our products.

Within the last 2 or 3 years, we have seen a drastic reversal of this situation. We find ourselves in a tough, competitive world—and we must, if we are to remain strong economically—condition ourselves to meet any competition. We must show that we have not forgotten how to compete.

As a businessman and a representative of the textile industry, I would like to suggest steps we can take toward strengthening our competitive position.

1. We should place great emphasis on our programs of research and development. It is unthinkable that this country which has been noted for its ingenuity and ability to innovate, should lag behind in new products and new applications.

2. We should seek to engender a change in the political philosophy and attitudes of our governmental leadership. We must make sure that our leadership is attuned to the needs of the Nation and realistically facing the facts of life.

3. We should develop better market planning—marketing programs that are aggressive where they must be aggressive and subtle where there is need for subtlety. Better means of distribution for our products.

In short, we must be able to compete internationally and establish a firmer place in the world markets. At the same time we must be able to maintain and build our markets domestically.

The sixties will definitely offer greater challenges and pitfalls than did the fifties. The latter was a good period for us, particularly, for Chemstrand. For if you disregard the year in which it was organized and chartered (1949), you can say that our company was a child of the fifties. That was the decade in which it became a producing company with its Acrilan acrylic fiber facilities at Decatur, Ala., and its nylon producing facilities at Pensacola, Fla. This was the decade in which we gained recognition in the field of chemical fibers. Now that we are in the sixties, we like to think we have gained a measure of maturity, with at the same time capacities for continued growth, both at home and abroad.

My company decided several years ago to license our acrylic fiber patents and know-how abroad. We realized it was inevitable that the great industrial areas would have their manmade fibers. We licensed in the United Kingdom for the British Commonwealth, in Italy for the European Common Market, and in Japan for the East. In each case, we participate in the equity of our associates abroad and retain directorships in these companies in proportion to our holdings. Although in the case of Italy and Japan we do not have financial control, our ideas and advice are sought and honored. In a small way, we are part of the economy of these countries. All three foreign companies started production in early 1959. In addition, the free exchange of know-how, both technical and commercial, is already of assistance to the corporation. We are firmly convinced that the future of our segment of the textile industry depends upon our ability to sell and compete on an international basis.

Chemstrand, as a producer of basic fibers, is inseparably linked with the textile industry. That we have advanced is proof that the textile industry has moved ahead during the same period.

We are one of the largest and most important industries in the United States and in the world. Although it is one of the oldest industries in the world—one which reaches back to prehistoric times—we find that during the past three decades or so, the textile industry has kept pace with, and in many ways led the advancing world. Our technology has improved, and today the textile industry has better equipment and more and better materials with which to work than ever before.

The development of manmade fibers has spurred research in all fibers. Even the natural fibers, which largely were unchanged for centuries, have taken on new versatility as the result of improved processes and recently developed finishes which fit them for dozens of new end uses.

At the same time you have a selection of manmade fibers which offers totally new concepts in fabrics and specific advantages for certain applications. Moreover, in this highly competitive field you find producers of these chemical fibers working constantly to improve fiber qualities and to engineer them to new specific applications. These fibers—which are synthesized from coal, gas, air, and water—can be controlled to the closest of specifications. Variations of the fiber properties to meet end uses will be limited only by the ingenuity of the chemist and the engineer.

Modern living with its almost universal central heating and air conditioning in homes, offices, and even in the family automobile has created demands for lighter clothing and covering. Chemical fibers have provided the means to meet this challenge and have made possible concepts of care in clothing far beyond anything thought possible 10 years ago.

Consumer demand for these qualities and properties in fabrics has brought tremendous growth to the chemical fiber industry. The noncellulosics, which right after World War II made up less than 1 percent of total fiber consumption, had by last year achieved a penetration of approximately 9.3 percent.

If we can believe forecasts, not only by our own market analysts but by independent sources as well, this trend is expected to continue, and use of noncellulosics in the United States should exceed a billion pounds before 1965.

There is always speculation about the possibility of newer types of fibers. The potential is great, and vast sums are being spent on research exploring many avenues. The strongest current trend of development, however, is toward the modification of existing fibers, both chemically and physically, to impart to them properties that better suit them for consumer and industrial applications. Examples can be found in two Chemstrand innovations developed during the past year—our Cumuloft textured nylon carpet yarn, which is expected to develop in better quality nylon carpets during the year, and dope-dyed Acrilan acrylic staple fiber, which is making its initial market penetration in men's half hose. At present, my company's overall development expenses—including basic and application research, engineering research, and process improvement—run annually into eight figures. And there are six other major companies now producing chemical fibers, some of which I am sure spend as much or more on research activities in the field as we do. This vast effort must inevitably produce results which will provide better materials for the textile manufacturers and ultimately better products for the buying public.

Now let's turn from the bright side of the picture to the problems we discussed earlier—specifically the rising competition in many parts of the world. Low-cost textile products are moving into this country in ever-increasing volume, while our export market is declining; the combination results in excess capacity on our farms, in our mills, and in our factories. Mr. Harry Dalton, my friend and colleague, in his able address before you in February, gave you a thorough analysis of the import-export situation, its effects on the industry and the economy.

There are several points I should like to emphasize in this matter of international trade and its effects on the well-being of our overall economy, and our industry in particular.

This Nation is the strongest force and still the greatest economy in the world. The latter is the cornerstone around which the other free nations have rebuilt their economic security since World War II. We must remain strong industrially and economically if the Western World—and our own Nation—is to be able to withstand the pressure of the Communist bloc.

In respect to our general economy we have built the highest standard of living ever known, and we have assisted in building up the economies of our friends and allies through a very generous contribution of our effort, our technology, and our earnings. In developing our own standard of living and assisting our friends, we have allowed an inflationary trend to build into our economy, thus adversely affecting the value of our currency. We have traded away through our policy of free trade too many of the checks and balances our fathers built into our democratic system.

Under the guise of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, and extended to June 1962, we have destroyed and will continue to destroy the balances required to maintain our high standards by negotiations at the international level through the agency General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. We have sent Government minions into negotiations against specialists. I call to your attention the fact that our Congress has never recognized this agency formally. We have been at least inept in our negotiations, if not illegal under our Constitution. In accepting the results of these negotiations to lower our tariffs, we have accepted so-called reciprocal tariff reductions abroad, while ignoring other more potent restrictive practices abroad, such as currency control, import licenses, subsidized exports.

There are laws on our books which, if administered more in our interest, would clear up this peril. There is current legislative action tabled in Washington urging the correct administration.

We must recall the sense of values that built us into the powerful nation we are today. To mention a few, "A full day's work for a full day's pay." "A penny saved is a penny earned," "Profit is the result of productivity." Here again, over the last 25 years individual initiative and effort have been dulled by the paternalistic theories of big government (and its inefficiencies) that the Government owes everyone a living. We can lose and we are losing the rights of the individual so well provided for by our Founding Fathers. We have allowed legislation that is leading to loss of man's right to work; we permit taxation as a discriminatory tool to spread the wealth and destroy savings, to subsidize and thus make noncompetitive whole segments of our economy (cotton for example).

We are a strong nation; we have the greatest industry in the world. We are a religious people. We are ahead in our standard of living, in our technology, productivity, and salesmanship. Militarily, we are the strongest nation on earth. Our problem is to stay ahead.

Do you remember that old song "Accentuate the Positive"? I think it's worth remembering. I believe we may be drifting into a negative approach—everyone is emphasizing the negative. Russia is first with their sputnik, so we're behind in science, education, and adaptation. Because we like to own two automobiles and have air conditioning and proper food, we are going soft, and ad infinitum.

First, then, let us accentuate the positive and, in the American way, pitch in and eliminate the negative.

Second, we have a great leadership in our Government, our President and his staff, our Senators and Representatives. Our job is to tell them what we want and in no uncertain terms. I would like to dwell on this just a moment.

We elect our Senators and Representatives. That is our first responsibility. Apparently, we're inclined to let it rest there. We also have the responsibility of keeping them informed of our requirements, national and local, and to insure by all means available to us their actions on our behalf. I'm afraid we wait for them to come to us and suggest our needs and requirements, especially in an election year. May I suggest we reassume our responsibilities?

This is a major undertaking and, in our case, a test of industrial leadership. We will have to do a grassroots job here. Badgering the executive and judicial branches of our Government is all well and good. But in my estimation, this is not the answer. The answer lies in the legislative branch, where the laws are made and our moneys appropriated, and we elect our Representatives and Senators. It is on them we must relie.

I firmly believe that should the entire textile industry—including wool and cotton growers, manmade fiber producers, and the textile manufacturing industries—set common goals and develop economic information for the total industry, then use our knowledge and common purpose to inform and instruct our Senators and Representatives as well as the public and the Government, we will do a job. I believe that in nearly every State in the Union the votes of people engaged in our industry would be sufficient to get serious attention, and action.

Our textile industry has done a great job in the face of increasing difficulties. We are one of the largest employers in the country; we have a loyalty among our employees unmatched in industry, and we propose to maintain this relationship. We are constantly improving our efficiencies, our processes, our machines, and methods of operation to produce better goods at lower cost. We continuously study our markets and devise new and better methods of distribution.

Nevertheless, these efforts must be stepped up if we are to stay ahead of competition. We should be unafraid to explore new techniques and procedures utilizing the fine tools which science and technology have given and are giving us. We may need to streamline our manufacturing processes, taking full advantage of such relatively new tools as our electronic computer systems.

We should throw greater emphasis (expenditure) into research. Our mills and factories will continue to sell those things unique in design and performance.

We must accelerate the art and science of distribution. Here is an area in which, perhaps, some of us have been remiss. Our marketing programs must be the result of long-range planning, and yet with a high degree of flexibility built in. Instead of sitting in paralyzed panic, waiting for the coup de grace from low priced imports, we should explore the foreign field to see what we can sell them. This will require that we make an effort to determine what other countries want. We must study foreign requirements, designs, styles, colors, and qualities of performance that appeal to potential oversea buyers. We should innovate, and take full advantage of the appeal of newness.

We should make certain our oversea representatives have at least a good fundamental understanding of foreign customs and manners. The resurgence of industry in countries around the world means a greater potential market for the goods we have to sell. It is a market we can ill afford to overlook.

Above all, let us not depend wholly upon Government to solve our problems. The tariff question is not one to be approached hastily, and with the thought only of today, tomorrow and the next day. It is worthy of deep, thoughtful consideration. I personally feel that until the standards of living in other nations more nearly approach that of ours, some program of selected tariffs will be necessary—perhaps one based on the differentials in wage rates. This would make provision for a lowering of tariffs as wages and standards of living rise in other countries.

We can do much to become competitive, however, through our own efforts; through concentrated efforts to provide superior quality goods and service to our customers. If price alone determined sales, General Motors would never sell Cadillacs. We must make our great advantages count for the maximum—our well organized programs of research and development; our production know-how and our marketing skills.

Let's accentuate the positive.

Newsweek Calls Draft "Campus to Chaos"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the April 4 issue of Newsweek magazine there appeared a thoughtful article on the system of military personnel procurement we now use, the draft. This article highlights the deficiencies in that system, deficiences that affect not only the quality of our military manpower but also the operation of our civilian economy. The question is not whether to let young men "get out" of their obligations to the country, and the article points this out quite well; the question is how to get the best in terms of military organization and defense.

I would like to place this article in the RECORD:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

THE DRAFT—CAMPUS TO CHAOS

Is there any sense trying to plan a career? Is it worthwhile to look for a permanent job? Should I get married? These are questions that tens of thousands of young men graduating from college must face up to now, as they bump squarely into four words "Uncle Sam needs you."

For most who graduate from high schools, there will be time to postpone the question of military service. But what about the young men of 21 and 22 who know the draft is coming soon. Will they be drafted? And how soon? How can they find out?

Or should they just enlist and get it over with? Or what about signing up for one of the reserve programs? And if so, which one of a bewildering variety of alternatives should they choose?

At some time, almost every American family will be touched by the draft—now in a state of terrible uncertainty and confusion. For the first full appraisal of the draft, and its effect on the Nation's youth, a team of Newsweek correspondents headed by General Editor Jack Iams talked to students, parents, draft boards, and public officials across the Nation. Following is the summing up—and the answers to all-important questions:

The conscientious father in Arlington, Va., was both hurt and disturbed when his college sophomore son spoke up: "Dad, do you realize you've got me locked in with this darned draft thing until I'm 35? The other guys are just kissing it off until they're 26; and then they'll be exempt."

"I told you to do what the draft board requires," said the father. "To apply for a student's deferment while you're in college. Keep your grades up. It's true that makes you liable until you're 35. But that's the law."

"It may be the law," said the sophomore, "but the other guys aren't bothering. They say it's the only way you can beat the draft."

Father, sure he was right, reached for the phone. But the woman clerk at his son's draft board shook him to his conscientious core. "Your son's right," she said. "We just aren't bothering with college deferments any more. It's mostly redtape and the boys aren't filing requests for deferment. They hardly ever get called until they're 23 and they're out of college by then, so why bother? But, of course, since your son did apply, he's liable until he's 35. Otherwise, the liability ends at 26."

That is one example of draft-law confusion. Another, and a more common one, is provided by 23-year-old Robert Reed, who was graduated from Princeton in 1958 and is waiting patiently at his home in Chicago's suburban Lake Forest for his local draft board to tap him. "Ever since college, I thought it would be just a couple of months. Then as time went by I thought maybe they had forgotten all about me. Two months ago I had my physical. I guess I'll be called any time now. I've been waiting so long, it'll be a relief." But, relief or no, nearly 2 years of uncertainty will have gone out of young Reed's life, with 2 years of active duty and 4 years Reserve obligation still to come.

Or there is the Detroit officeboy, high school graduate James Gentner, now 21. "In June of 1957 I volunteered for induction. They deferred me for 3 months. They were supposed to call me in October that year, but they haven't done it yet. They may call today, tomorrow, a year from now. They've got me hanging." And while he's hanging, young Gentner marks time in a "just for now" job.

Another, and less resigned attitude, is that of 22-year-old Tom Taylor, a recent University of California graduate currently looking for a job in San Francisco. "I don't want to be drafted. It seems to be a waste of time in terms of career and the little good it does. I want to go into advertising but I can't get a good job because of the Army thing. I just hope there'll be a draft cut."

THE ODDS ARE 99 TO 1

These are typical cases, chosen at random. They can be multiplied thousands of times with individual variation in any part of the Nation today.

Few, if any, of these uncertain and badgered young men—and there are an eligible million and a half of them now in the draft age bracket of 18½ to 26—are unwilling to serve their country if they are really needed. But many wonder how great that need is, particularly when they know that the draft is currently taking fewer than 100,000 men a year (an estimated 93,000 in fiscal 1961). No wonder the temptation is to play "roulette," to lie low, say nothing, and hope to reach the magic age of 26 before one's number comes up.

But "draft roulette" is a game that plays havoc with nerves and with self-respect. Also, the chances of winning are slim. Right now, the Pentagon insists that "virtually no nonfather who is otherwise eligible is currently 'escaping' the draft." The word "virtually" is a slippery one, of course. But Pentagon officials say the odds are at least 99 to 1 against the "roulette" player.

But even those who gamble on waiting it out are weighted down by what many young men consider the heaviest burden imposed on them by the draft as it stands today: The near impossibility of going into a desirable

job upon which a career can be built. Obviously, the great majority of employers are reluctant to hire young men for positions of any real responsibility when there is no telling just how soon they may be plucked for service. Conversely, many of the young men themselves would prefer to mark time in some run-of-the-mill job—working in a filling station or at a soda fountain—rather than embark on a serious working life that may be interrupted at any time.

A dean speaks: The way a majority of college students apparently feel is summed up by Amherst's Associate Dean John C. Estey, Jr., himself an Air Force veteran of Korea and student adviser on military obligations:

"In my experience in counseling some thousand students, I think I could characterize their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity, and—I am extremely sorry to say—frustration and demoralization.

"They are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination go on to graduate school, planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be free men. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and have a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft.

"If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as valuable as his feet and back. Finally, he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy rasons that he is bound to say, "How shall I get out of it?' rather than 'How shall I serve?' "

Ways out: For those who frankly want "to get out of it" there are a number of more hopeful prospects than "roulette." Some are matters of chance; some aren't. Briefly, these are the main avenues to "freedom":

Rejection for failure to meet physical or mental standards.

Fatherhood. Actually, fathers are not exempt or even automatically deferred; but they are far enough down on the order of preference to give them what is tanamount to indefinite deferment.

Continuance of graduate schooling until age 26—providing that a high average is maintained. The fact that this requires money has caused critics of the present draft setup to cry "one law for the rich, one for the poor." Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, Vermont Democrat, has even compared the educational deferment to the Civil War practice of a draftee's hiring a substitute.

Pursuance of certain essential occupations, such as science, engineering, agriculture, and teaching. Decisions as to degree of essentiality are up to local draft boards.

The ministry, and study for the ministry. This is a flat exemption. It has raised problems, according to a California draft-board official, with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses, some of whose members claim to be ministers though they hold full-time jobs.

Hardship cases—again determined by local boards. About a million and a half are currently listed in this category.

To what extent any or all of these categories are being exploited by the unscrupulous draft-dodger, nobody knows for sure. Draft-board officials are generally convinced that the successful faker is rare, indeed, though the tendency these days is toward leniency, and as one put it: "We stretch a point not to create hardship."

But where the question of fatherhood is concerned, there is simply no way of knowing when a young man has cynically and deliberately got himself married and started a family strictly for draft avoidance. There are now 400,000 fathers who are as good as exempt. A recent Labor Department study estimates that 35 to 40 percent of the men reaching the age of 22–23 will have become fathers. Certainly many a parent must wonder uneasily if his son has made a hasty and perhaps foolish marriage, saddling himself with a family that he may not be able to support. One New Jersey father put it like this: "My kid, who is 22, swears that he wouldn't think of getting married except for old-fashioned romantic reasons. But in the same breath he talks about friends of his who have started families just to get out of service." And it is a standard gag among deferred students at the University of Southern California: "If your grades fall you'd better have a fertile girl on tap."

The job problem: If the normal course of marriage is upset by the draft, the normal path of starting on a career is even more seriously affected. The college graduate who wants a job as a steppingstone to better things is just out of luck. In a great many cases, as long as the draft hangs over him. It's true that if he is drafted out of a job, his employer by law must rehire him when he is free. But the fact is that most employers don't want to hire a 1–A in the first place.

Large companies with elaborate personnel systems are inclined to insist that draft imminence is no factor in their hiring policies. But a far more widespread attitude was bluntly put by the San Francisco Bank of America's vice president, Frank E. Young: "We usually wait until a young man has completed his draft requirements. If you take a man and put him through training and then let him go off for 2 years in the Army, we have to start him again from scratch and this isn't worthwhile."

Employment agencies are still more outspoken. An official of Detroit's Action Center put it: "Many employers express the stipulation that employees be 4–F or have completed military training. It is rather prevalent as a stipulation."

The fresh college graduates themselves say flatly there is almost no chance of getting a decent job—one that will lead anywhere—during the months of limbo between the bright day of graduation and the dark one when Uncle Sam's greetings arrive. What burns up the eligibles is that during this same period their friends who are rejected as unfit or who have become fathers are walking into the jobs of their choice and getting a long head start.

How vital? This disruption over the draft during what is, nominally anyway, the peacetime American way of life, raises a basic national question: What justification is there for continuing a law passed in a time of stress, namely 1940?

The very history of that law provides a partial answer. It was dropped at the beginning of 1947. It was renewed 15 months later, in 1948, when the Soviet aggression threat appeared clear and present. Even then the law's teeth were not really felt until the summer of 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean war. In September of that year, 50,000 were called up (compared with the present monthly average of about 7,500).

The draft law has been renewed fives times since then, most recently in February of last year for another 4-year stretch, until July 1, 1963. (It was no accident that Congress chose to set a nonelection year for the next bubbling up of the controversial issue.)

Baby crop: There was some opposition to renewal in Congress last time. There will almost certainly be more in 1963—barring some world upheaval—because that's when the postwar bumper baby crop will start crowding the registration lists. That means that the draft, purely in terms of providing the armed services with manpower, will be only a drop in the bucket. For that matter, it isn't much more than a drop in the bucket today, providing as it does less than 100,000 men annually to a total defense manpower of 2.5 million.

If that is so, why is the draft necessary even now?

Defense officials, led by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, have plenty of answers, but they mostly boil down to this: If it weren't for the hot breath of the draft, volunteer enlistments would drop far below the point of sufficiency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, in charge of manpower and reserves, puts it simply: "Even if we don't take many people in the draft, we need it for a proper flow of enlistments. The Armed Forces would dwindle if you removed that impetus. We would never have time in an emergency to rebuild a Selective Service System if it were dissipated. Selective Service is the machinery in being, a pillar of our ability to mobilize manpower in an emergency." It is a hard argument to answer. One answer may come from England: there conscription has been abolished as of the end of this year, on the ground that sufficient volunteers are available to meet Britain's military commitments—and provide more efficient forces. But skeptical American officials reply that results of the British experiment won't be known for another 2 years.

It should also be stated, on the side of the draft, that the civilian officials who carry out most of the actual, backbreaking work of administering the law do a first-class, thoughtful, considerate job ("a beautiful job," says Georgia Tech's Dean Fred Ajax)—and furthermore, the bulk of them do it without pay.

Nevertheless, the great problems of disruption, delay, uncertainty, confusion, and general demoralization, where the flower of the Nation's young manhood is concerned, are undeniably present, casting their shadows across a nation opposed since its birth to the militaristic tradition. What can be done about it?

Two presidential aspirants have ideas on the subject:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY says: "I am not at all satisfied with the present law. One immediate step should be taken. Our whole program should be reviewed and revised by a special manpower commission of civilian members."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the candidate most deeply immersed in defense problems, says: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent upon involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated."

Keep it: Vice President RICHARD NIXON, on the other hand, has never changed from the position he voiced in 1956, when he said there was no "easy way" to maintain defense, and the draft, however hard a way, was indispensable to national security.

The average youngster, for all his grumbling, knows full well that behind all the confusion and uncertainty of the draft, behind the rosy promises of service recruiting officers, behind the inequities and the skulduggery and the smart-guy stuff, there lies the simple, basic need of his country's welfare. His complaint is not: "Why should I serve?" It is: "Tell me when and how I should serve, and to the best of my ability." He doesn't want his time wasted—and his time, in the long run, is the Nation's time.

At the time of the hearings and vote on the extension of the draft in the 1st session of this Congress, I presented testimony before the Senate Armed Forces Committee. In the light of this article, I think that this testimony bears repeat-

ing. I would like to enter this testimony in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubts it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, April 3, 1951, pages 3220-3222 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; April 12, 1951, pages 3786-3787; February 29, 1952, pages 1674-1678; May 17, 1955, pages 6497-6498; and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close-order military drill skills indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operator or not and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happen to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90 percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A–1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: The cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the education system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

The committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

Our military manpower policies are of great and far-reaching importance. Their implications are, unfortunately, too often lost to those to whom they are the most important; those groups which should have the most interest in this situation, the educators of the country for example, have been strangely silent.

It would be a shame to perpetuate a harmful system simply because the system in being is in being and there is no earnest search for a suitable alternative.

Goals for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald "Duke" Norberg, of Iowa, has for many years written for a number of newspapers in Iowa. He has become known to Iowans for his ability to state, with both brevity and clarity, whatever he concludes. He recently introduced a statement which was approved by the Democratic Midwest Conference at Detroit, Mich., on March 26, 1960. It forcefully sets forth the goals and the program of action which the vast majority in the Midwest States now endorse. This concise statement is as follows:

GOALS FOR AMERICA—AGRICULTURE

The abilities of the people of the United States of America to operate an expanding domestic economy with full recognition for human values, and provide dynamic and constructive world leadership, are inevitably tied to a realistic, responsive food and fiber policy.

This fact has been rejected by an inflexible, unimaginative, unfeeling Republican administration for 8 years and the rejection has had a disastrous impact upon agriculture as well as contributing to fringe hazards affecting the total welfare.

Results of Republican negativism, of reaction rather than action, are evident in statistics:

Net farm income has dropped 25 percent since 1952, and true purchasing power of farm families is at the lowest point since 1934. A further decline in farm income is predicted for 1960.

While the producer's share of the food dollar has been dropping to a 20-year low, there has been no corresponding decrease in the consumer's outlay for food. Further, the cost of ineffective Republican farm programs has multiplied many times, establishing an alltime record for consumption of taxpayers' dollars.

Remedial legislative efforts, launched by Democratic Congresses, have been crushed by presidential veto and administrative edict.

Comparative statistics tell only part of the story of shameful failure to manage abundance.

The family farm for generations has been more than a source of food and fiber. It has provided an environment rich in appreciation for social, cultural and spiritual values. It has energized schools, churches, and governments in rural communities across the land. It has been the base for businesses and professions that call a town home.

A society that permits allout destruction of the family farm contributes to more than economic ills. It helps bring on its own heart trouble.

While needlessly adding emphasis to the natural effects of technological progress on the rural economy, the Republican national administration has neglected to fully utilize the avenues for distribution of our abundant food resources. A food-stamp authorization that would benefit the undernourished at home goes unused, while underdeveloped countries which would benefit from a clear-cut policy of American food utilization are left wavering between hope and conjecture.

Recitation of failure is no comfort for the afflicted, nor is it adequate motivation for political philosophy and action. Americans know what's wrong. They have confidence that among them is the know-how that will correct mistakes. What they seek is leadership with purpose, with vision, with faith and determination that will help open the door to a new era of democratic achievement.

Traditionally they have found this leadership in the Democratic Party. Hopefully, they look toward it now.

The Democratic Midwest Conference respectfully recommends for adoption by the Democratic Party of the United States of America, for implementation by its elected officials with the advice and consent of producers and consumers, the following policy for American agriculture:

1. The adoption of production goals for food and fiber that will:

(a) Meet the demands of the domestic market.

(b) Fulfill the requirements of special domestic nutritional needs, including school lunch and milk programs and care of underprivileged.

(c) Meet the commercial demands of the foreign markets, on a cooperative basis with other exporters of food and fiber, and the special foreign program demands—primarily those which figure in economic growth of underdeveloped nations and enrich the prospects for peace.

(d) Meet the requirements for an adequate food and fiber reserve.

(e) Make possible, for farm families, realization of a fair share of the national income.

2. The utilization, in achievement of the goals, of varied methods of production and adjustment including land retirement, conservation practices, marketing agreements and quotas, compensatory payments and payments in kind from Government reserves.

3. The modernization of farm credit programs, with consideration for the current emergency needs in this field resulting from the agricultural depression.

4. A fresh and vigorous approach to the poverty problem in the low-production farm areas.

5. A strong system of farmer-elected committees which play a contributing role in formulating the positive food and nutrition policy, in referendums related to marketing agreements and production and marketing quotas, and in the local and national administration of the adopted programs.

Payroll Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a salary increase for postal workers appears to be heading toward a deadlock between those who believe circumstances require an immediate increase and those who wish to postpone action until we have the benefit of the BLS study of the entire Federal payroll structure.

In order to take care of the most pressing needs of the postal employees, while recognizing the wisdom of a general pay-

roll revision, I suggest that we enact a bill increasing postal salaries at once with a termination date of December 31, 1961.

Such a measure would assure that the next Congress will consider and act promptly upon recommendations for a general payroll revision which will then be available. I believe this assurance might overcome the steadfast opposition of those who now oppose a salary increase, and it may be the only way to avoid repetition of what occurred in 1957. The Congress will have ample time in 1961 to go into the pay structure thoroughly so that a sensible, fair, and equitable system can be established before the expiration date of the temporary increase I have recommended.

The Federal Tax Collector Versus Local Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received from a constituent commenting upon a recent newsletter of mine to my constituents:

BALLWIN, MO., *April 18, 1960.*

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I have just read the March issue of your newsletter, "A Report From Your Congressman." In this issue, you have gone to some length emphasizing the philosophy of government that what government matters can be handled locally should be handled. You particularly point out the Blatnik bill which would provide Federal aid to construct sewage disposal plants.

As you will note, I am a resident of Ballwin, Mo., and also an alderman in this community. We have been confronted with a deplorable sanitation problem stemming from the excessive use of septic tanks in our community. They have not been satisfactory in this area. This being the situation, our community has investigated the possibility of sewers, their costs and presently have a bond issue election on May 17, which will provide for a municipal sewer system which would serve 100 percent of our community. We're a small town with the population estimated at only some 6,000. The proposed bond issue would raise the present tax rate to our residents by $1.50 per $100 valuation.

My point is this: Even though Federal aid, or State aid, or county aid, or any aid on the surface would certainly seem a desirable thing in the construction of our sewer system and disposal plant, and having been directly confronted with this difficult problem, I wholeheartedly agree with your stand that this is a local problem and a local government should contend with it. And, I believe this is the will of most people. I know our mayor and board of aldermen have agreed that what the local government can cope with, it should. I believe the people are beginning to realize that services provided by the Federal Government for local projects are, in the final analysis, far more expensive than what the expense would be if provided by local governments. Our neighboring communities, Ellisville and Manchester, Mo., just recently voted expensive bond issues for a sanitary sewer system. It is gratifying to see small communities arise to the occasion when local conditions threaten their welfare.

Congratulations on your stand on the Blatnik bill, as well as the philosophy of government of which it is a part.

Yours truly,

HARRY SWANSON.

Eisenhower Says Connole Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, confirmation has been given to the reported intention of the White House to drop William R. Connole as a member of the Federal Power Commission. It was asserted that the move is being made because of a belief that a better man can be placed in the job.

As in the case of the first report of administration intentions, the confirmation has been followed by public statements strongly in support of Commissioner Connole's reappointment. I feel obligated to include in the RECORD, under permission previously granted, an article published in this morning's New York Times and a letter appearing in the same edition of the Times, to bring to the attention of the Congress the opinions of persons close to the field in which the Federal Power Commission functions.

In addition to voicing support, the letter, which is from the professors of law at Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and Pennsylvania Law Schools, makes this telling point—a topnotch man will hardly be inclined to leave his business to take a regulatory agency post in Washington when he sees that a good performance, such as Commissioner Connole's, does not assure continuance in the agency position.

The article and the letter follow:

EISENHOWER SAYS CONNOLE MUST GO—TELLS NEWSMEN HE CAN FIND A BETTER MAN FOR FPC—OUSTER PROTESTS RISE

WASHINGTON, April 27.—President Eisenhower confirmed today that William R. Connole would be dropped as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Asked why, the President told his news conference with evident irritation: "I think I can get a better man, that's all."

Shortly after the President made the decision known, a new testimonial came in for Mr. Connole. His reappointment was endorsed unanimously by the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, meeting in West Virginia.

This conference includes the regulatory boards of 10 States and the District of Columbia.

OTHERS VOICE SUPPORT

Last week, it was learned, the utility commissioners from the Southeastern States endorsed Mr. Connole. Earlier, regulatory commissioners from the New England States, California and Tennessee had urged his reappointment.

Asked for comment on the President's statement, Mr. Connole said he had "never known the basis for this decision nor who made it."

"I believe I have discharged my duties on the FPC creditably," Mr. Connole said. "This opinion plainly has been shared by many others, including professional regulators throughout the United States. This is evidenced by the efforts that have been made by the State commissions of some 30 States urging the President to reappoint me.

"President Eisenhower has never indicated to any person that I know, and certainly not to me, wherein he has been dissatisfied with my performance."

TERM UP JUNE 22

Mr. Connole, a Connecticut political independent, has served on the Commission since 1955. His term expires June 22.

The case has aroused considerable controversy because Mr. Connole has been regarded for the last few years as the member of the Power Commission most determined to hold down natural gas rates. A group of mayors, calling for his reappointment, said he alone on the Commission had tried to protect the consumer.

Industry publications have said that Mr. Connole's reappointment was blocked by natural gas producers. Others have suggested that he was dropped because a more politically advantageous appointment could be made.

His place must be filled by either a Democrat or an independent.

URGES INQUIRY

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, issued a statement today saying that Mr. Connole had done a good job and that the reason for the opposition to him should be "smoked out."

"We've had a lot of trouble in Washington with Commissioners," Senator DODD said. "Some of them have resigned under fire. It hasn't been a pretty story. Now that we have a good one, let's keep him."

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, also deplored the decision. He said the apparent reason was that Mr. Connole "favors stricter control of the gas and oil industries than does Eisenhower."

The professors of administrative law and regulation at Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools wrote the New York Times today deploring the President's decision. They said they were shocked at the news.

DIRE EFFECTS SEEN

"A failure to reappoint Mr. Connole," they said, "will be a body blow to Government regulation, regardless of the merit of the new appointment.

"A first-rate man thinks twice before pulling up stakes and going to Washington if a good performance will not assure his reappointment."

The professors said they "earnestly hope that the President will reconsider."

Signers of the letter were Profs. Walter Gellhorn and William K. Jones of Columbia, Paul M. Bator, Clark Byse, Louis L. Jaffe, Albert M. Sacks, and Donald T. Trautman of Harvard, Paul J. Mishkin and Louis B. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, and Thomas I. Emerson of Yale.

It was disclosed last month that Mr. Connole, along with two other power Commissioners, had been visited privately by an attorney in a pending gas rate case, Thomas G. Corcoran.

A congressional hearing on the matter is scheduled for next Monday.

The White House decision not to reappoint Mr. Connole was made before the Corcoran matter was disclosed.

Asked today whether the decision against Mr. Connole had anything to do with the Corcoran visit, James C. Hagerty, the President's press secretary, said: "Not so far as I know."

REAPPOINTMENT OF CONNOLE URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The undersigned, professors of administrative law and government regulation in the Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools, are shocked by the President's statement that he does not intend to reappoint William Connole to the Federal Power Commission.

The regulatory agencies have been undergoing a severe loss of public confidence. In some instances standards of propriety have been lax and zeal in pursuing the public interest inadequate. There have been proposals for institutional reform. But no reform can dispense with the need of good men.

On the public record Mr. Connole has been such a man. "Keenest of the Commissioners" is the judgment of a writer in Fortune magazine. "Mr. Connole alone in the FPC," says a mayor's committee, "has held out for effective regulation." He has shown energy, intelligence, and zeal. His concern for the consumer has earned him the support of State utility commissions and the reported opposition of the companies.

A failure to reappoint will be a body blow to Government regulation, regardless of the merit of the new appointment. A first-rate man thinks twice before pulling up stakes and going to Washington if a good performance will not assure his reappointment. It becomes just that much more difficult to find capable men for jobs which at best have a limited appeal. We earnestly hope that the President will reconsider.

Paul M. Bator, Clark Byse, Thomas I. Emerson, Walter Gellhorn, Louis L. Jaffe, William K. Jones, Paul J. Mishkin, Albert M. Sacks, Louis B. Schwartz, Donald T. Trautman.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 27, 1960.*

Ways and Means Committee Amendments to H.R. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House that the Committee on Ways and Means has today adopted two amendments to H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act. The committee proposes to offer these amendments to the House when the House reesumes consideration of H.R. 5. In view of the fact that it is expected that the House will resume consideration of H.R. 5 in the very near future, I am submitting the text of these amendments as well as the text of a press release issued by Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS in explanation of the committee amendments. I expect to submit at an early date a full, technical discussion of these amendments.

As pointed out in the press release, the major amendment would limit the provisions of the bill to the less developed countries. This amendment follows the recommendation of the Treasury Department and of the President in his budget message this year.

The text of the committee amendments and Chairman MILLS' press release follows:

Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means had adopted two amendments to H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act, introduced by the Honorable HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana. Chairman MILLS said that the committee would offer these amendments to the House when the House resumes consideration of H.R. 5.

The first amendment would limit the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned and reinvested in less-developed countries and would also eliminate the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income of the Foreign Business Corporation. The second amendment would require corporations to meet the labor standards of the foreign country in which they are operating in order to qualify under the provisions of H.R. 5.

An explanation of the committee amendments follows:

1. (a) Limitation to less-developed countries.

The committee amendment limiting the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned in less-developed countries follows the recommendation of the Treasury Department. Under the amendment, in order for a corporation to qualify as a Foreign Business Corporation and in order for a subsidiary of the Foreign Business Corporation to qualify, 90 percent or more of the gross income must be from sources within less-developed countries. The term "less-developed country" is defined as any foreign country, other than any area within the Sino-Soviet bloc, which the President of the United States has designated as a less-developed country, except that the President is not permitted to designate any of the following countries as a less-developed country: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland. The term "less-developed country" is defined so it may include oversea territories, departments, provinces or possessions without including the mother country.

The committee amendment also provides that the distribution rules relating to investment and payroll situated outside the United States and to prohibited investments in the United States are amended to refer to investment and payroll situated in the less-developed countries and to prohibited investments outside of the less-developed countries.

(b) Elimination of gross-up.

This committee amendment also provided for the elimination of the gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations from foreign subsidiaries. The committee has before it a bill, H.R. 10859, on which public hearings have been held, which would provide for the gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by domestic corporations generally. The committee's decision, therefore, was to treat the foreign business corporation on a comparable basis, with respect to the "gross-up," with all other domestic corporations earning dividend income from foreign sources.

2. Substandard labor conditions.

This amendment provides that a foreign business corporation or a qualified subsidiary of the foreign business corporation will be disqualified for any taxable year for which the Secretary of Labor has determined that the corporation has operated in any less-developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any such determination by the Secretary of Labor is reviewable by the courts.

The concept of substandard labor conditions is defined in the amendment as a situation in which the corporation's aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment is below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned. If there are no such minimum standards, the amendment provides alternative tests. The first alternative test is the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or, if there are no other employers in the same industry, the average standards prevailing for other employers in similar industries. If the first alternative test is not available, then the second alternative test will be used by the Secretary of Labor, namely, where the remuneration is substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of the country concerned.

The amendment provides that an investigation can be instituted by the Secretary of Labor on his own initiative or on application by any affected domestic party.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 5 (LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES AND ELIMINATION OF GROSS-UP)

Page 23, strike out the period at the end of the first line after line 17 and insert: ", etc."

Page 24, strike out the period at the end of line 1 and insert: ", ETC."

Page 24, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert:

"(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources within less developed countries (within the meaning of subsection (e)),"

Page 24, lines 23 and 24, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 25, line 2, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 27, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out "FOREIGN" and insert: "LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY".

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"(e) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED; ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO SOURCES WITHIN OR WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—For purposes of this subpart—

"(1) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED.—A less developed country is any foreign country (other than an area within the Sino-Soviet bloc) or any possession of the United States with respect to which, on the first day of the taxable year, there is in effect an Executive order by the President of the United States designating such country or possession as an economically less developed country for purposes of this subpart. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an overseas territory, department, province, or possession may be treated as a separate country.

"(2) CERTAIN COUNTRIES EXCLUDED.—No designation shall be made under paragraph (1) with respect to—Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

"(3) SOURCE RULES.—Items of gross income, expenses, losses, and deductions shall be allocated to sources within or without less developed countries under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such regulations shall, to the extent the Secretary or his delegate finds practicable, be consistent with the principles of part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income)."

Page 29, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert:

"(A) the gross income from sources without less developed countries, and".

Page 30, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 4 on page 31, and insert:

"(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter which are allocable to sources without less developed countries.

"(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'reinvested foreign income' means the taxable income from sources within less developed countries.

"(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

"(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

"(B) If the net long-term capital gain from sources within less developed countries exceeds the net".

Page 33, strike out lines 4 through 8, and insert:

"(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the substraction is made."

Page 34, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert:

"(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—"

Page 34, line 25, strike out "within the United States" and insert: "without less developed countries".

Page 35, line 3, strike out "within the United States" and insert: "without less developed countries".

Page 37, line 20, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 42, strike out lines 16 through 22 and insert:

"(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and".

Page 43, beginning in line 1, strike out "such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States" and insert: "such taxes so allocable and so paid or accrued".

Page 44, after line 3, insert:

"For purposes of paragraph (2), the taxable income from sources without the United States shall be determined by including the amount subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year and, if the corporation is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year, by excluding the items referred to in section 952(b) (relating to definition of reinvestment foreign income)."

Page 44, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45, and insert:

"(c) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart, any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902."

Page 46, line 17, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 47, lines 6 and 7, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 48, line 1, strike out "a foreign country" and insert: "a less developed country".

Page 48, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 50, strike out "foreign" in lines 5, 14, and 19, and insert: "less developed".

Page 52, line 15, strike out "paid" and insert: "which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid".

Page 54, lines 12 and 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Page 58, line 19, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5 (SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS)

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"(f) DISQUALIFICATION FOR SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) shall be treated as an ineligible corporation within the meaning of subsection (d) for any taxable year during which it operates in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any determination that this paragraph applies to any corporation for any taxable year shall be made by the Secretary of Labor. Any such determination shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the courts (including the Tax Court of the United States) in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of a deficiency in respect of income tax.

"(2) SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'substandard labor conditions' means aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment which is—

"(A) below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned, or

"(B) if there are no such minimum standards—

"(i) below the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or (if there are no other employers in the same industry) for other employers in similar industries in such country, or

"(ii) where there are no average standards referred to in clause (i), substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of such country.

"(3) DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

"(A) INVESTIGATIONS.—On application of any affected domestic party (if the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that the conditions described in this subparagraph exist), or on his own initiative, the Secretary of Labor shall make an investigation to determine whether any corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

"(B) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.—For the purpose of any investigation under subparagraph (A), the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C., secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

"(C) CERTIFICATION.—If, pursuant to any investigation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Labor determines that a corporation has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions during any taxable year, he shall promptly certify such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(D) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE.—The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply with respect to investigations and determinations by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection.

"(E) TAXABLE YEARS AFFECTED.—No determination shall be made by the Secretary of Labor with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless, during such taxable year, the taxpayer has been notified that an investigation under subparagraph (A) has begun, or is continuing, with respect to such corporation for such year.

"(F) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to the performance of his functions under this subsection.

"(4) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"For provisions relating to the authority of the Secretary or his delegate to require the taxpayer to furnish information, see subsection (a)(5) and the last sentence of subsection (c)(1)."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Faith or Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier this month, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI delivered a magnificent address in the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Chicago. In his address entitled "Faith of Fear," Mr. Hoover called attention to some of the most serious and troublesome problems of our era and suggested steps which good citizens everywhere might take to be helpful in preserving the best that is in America.

Because of the importance of this address, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH OR FEAR

(Address by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before Quinn Chapel, African Methodist Episcopal Church, in Chicago, Ill., April 18, 1960)

The honor you have conferred upon me this evening I accept on behalf of my associates, without whose dedication to duty and personal sacrifices the accomplishments of the FBI would not be possible.

My pleasure in being with you is deeply enhanced by the fact that your invitation was personally extended by Dr. Archibald J. Carey, a trusted official of our Government at the White House, and a devoted servant of God. As Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy, he is helping to promote the basic American concept of fairness and equal opportunity for all. In this undertaking, he has the full endorsement and support of every right-thinking citizen.

It is a privilege to share this evening with the members and friends of Quinn Chapel of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Quinn Chapel is steeped in rich tradition. This was the first congregation established by Negro Americans in Chicago and it is the city's second oldest Protestant church.

The development of the African Methodist Episcopal Church into a vigorous member of the Christian army is truly a great American story. The founder of this church, Bishop Richard Allen, was born to slavery in Philadelphia 200 years ago. Today, his name occupies a place of high and respected distinction in the annals of American history. Bishop Allen, like all other Americans who have made positive and lasting contributions to the growth of our Nation, possessed a true faith in God.

This Republic was born out of such faith held by the Founding Fathers in a Supreme Being and His divine plan. It can continue to exist in freedom only if that faith remains forthright and strong, and the voice of the people, bulwarked by intelligent and basic moral concepts, guides its destiny. Reason and patriotism are still the Republic's first line of defense in these troubled times.

The truth of these words is found time and again in the stories of the lives of great patriots from the contemporaries of Bishop Allen to the outstanding national figures of the present day. No one can dispute that deep religious conviction dominated the thoughts and actions of Abraham Lincoln, that great humanitarian and statesman whom the State of Illinois sent to the White House nearly 100 years ago. It was Abraham Lincoln who, during a time of grave peril, told the American people, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." The words of our martyred President still ring true today.

As we enter the new decade of the 1960's, doubt and unrest plague the minds of people everywhere. Fear silences the voice of freedom for nearly 1 billion people who have been forced under the yoke of Communist oppression. Fear silences the voices of protest even in a certain non-Communist area in our own hemisphere where intimidation and terror at the hands of Communists and their dupes is the ruling force. And fear silences the voices of decency in many communities across the United States where racketeers—often posing as officials of industrial, labor or political organizations—use strong-arm tactics and lawless economic pressures in their lust for profit and power.

The crime syndicates, the ruthless mobsters, the lawless legions that infiltrate legitimate businesses, unions, political organizations, and government constitute a deadly enemy to our society. They use every type of terrorism, force, and trickery to suit their sinister purposes. These parasites are a shame to our Nation as well as to our honest law-abiding businessmen and labor leaders. They are a blight on every taxpayer.

The two greatest problems confronting the law enforcement profession today are presented by those persons who, through indifference or fear, fail to carry out the responsibilities of good citizenship—and by those who complacently tolerate explosive social conditions in their own back yards. Where moral issues are concerned, there can be no compromise. Too many apathetic persons are unwilling to take an active part in the clearance of moral slums. Righteous anger is an inevitable ingredient of a truly noble life. Supine indifference always is a sign of moral deterioration.

Either we display the courage and determination to actively uphold our God-given heritage of freedom and decency, or we surrender ourselves to an evil cause. If the values we profess to hold dear are to be protected and nurtured, we must have a rebirth of faith and belief in their worth.

In the fight against crime and subversion, a critical need exists today for all of us to share Abraham Lincoln's faith "that right makes might" and to dare to do our duty as we understand it.

We, the American people, are confronted with a very serious era of criminality. Each time the clock ticks off 20 seconds, another serious crime is added to the Nation's total. A murder, forcible rape, or assault to kill is committed every 4 minutes. There is a burglary each 46 seconds; a robbery each 7 minutes. More than 30 automobiles are stolen every hour.

During the past decade, the Nation's crime problem has grown four times as fast as our increasing population. Despite the best efforts of law enforcement agencies, day by day our vast criminal army continues to grow.

In terms of dollars and cents alone, crime exerts a tremendous burden upon all of us. The Nation's annual cost of crime now totals $22 billion—the equivalent of $128 for every man, woman, and child. For every $1 contributed to churches, $9 goes to crime. And for every $1 we spend on education, crime costs us $1.11. We cannot afford a $22 billion a year tribute to the barons of the underworld. We need funds for churches, homes, schools, and defense purposes.

But by far the greatest tragedy in this appalling crime picture is the role played by our youth. Teenage hoodlums—too long and too often shielded under a cloak of considered leniency and incredible tenderness—constitute a critical threat to decency and personal safety and, more seriously, to the future of our country.

During the past 5 years, arrests of persons aged 10 through 17 have increased 50 percent. Today, youthful offenders account for one-fourth of all the arrests for robberies, one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests, and two-thirds of all automobile theft arrests. No generation has ever before witnessed such extreme sadism, sacrilege and senseless brutality as that practiced by the young thugs who have turned their backs on God to join a surging juvenile underworld.

There can be no worse indictment of adult society than facts such as these. America's juvenile criminality is directly traceable to the failure of adults to meet their obligation to train young people for their rightful responsibilities to society. Obviously, the basic needs of thousands of young peope have not been met. In almost every instance, primary responsibility rests with the parents. Healthy homes do not produce morally sick children such as the ruthless young muggers, brawlers, and rapists who terrorize entire sections of our cities.

The solution to your youth problem does not lie in the unrealistic approach which is followed in many communities. Pampering and overprotection, whether practiced in the home or the courts, do not educate a child to respect the law or the rights of others. Vicious young criminals must be required to face moral and legal responsibility for their acts of violence. Youthfulness is no excuse for brutality and lawlessness.

For many years, we have seen the advocates of soft justice, the coddling of youthful criminals, and easy clemency gain more and more control in high places. Now we can see where they have brought us—to an avalanche of crime and terror which threatens decent citizens everywhere.

The soft approach to juvenile treatment sponsored by many well-meaning but misguided sentimentalists is becoming more and more damaging to our moral fabric and to lawful authority. There is no justification for treating those on the threshold of legal maturity as if they were prankish children when they commit vicious crimes.

Juvenile delinquency and its inevitable road to more serious crime is our greatest tragedy because young people are the Nation's most important asset and its greatest investment. Our hope for the future rests squarely in their hands. Either we imbue the younger generation with the faith and moral courage to resist all forms of indecency and lawlessness, or the United States is destined to fall from its pinnacle of leadership into the ranks of other nations, once great, which have crumbled from within.

Morality cannot be maintained without religion. The Holy Scripture gives us our guide: "The people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits."

Faith in God is the time-tested armor which neither crime nor subversion nor any other form of moral debauchery has been able to penetrate. That is why you will not find a man who truly believes in God among the vast legions of America's criminal and subversive enemies. And tht is why you find such intense fear and hatred of our Judaic-Christian principles among the peddlers of atheistic communism.

In the past four decades we have seen the forces of international communism reach out from the Kremlin to threaten all nations of the world. Today the Communists control approximately one-fourth of the earth's land surface—an area inhabited by nearly 1 billion people. And the ultimate goal of communism is to dominate the entire earth.

International communism is the vilest form of atheism ever devised by the mind of man. It is completely unrestrained by moral considerations. Its methods are lies, immorality, treachery, and deceit. Its agents are the almost 35 million fanatics who comprise the 83 Communist Parties throughout the world today. Here are the legions from which world atheism draws its strongest support.

Last year the official Soviet newspaper Izvestia openly declared: "The narcotic of religion must be combated with skill and persistence. Our ideology will never compromise with religion." These same views are shared by the Communist Party, U.S.A., a group of fanatically pro-Soviet conspirators led by a Moscow-trained ex-convict who constitute the largest subversive organization in our Nation today.

Despite the party's public record of treachery, deceit, and inhumanity, tolerance of the danger of communism continues to grow. Today, those of us who actively oppose the subtle tactics of the Communist Party find ourselves subjected to mounting abuse and ridicule. Misguided and ill-informed persons, posing as alleged experts on Communist subversion, would have it believed that the party is a shattered, broken and threadbare group of harmless misfits. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The war between communism and the free world is not fought with bombs or other tangible weapons. It is being fought now by subversion through the medium of ideas.

It is not an accident that the greatest concentration of Communist workers has been found in three fields—education, unions, entertainment. These are the areas where ideas flourish and thinking patterns are formed.

The Communists are not the only purveyors of an alien ideology in our midst. Nor are they the sole subversive element which seeks to capture the minds of America's youth.

In recent months, still another dangerous threat against decency and life has asserted itself with renewed vigor on the American scene. I refer to the hate groups, the rabble rousers and other lawless elements which have dedicated themselves to maligning, intimidating and terrorizing vast segments of our population.

Prejudice and intolerance, hate and fear, are a disease as infectious as a virus. The general increase in organized prejudice is most disturbing. It includes anti-Protestant, anti-Catholic, anti-Jew, and anti-Negro individuals and groups. These merchants of hate, slander, and insinuation clutter the mails with their obscenity. Some of it falls into the hands of impressionable juveniles, neurotic dupes and moronic adults who then resort to smearing and damaging churches, synagogues, schools, and homes.

All the various forms of the virus of bigotry exist, either dormant or active, in every community—large or small.

These elements have hurled a critical challenge at the law enforcement profession and other forces for decency across the Nation. The person who would bomb a school, desecrate a house of worship, or spread the doctrine of hate toward his fellow man constitutes a real threat to our American way of life. He lives in a vacuum of moral degeneracy. His crimes are so outrageous it is unthinkable that anyone except the extreme lunatic fringe could rationalize or condone them.

Invariably, these hatemongers attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism, but their real objective is to destroy the very American ideals which they claim to uphold. They preach mobocracy—disrespect for the law, for our Constitution, and disregard for the welfare of others.

I place the fiery cross of the vicious Ku Klux Klan in the same category as the swastika of the Nazis and the godless hammer and sickle of atheistic communism. All ignore the rights of everyone to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

All right-thinking citizens know that there is no place in America for vigilantes, rabble rousers, the lunatic fringe and those who make a profit—political or material—out of merchandising prejudice.

No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in our society. Intimidation and mob action are not the American way—nor are they God's way—of accomplishing any objective which is truly worth while.

The best answer to the outrages perpetrated by these elements is effective action within the local community. No human force is more powerful than the indignation of a free and God-fearing people. Throughout our Nation's history, this fact has been proved over and over. In President Lincoln's words, the real strength of America does not rest in the Government but in those citizens who dare to do their duty as they understand it.

We must be ever alert to the evil influences of groups which spread hatred and bigotry. We cannot have full citizenship for some and part citizenship for others. We must all work together to dispel intolerance and promote brotherhood among all men.

America was carved out of the rugged wilderness by the heroic efforts of men and women who made great sacrifices that they and those to come after them might live in freedom under God. Faith, courage, devotion to a noble cause: These were the driving forces which spurred the early settlers to blaze new trails through virgin forests, across uncharted mountains, into valleys where civilized man never before had trod.

Our forefathers had a great vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision for the future—the faith and determination to insure that America remains the beacon of freedom and promise for the oppressed peoples of the world.

Freedom is not the absence of discipline but the use of disciplines which will enable us to enter into our inheritance and accomplish our destiny.

When man surrenders his ideals, he dies spiritually. Only by protecting America's God-given heritage of liberty and justice for all can we preserve this Republic for generations yet to come to live in "freedom's holy light."

Comprehensive Planning Project Called Unusual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of this body to the following news story from the Madras (Oreg.) Pioneer, a weekly newspaper in my district. The study reported on is, as far as I know, unique in character. It is not only vital to the Warm Springs Indians, but, as is pointed out in the story, may well furnish a yardstick for future work with other tribes. The problems that face the Warm Springs Indians are not unique, but similar to problems facing Indians on other reservations across the Nation. This pioneer study thus has importance far beyond the confines of the Warm Springs Reservation and the State of Oregon.

The story follows:

[From the Madras (Oreg.) Pioneer, Apr. 7, 1960]

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROJECT CALLED UNUSUAL

When the tribal council of the Warm Springs, Oregon's last intact Indian reservation, signed a $100,000 contract with Oregon State College 1½ years ago, it launched a developmental study unique in the records of both American Indian tribes and American colleges.

There are hard fiscal facts back of the decision of the tribal leaders to invest a large amount from their people's share in the Celilo Falls fishing settlement in this comprehensive planning project. Population on the reservation is climbing almost twice as fast as in the rest of the State. (From about 800 in 1938 to 1,465 on tribal rolls this year.) As it climbs and as the profit from the reservation's main source of income, timber, grows less, annual per capita payment was $1,100. This year it is $900.

DEATH RATE

While the reservation death rate of 20 per 1,000 is more than twice that of the 9.1 in the State, the birth rate more than makes up for it—40.2 compared to the statewide 22.9. Where 50 percent of Oregon's population is 35 or younger, on the reservation more than 50 percent are 25 or less.

This unpublicized action research project in the shadow of Mount Jefferson is dramatically different in that a key assumption was that human factors were as important or more important than the agricultural, industrial, and natural resources planinng. To this end, the man chosen to head the study, Dr. Norman McKown is a social psychologist by training, and the staff working with him has included 25 from virtually all departments of the college.

RECOMMENDATIONS DUE

It is different in the college's written as well as moral commitment to follow through with help to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs after the recommendations are in next fall.

In the Portland office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the area director, Don Foster,

said he knew of no other Indian tribe which had attempted anything quite like this liaison with a college. Most such developmental inventories are short time, hot-shot appraisals, he said, that find their way into the tribal archives and die there.

"The slow, patient process of bringing the Indians themselves into the planning so that they understand the recommendation," he said, "sets this study apart * * * it is a yardstick by which we can plan work in the future with other tribes."

PARK AREA FOUND

A sidebar of the study has been the discovery of a magnificent wilderness park area on the reservation near Madras—1,100 acres virtually unknown even to the Indians themselves.

This is the only mountain scenic area left in the Cascades that is not tied up with the national parks or Forest Service and thus is open for private recreational development. For the Warm Springs, it could be like finding gold at the grassroots, according to Paul Tschirley, of the OSC natural resources staff. The area is north of Mount Jefferson, bordering on the Forest Service's Jefferson Wilderness Park. Tschirley called it a fantastic natural complex of Alpine and sub-Alpine terrain.

REPORT IN JULY

The council of the Confederated Tribes (the reservation includes Waco and Paiute as well as Warm Springs Indians) will receive the exhaustive OSC report in July, and Dr. McKown and his associates will spend 2 full months holding explanatory meetings with the Warm Springs people.

"It is our philosophy to get the results used," Dr. McKown said. "This is a joint project; the work of the college will be of no use to the Warm Springs people unless the people themselves are ready to use it."

Science, Technology, and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Science, Technology, and National Security," which was delivered by a friend of mine, who is a very distinguished American, before the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, on April 25. The gentleman to whom I refer is Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corp., and his statement was delivered before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. Dr. Perkins is a distinguished scholar in his own right, and presently he is an adviser and consultant to the Research and Development Board, of the Department of Defense.

I believe that the statement which Dr. Perkins delivered before the subcommittee deserves careful study by all Members of the Senate, because of the importance of the suggestions he made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(Statement by Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corp., before the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, April 25, 1960)

Science and technology are the real revolutionaries of our time. Together they have helped to spawn the industrial revolution that is the hallmark of the modern state—a revolution still in progress. Together they have also helped to revolutionize military weapons and military policy. And both the industrial revolution and current military requirements have, in turn, placed increasing pressure on science and technology for further invention and engineering capability. The response has only served to produce still further requirements. We live today in the midst of this accelerating cycle and it is wise and proper that this committee give the most serious attention to its impact on our national security policies.

It should be stated at the outset that we are dealing with problems of enormous importance and complexity. There are no simple formulas for their solution. We are concerned with nothing less than our organized response to the most central problems of our century.

Let us now turn to the specific features of this technological revolution and to the problems it has created for national security planning. The central fact is that scientific invention has largely conquered the three historical barriers to the application of force—namely, barriers of power, distance, and time. Decades of quiet research in a dozen different countries slowly and methodically put together the puzzle of the atom. This knowledge has been engineered to produce a weapon no larger than a compact car that can obliterate a city in one blow. And even greater power is in immediate prospect. We are almost at the point where our conquest of power raises some real questions as to what to do with it. In any event, power is certainly no limiting factor in weaponry or strategy.

On another scientific front, scientific research of recent decades into the nature of heat, electricity and aerodynamics has provided the scientific capability that has conquered the factors of time and distance through the jetplane and the intercontinental ballistic missile. And who knows what capabilities will develop out of the orbiting satellite combined with even more powerful fusion weapons? But it is clear that these systems that can deliver almost infinite power anywhere in the world in a relatively few minutes have finally mastered the traditional barriers of power, time, and space. We shall see in a moment how this conquest has profoundly altered the very nature of our national security programs and our established systems for devising these programs.

But before we deal with this issue, we must register several other conditionary factors that are prime determinates of the management and shaping of national security policy.

The conquests of power, distance, and time have not been purchased without a price. The complexity of weapons, their early obsolescence as new invention piles on new invention, the geometric increase in cost, the multiplication of systems as new technology opens doors to new capabilities—all these interlocking developments have required a major realinement of public expenditures. As research ideas grow to prototypes, to production orders, to established weapon systems—costs rapidly increase from thousands to billions of dollars. And, by definition, a program that will cost a billion dollars involves a high-level policy decision. Thus, the process itself has forced research projections up to the level of high administrative concern.

The two derivative consequences of this cycle have been the injection of scientific considerations into our basic plans for national security. The other derivative has been the importance of the scientist and his output to the future growth and security of our country.

Let us summarize the points already made before we proceed further. Science and technology have through research and engineering invention produced weapons that can place almost unlimited destruction anywhere in the world within minutes of time. These weapons and the military requirements they have produced are responsible, on the one hand, for profound instabilities in our relations with the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world, and, on the other hand, for profound instabilities in our domestic economic and political arrangements and allocations of resources. Our response to both types of instabilities has been to return to our scientists for assistance that will produce stability. And, finally, we have found it necessary to plan our future by anticipating likely problems and making sure the connected pieces of the puzzle, both foreign and domestic, will fall in place at the right time and with the right effect.

And now to our most central question—has our planning for national security programs kept pace with the driving factors just described? Since Americans are never satisfied with the adequacy of their social arrangements, it will presumably not be out of order to suggest some directions which might lead to improvement. I obviously cannot do more than suggest three or four specific areas of concern. I will leave any reference to the National Security Council until an executive session at the end of my testimony.

I. The global sweep of modern weapons makes it clear that foreign policy and military policy are inextricably linked. And yet there are few indications, indeed, that this fact has influenced either the organization or the procedures of the Department of State. There is no high official in the Department who has these considerations as his specific responsibility. There is no counterpart to an Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. There is not, as far as I know, any regular briefing of the top officials of the Department on the military component of our foreign policy. Junior officers do not attend military staff colleges in any significant numbers. If the military component is a decisive ingredient, there are few visible indications that the State Department has taken appropriate steps to develop the necessary internal expertise.

It is not an adequate reply to say that this marriage takes place at the summit of the Government. Coordination at the top of two hierarchies will never produce real fusion of policy without adequate preparation for that fusion from the first steps in the process of policy formation. Or to put the matter another way, State policies that take little account of military considerations until they reach the top may suffer from unrealism. Clearly, the same organizational attention should be given to military considerations as is given to economic factors. The latter were introduced into the Department several decades ago and are now dignified with an Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. Does the military component deserve much less significant treatment?

This is no academic point because there is abundant evidence that the absence of this

expertise has in the past presented some acute practical difficulties. The doctrine of massive retaliation as an automatic reply to any Russian aggression seemed to ignore completely the existence and implications of a Russian strike capability. Early statements about our interest in southern Korea might have been differently phrased with a better understanding of the military importance of southern Korea to the defense of Formosa and Japan. The case for greater organizational attention to military considerations within the Department of State is fairly conclusive—both in principle and based on actual experience.

Several recommendations on this front worth considering might be:

1. Regular scheduled military briefings for all officers of the Department, from Department Chief on up.

2. The appointment of a civilian officer for military affairs at the level of Assistant Secretary.

3. At least two dozen middle grade officers a year should be assigned to the National War College for their regular program of courses and instruction.

4. Consideration might be given to develop the appropriate relations with a semiprivate research organization like Rand to secure appropriate assistance in the analysis of the military and strategic considerations involved in various foreign policies.

5. As a general objective, the Department should have the same level of expertize in military affairs as does the Defense Department in political and international affairs.

II. Just as modern weapons require military knowledge in the State Department, modern weapons and derived modern strategy have made largely obsolete existing organization in the Pentagon. If anything is clear, it is that modern warfare does not divide itself up into problems of land, sea, and air. Weapons have made the globe one large integrated battlefield and strategy; tactics and the organization to support these must recognize this fact. Functional tasks now divide along lines of strategic deterrence, limited warfare, continental military defense, civil defense, and military assistance to allies in support of the above. The hard, unvarnished truth is that it has been imposible to assign tasks on a functional basis along existing service lines.

We have really known this, but tradition, requirements of service morale, and plain inertia have kept us from making the necessary hard decisions to really unify the separate services and to create an organization in accordance with the tasks to be performed. Not willing to do so, we have tried to solve the problem by leaving the services intact and by loading additional paper authority on the office of the Secretary of Defense. It has come as a surprise to no one that the rationalizing of land, sea, and air services with modern functions of strategic deterrence, limited war and continental defense has not come off. We have plainly expected the impossible from the Secretary of Defense, who could not succeed if he were the most skilled political parliamentarian and experienced manager of military programs on earth. But actually we have tried to resolve the irresolvable through the administrative skills of government officials whose first government experience of any substantial magnitude started the day they walked into their new office in the Pentagon. The present Secretary of Defense is a happy reversion to the tradition of Forrestal, Marshall, and Lovett, which assumed that some prior experience would be useful.

This formula for resolving the problem of service divisions and functional tasks has also complicated the business of making the best use of our scientists and engineers. Bush's dream of an integrated research and development program has, at least until recently, fallen on the rocks of service rivalries and the operating weakness of the office of the Secretary of Defense. I am told there is currently a warm and relaxed working relation between Herbert York and his equivalent in the three departments. The basic structure will require solid proof of miracles accomplished before I can believe that the ability and above-service orientation of the present research and development managers have surmounted them.

Vivid memories linger of research demonstrations of air defense systems that were supposed to be 99 percent foolproof and strategic systems that drop bombs with pinpoint accuracy. The service missions they served had a profound influence on the point of view and led us into untold expenditures on marginal systems.

III. A third concern has to do with the role of the scientist himself. We have seen how his services have become of decisive importance at all stages of the development of national security policy. My point is that he is in danger of being both underused or overused. He will be underused when he is placed in a Government laboratory and given detailed instructions and blinders and told to solve the problem, please. Experience has long since demonstrated the value of an arms length arrangement that makes it possible for a scientist to bring to bear his creative imagination on a widely and lossely defined problem. Scientific laboratories under military direction have frequently not prospered. On the whole, a civilian management is preferable and, on the whole, the more creative the approach required, the more substantial the case for putting the scientist in a university environment on a contract arrangement.

But he can be overemployed, too. As the man with the answers to our deepest fears we are inclined to translate important special authority into authority in general. A specialist on atomic energy does not necessarily speak with equal authority on infrared devices or jet propulsion. Even less does he speak with authority on problems of strategic deterrence or on the outcome of the cold war. We are in some danger, it seems to me, of repeating the mistakes of the thirties when the fears of depression produced an overvaluation of the general skills of the economist. The scientist like the economist has special skills of greatest importance. But only when they have, through experience or unique training, translated themselves into generalists should they be allowed to have a decisive vote in the public processes. It is no accident that two great and effective men, Killian and Glennan, did not come to their substantial administrative tasks directly from the laboratory.

IV. Finally, this problem points up the long range importance of an educational system that identifies, respects, and cultivates scientific talent. Real talent, creative talent is our most precious commodity. Unless it is forthcoming, all other arrangements for its better use are only arrangements. It follows, therefore, that the most decisive element for the long run in the whole complex of national security is the best possible educational system. Impoverish this and we are doomed.

But three specific tasks devolve on our educational system if it is to give the broad support required for the complex management of our national security affairs.

First, as suggested, our program of scientific education must be of the best. This is not now the case. For details I refer to the statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee called "Education for the Age of Science" and published last May.

Second, our future scientists must receive a thorough grounding in the social sciences and humanities for the simple reason that, as the revolutionaries of our era, they should be acquained with the society they are helping to change. They must also be in a position to speak the language of the generalists and administrators who will become increasingly interested in their work.

And last, but far from least, we must make heroic efforts to raise the whole level of scientific understanding of the general citizenry. In a democracy scientists and engineers can probably go no further than the enlightened public will understand and permit. The two worlds so graphically described by C. P. Snow must be united or at least adequately bridged if we are to survive as an effective, dynamic, and secure society.

Senator Mundt's Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, an article published in the April 1960, issue of Partners magazine discusses the role played by my colleague, Senator MUNDT, in enacting labor legislation.

It now appears that his efforts aimed at insuring freedom in labor unions and protecting the rights of workingmen are to be misinterpreted in a massive campaign designed to defeat him in the coming election.

Partners magazine deplores such tactics in view of his record in this field.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that the real facts about Senator MUNDT's record may be better known.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MEMO

MUNDT AND CURTIS ARE CHIEF TARGETS

Aware of Senator MCCLELLAN's undisputed strength in Arkansas, enemies of the act are placing chief emphasis on Senators they feel they have the best chance of defeating: Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska.

Records show that Senators MUNDT and CURTIS have done as much to protect the businessman, the rank-and-file worker and the public from racketeers in the labor movement as have any men in Congress. It is the labor racketeers who has most to gain from their defeat, and the curious thing is that union leaders who themselves are not racketeers and who proclaim their desire to clean up the labor movement from within should join forces—as many of them appear to be doing—with their less wholesome brethren to punish two of the truest friends an upright labor movement has ever had.

OPPOSITION MAY PROVE HELPFUL

Perhaps, however, such opposition will turn out to be healthy and act as a support, rather than a detriment, to the Senators in question. The mail that is reaching members of the House whom Teamsters Boss Hoffa is openly out to get seems to indicate that a cross section of the voting public are well aware of who's who in the labor picture and that the character of a candidate can also be judged from the character of the people who oppose his election. In this connection, it was not without significance that

recently in New York, when Hoffa summoned his faithful to Madison Square Garden to hear his political dictates, he spoke to a half-filled auditorium—to roughly 8,000 teamsters out of a total local membership of upwards of 150,000.

Not only was the rally a weak one attendancewise, it can also be safely assumed that a fair proportion of the final audience were on hand more to see with their own eyes a notorious union figure than to take notes on what candidates he wants defeated. Thus, as the editor of this magazine has stoutly held over the years, it is one thing for a labor leader to shout his ability to "deliver the labor vote" and another thing to control the minds of his constituents—and if this be true in Madison Square Garden it is doubly true in a public election, where ballots are secret and the coercions of union bossism are unable to squeeze into the voting booth.

SENATOR MUNDT CARRIES ON

Meanwhile, "even in an election year," Senator MUNDT continues to serve what his conscience tells him is American labor—the workers who toil in industry and shoulder the cost of unionism, both good and bad, not the leaders who seek to make of the labor movement a private estate.

Already the author of that portion of the Landrum-Griffin Act which requires that the election of union officers be on a two-party basis fully protected by a secret ballot, accredited polls watchers, etc., he is now interested in extending the principle of full democracy to the casting of strike votes, in line with Editor Frank's proposal outlined on pages 37 and 38 of the present issue of Partners.

The word is, as of this writing, that Senator MUNDT has taken this proposal in hand and is developing a bill that will cover its salient points. As soon as the bill is in final legislative form it will, as we understand, be put in the hopper for early reference to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Such, in all likelihood, will have been accomplished before this issue of Partners is off the press.

Behold, then one who is proud to stand on his principles—whether this be an election year or not.

A Realistic Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 22, 1960, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard. In my opinion the editorial neatly sums up some glaring flaws in the U.S. foreign policy.

I only hope the warning it contains—"Someday, if we get hurt badly enough, we'll learn how to give back the diplomatic fraternity pin" does not have to be validated again and again and again.

OUR WEAKNESS

Syngman Rhee is no rose. Neither are Chiang Kai-shek, Franco, nor a basketful of Latin American dictators. Yet, in the eyes of too much of the world, these are "Uncle Sam's picked people." And there is some truth, too much truth, in this view of repressive dictators who seem to be in orbit with the United States.

How do we get ourselves into such company?

Part of the fault, it seems to us, lies in an American naivete. Right now we're sore at Communists. So are Rhee, Chiang, Franco, and some Latin American strong men. We reason that anybody who dislikes the same people we dislike must be a stout fellow, indeed. So we support our enemies' enemies.

We did that in World War II. We were mad at the Germans. The Russians were mad at the Germans, too. So we went into a national hysteria about what brave, noble patriots the Russians were. We didn't look beyond their anger at our common enemy. Now that the world situation has changed we buddy up to anybody who is disenchanted with Communists.

Another American failing is that we've never learned how to stop going steady. We cling to people like Rhee long after we've learned that he is not as he was advertised. Someday, if we get hurt badly enough, we'll learn how to give back the diplomatic fraternity pin.

Every Day Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial with reference to Loyalty Day on May 1, which appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, on April 28, 1960:

EVERY DAY LOYALTY DAY

Before his departure on his goodfellowship world tour, Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann of the Veterans of Foreign Wars designated the week of May 1–7 as National VFW Week. This will be the ninth annual observance of such a week by the VFW.

In his message to the membership, Commander in Chief Feldmann also points out that the first day of National VFW Week falls on May 1 which is also observed as Loyalty Day throughout the United States.

May 1, or May Day, as we may have pointed out at some earlier date, was the day when the Reds of Europe chose to march and display their strength and their disregard of all that we hold dear here in the United States—all things which are dear to the hearts of all free people.

The word "loyalty" has been defined in various ways but we like to think of it in the terms expressed by Oliver Wendell Holmes, the old "autocrat of the breakfast table" when he wrote:

"Wake in our breasts the living fires,
The holy faith that warmed our sires;
Thy hand hath made our Nation free;
To die for her is serving Thee."

It is interesting to note that Loyalty Day as conceived by the Veterans of Foreign Wars back in 1952 was welcomed wih enthusiasm by the people of the United States and State after State, through their Governors, proclaimed that May 1 of each year be regarded as a day when the citizens of the United States should demonstrate that the spirit of our Founding Fathers had not been forgotten and present themselves in a nationwide showing that our people still remembered the fundamental principles upon which the United States of America were based.

The VFW idea of Loyalty Day was so well accepted that on July 18, 1959, a bill was signed by President Eisenhower proclaiming May 1 of each year Loyalty Day. After 7 years of local observation the day was made official.

As we have said, the word "loyalty" has many definitions. It might mean constancy to a superior, adherence to a firm belief—religious or otherwise, faithfulness in love—but we believe that when the Veterans of Foreign Wars first suggested the observation of such a day they were thinking, primarily, of loyalty to country.

It is for that reason that we have quoted the lines from Oliver Wendell Holmes which appear in this editorial and which we feel truly express that love of country which should fill the heart of every citizen.

We realize that outward expression of love of country is becoming a bit on the old-fashioned side. We do not believe that our people as a whole are less loyal to the tenets of their ancestors but we do feel that they fear to express themselves in this regard lest they be regarded as out-of-date "squares" in the language of the day or "sick," which appears to be the ultimate in scorn which our young people use in describing what, perhaps, in their upbringing, they do not understand.

On the contrary, we do not agree that an expression of love of country is square or sick but a demonstration of belief in the reasons which have made this country one of the greatest on earth.

Firm in our belief in the greatness of our country we only wish that every American citizen might be treated to a sight which those living in the Nation's Capital are privileged to enjoy.

We have in mind here the Washington Monument, rising on a slight hill, but sufficiently set apart that it may be seen by every passerby and from afar, when approaching the center of the city of Washington, D.C.

Someone conceived the idea that it might be a fine thing to place the American flag, set in high flagstaffs and arranged in a circle around the monument.

The idea was put into effect only a couple of years ago but to us, as simple Americans, the sight of the Star-Spangled Banner floating in the breeze around the monument erected to the Father of our Country is a solemn, soul-stirring sight.

We have been fortunate to pass by this spectacle frequently and the sight of those flags waving in the breeze never fails to give us a thrill.

It would seem as if Nature herself had conspired to make this a sight worth while. Never have we passed the monument but we found our flag floating proudly, wafted by the gentle winds, so that each flag stood out as if proclaiming the reasons why the United States of America was formed.

It is well for us to observe Loyalty Day on May 1. It would be better for all of us if we observed Loyalty Day every day, always mindful of what our country stands for and why we should be proud of its achievements.

The Exploration of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I was privileged to hear a most informa-

tive address the evening of April 25, at the dinner of the Notre Dame University Club of Washington, D.C., given by Mr. John A. Johnson, General Counsel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This is entitled "The Exploration of Space," a subject of such keen and compelling interest that I ask unanimous consent for it to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPLORATION OF SPACE

(Address by John A. Johnson, General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the Notre Dame University Club of Washington, D.C., April 25, 1960)

The subject of my remarks this evening is the Nation's program for the exploration of space. It is a sign of the sophistication of our age that we have already learned to speak these words almost casually. The exploration of space. What does it mean? What does it signify for man as he enters the 7th decade of the 20th century?

It was less than 2 years ago that Congress enacted the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958—truly a revolutionary piece of legislation. It established a new Government agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and gave it a responsibility radically different from anything that had gone before. For thousands of years man has been devising forms of government and writing laws, but never before had he presumed to deal with the limitless reaches of outer space. Now, for the first time, a new role for Government was conceived. Now, for the first time in the long history of legislation, these words, "the exploration of space," were written into a law. After months of careful deliberation, in the spring and summer of 1958, Congress enacted a statute which directed the new agency, NASA, to conduct such activities "as may be required for the exploration of space." It became law when the President signed it on July 28, 1958. Thus the United States officially entered the space age.

I say again that this was a revolutionary piece of legislation. From man's earliest beginnings, he has been engaged in one kind of exploration or another. The very word "exploration" calls to mind some of the noblest enterprises of mankind. We think of the great voyages of discovery of Columbus and Balboa, of Magellan and Cook, and, in our own century, of Peary, Scott, and Amundsen. Man is an explorer by nature; there is something of it in each of us. Man demands that the unknown be reduced to knowledge; that the unfamiliar and remote, wherever possible, become the stuff of human experience.

It is not a new thing for governments to be concerned with exploration. Motivated by desires for trade, conquest, and colonization, many of the sovereigns of the past have engaged in the business of exploration and discovery, and nations have risen to greatness because of such activity. But in 1958, our Nation soberly and deliberately conceived for the first time that it should be an essential and continuing function of government to undertake the exploration of a boundless new realm without regard to any of the motives which have moved nations in the past to reach beyond themselves into the unknown. The exploration of space is not a national program today because it holds the prospect of new worlds to conquer by the sword; nor because it offers opportunities for colonization; nor even because of the promise of economic benefits, although these may turn out to be substantial. No, the exploration of space is a national program because at this point in history man realizes, more intensely than ever before, that knowledge is power. Today, greatness as a nation depends upon mastery and control of man's physical environment; and the extension and perfection of scientific knowledge is fundamental to that mastery and control. Man's environment is not limited to the earth; it includes the great spatial sea in which the earth itself moves. Today, man has at his disposal for the first time the tools which make it possible for him to venture forth into that great sea of space, to explore and to discover, to investigate and to learn. These tools, which future generations will doubtless think primitive, must be improved, perfected, and used in the service of enlarging the boundaries of man's knowledge. What benefits this may ultimately bring to mankind, no one today can predict, although some are already foreseeable. But one can prophesy with certainty that the exploration of space will be a great new human adventure, and one from which it is inconceivable that man will withdraw, regardless of the frustrations, the heartaches, and the costs that it is bound to entail.

In considering our Nation's space exploration program, it is well to know first of all what it is not. It is not a military program; it is a civilian program. It is not a program designed to create new and more powerful weapons or, for that matter, defense against such weapons. It is a program devoted to peaceful purposes.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 starts out with an important declaration of national policy. It states "that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind." In furtherance of this end, the Congress established a civilian agency, NASA, to be given responsibility for all of the Nation's space activities except, in the terms of the act, "activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States," which remain the responsibility of the Department of Defense. The creation of a civilian agency for this purpose was a legislative act having the most profound implications; henceforth it was to be clearly understood that the policy of our Nation is to emphasize activities in space for civilian, rather than military, purposes.

The exploration of space, then, is by law a civilian undertaking, and is to be pursued for peaceful purposes. It is the mission for which NASA is responsible under the law. And it is a mission which does not embrace the military uses of space.

Our armed services, of course, also have a clear-cut mission. That mission is the supremely important one of the defense of our Nation, and in carrying it out the military must make use of every means available to it. This includes the utilization of space whenever that medium provides the best means for accomplishing the mission of defense.

The armed services, however, are under no obligation to perform any part of the defense mission in space merely because space is now, for the first time in history, accessible to man. For the military, space is just another place, another medium, like the land, the sea, and the air, where military functions can be performed for the defense of the Nation. The military utilization of space, and the research and development effort directed by the Armed Forces toward that end, are integral parts of the total defense program of the United States. Military space projects are undertaken only to meet military requirements, and they presumably must compete in the military budget with alternative, and more conventional, means of accomplishing the same military objectives. For the military, the test must be: Is the utilization of space in this particular manner, all things considered, the most prudent way to expend our resources to achieve the best defense of the Nation?

The mission given by law to NASA, on the other hand, is to undertake the exploration of space for peaceful purposes. No qualifications. No ifs, ands, or buts. The exploration of space has been recognized by law as an end to be pursued, a mission to be carried out, for its own sake and without having to justify it either in relation to the defense of the Nation or the economic benefits which may possibly flow from it.

The exploration of space comprehends all the means of expanding man's knowledge of the space environment—by the conduct of scientific experiments in space, and by observation through the use of unmanned vehicles equipped with the most ingenious instruments man can devise. But it doesn't stop there. Ultimately, and essentially, it means the sending of man himself into space. It is the prospect of man escaping from his earthly environment that makes the whole business the most exciting enterprise of our age. It is the thought of man being projected into a totally alien environment, whether in orbit about the Earth, or standing for the first time on the Moon, or preparing to land on another planet, that stimulates the human imagination as nothing else has stimulated it since the first days of powered flight half a century ago.

If we bear these considerations in mind, I think we can see more clearly where we are going in space and why we are going there. I think, too, that we will understand better the shape and content and dimensions of our space exploration program.

Now I am not going to recount the details of what our Government has been doing in space since NASA was established, since I am sure that you are more interested in hearing about where we are going than where we have been. Each of our failures—and there have been several—and each of our successes—and there have been quite a number of these—have been duly headlined by the press around the world. It is evident to all, I think, that the pace of the program is quickening and that successes are becoming more frequent and notable than failures. I shall simply summarize progress to date by noting what we like to call the boxscore. Up to the present time, the United States has launched a total of 18 earth satellites, 10 of which are still in orbit. The Soviet Union has launched 4 and, of that number, 1 is still up. In addition, the Soviet Union has one satellite orbiting the sun, while the United States has two, Pioneers IV and V. So, I think that we can all agree that the boxscore looks pretty good. In addition, it is fair to say that the volume of useful scientific information which has been published as a result of U.S. launchings to date substantially exceeds the Soviet output.

As all of you know, the past several weeks have been a period of particularly intense activity on the part of the United States in exploring space. I will mention only two of our recent successes, Tiros I, launched on April 1, 1960, which has produced a remarkably fine batch of photographs of the earth and its cloud cover, and Pioneer V, launched on March 11, 1960, which is now orbiting the Sun between the Earth and Venus. Early this morning Pioneer V passed the 6-million-mile mark on its journey from the earth, and its messages are still being regularly received. In the next few weeks, it is probable that a command will be sent to Pioneer V to turn on a more powerful 150-watt transmitter which, if successful, could make it possible for scientists to remain in communication with it for a distance of 50 million miles or more.

I cite these two instances of Tiros I and Pioneer V as evidence of the richness and diversity which characterizes our space ex-

ploration program. In addition, in just another 10 days, if all goes well, another launching will take place which promises to be a dramatic first in space. On May 5, NASA plans to launch from Cape Canaveral a 100-foot inflatable sphere for use as a communications satellite. The sphere, made of a very light plastic, coated with highly reflective aluminum, weighs only about 150 pounds. When launched, it will be folded into a spherical container about 2 feet in diameter. It will be aimed for going into orbit about the earth at an altitude of about 1,000 miles. At this point, the container will be opened by an explosive charge. In the vacuum of outer space, the sphere will inflate rapidly as the result of expansion of a small amount of air trapped within it. Inflation of the sphere will be maintained in outer space by evaporation of about 30 pounds of a sublimating powder. The fully inflated sphere, if it were resting on the ground, would be about as high as a 10-story building, almost as large as any office building we have in Washington.

The objective of this experiment, which we call Project Echo, is to test the feasibility of a satellite communications system on a global basis. The vapor-deposited aluminum skin of the big satellite will give it a high degree of radio-wave reflectivity. After it is placed into orbit, NASA hopes to establish radio communication between the east and west coasts of the United States by bouncing signals off the 100-foot sphere. Such satellites may some day be used as relay stations for transmission of telephone and telegraph messages and even worldwide television.

Incidentally, launching of the sphere is planned for a time of day so that it will remain in continuous sunlight for about 2 weeks. It will circle the earth every 2 hours and should be easily visible to the naked eye, having a brightness comparable to that of Vega, one of the brighter stars in the heavens. Quite aside from the practical benefits it promises, it should be a thrilling new celestial phenomenon.

With all of this activity going on, why do we still hear talk about the so-called space lag, and the alleged superiority of the Soviet Union in space? Before attempting to answer this question, we shall have to take a look at one of the major elements of space technology.

First of all, before we can think seriously about doing anything in space we must have the means of propelling a useful object, such as the Tiros satellite or the manned space capsule which the Mercury astronauts will ride, from the earth into outer space. The propulsion and guidance systems necessary to put a spacecraft into orbit about the Earth or into a flight path toward the Moon are combined in what we call launch vehicles. In front of me here today are models of the launch vehicles currently used and several that are planned for the future. Up to the present time, the launch vehicles which we have used in our space exploration program have largely employed rockets developed for use in our ballistic missiles, the intermediate-range Thor and Jupiter and the intercontinental-range Atlas. The Russians likewise have been able to use rockets developed for their long-range ballistic missiles. Theirs are presently more powerful than ours, and there is a simple historical reason for this. I feel it is so important that this be understood, that it is worthwhile for us to spend a few minutes reviewing a bit of recent history.

In the late 1940's the United States chose to continue and further develop the heavy bomber as the delivery system for nuclear weapons. At that time the Soviet Union, having no heavy bomber force nor bases from which to stage intercontinental flights, chose to build high-thrust rocket systems for ballistic missiles to perform the delivery task. Thus, they gained a head start of several years in the concentrated research and development work that ultimately led to the big rockets now being used in both the missile and space business. Furthermore, they began development at a time when the Russian nuclear warheads were very large, heavy, and relatively inefficient, and so they were compelled to develop a more powerful launching vehicle than was later selected by us. The early versions of our atomic bombs were heavy and large also, but we concentrated at that time on the manned bombers—the B–47 and the B–52—as the means for delivering our nuclear warheads. Only after we had solved the problems of producing lighter, smaller, and enormously more efficient atomic and hydrogen bombs did we start a determined all-out program to produce a rocket to carry these bombs to the target. Thus, our decision to develop rocket propelled ballistic missile systems was made only after nuclear warhead development had proceeded to the point where we could plan on smaller vehicles to deliver the same punch. This was in late 1954 and early 1955. Now, in a little more than half the time taken by the Russians, our scientists, engineers, and industrial contractors have produced the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's and the Atlas ICBM as operationally useful missiles capable of carrying to the target, with the required accuracy, warheads as powerful as may be needed. The difference in thrust between the Soviet rockets and our rockets in no way means that our ballistic missiles are inferior to theirs. As a matter of fact, it is probable that the rockets which the Soviets today possess are more powerful than they now need for military weapons purposes.

The story is different when we turn from the missile business to the space business. While our rockets can carry a warhead to the desired target with accuracy in the same manner as the Soviet rockets can, their more powerful rockets, when employed in space launch vehicles, have enabled them to achieve some spectacular feats in space which we have so far not been able to match. The Russians, with their higher thrust propulsion systems, can project into outer space more heavily instrumented payloads than can the United States.

Up to the present time, we have had to rely almost entirely upon the 150,000-pound-thrust Thor and Jupiter rockets in providing propulsion for our space launch vehicles. In only a few experiments has the United States used the higher thrust Atlas, having somewhat more than twice that amount of thrust. The Soviet scientists, on the other hand, have had at their command a rocket which we estimate is in the 600,000- to 800,000-pound-thrust range.

This disparity in thrust enables the Soviet Union to undertake very difficult space missions, some of which are completely denied to us today. Until we develop more powerful launch vehicle systems, we cannot exactly duplicate the Soviet achievements in space.

Space technology, of course, is a very complex thing involving innumerable elements other than rocket propulsion. I think it is safe to say that, in every other aspect of space technology, the United States is at least equal with, and in some cases ahead of, the Soviet Union. But this matter of total thrust in our launch vehicles is a real limiting factor for the moment.

Now you might quite properly ask what we are doing about it. The answer is, "Plenty." Both NASA and the Department of Defense are urgently engaged in developing a family of launch vehicle systems that will correct this imbalance. The family currently consists of the Scout, the Thor-Agena B, the Atlas-Agena B, the Atlas-Centaur, and the Saturn. Of these, all are NASA development responsibilities excepting only the Agena B upper stages to be used with Thor and Atlas rockets.

In comparing the expected performance of these new launch vehicles, it is necessary to use a common yardstick. This yardstick is the number of pounds of payload each of them will be capable of placing in orbit about the earth at an altitude of 300 nautical miles. Using this standard, the Scout, which is designed to be a relatively low-cost utility vehicle, will place a 200-pound payload in such an orbit; Thor-Agena B, a 1,600-pound payload; Atlas-Agena B, a 5,000-pound payload; Atlas-Centaur, 8,500 pounds; and Saturn, about 30,000 pounds. Scout should be available later this year, and Thor-Agena B, Atlas-Agena B, and Atlas-Centaur in 1961. We hope to launch the first operational Saturn vehicle before the end of 1964.

Looking further down the road, we expect to have the Nova vehicle, truly a monster, some time after 1965. The engines for Nova are now under development. Each of them will produce about 1,500,000 pounds of thrust, relatively equivalent to the entire thrust of Saturn and about four times that of the present Atlas. These tremendous engines will be clustered in Nova to produce a total thrust of 6 to 12 million pounds, conceivably as much as 30 times that of Atlas.

As the result of this development program, within the next 12 to 18 months we should have available launch vehicles that will enable us to exceed what the Soviet Union has done to date. We cannot, of course, assume that they will not progress in the meantime. So our goal cannot be merely to catch up. Consequently our highest priority project in the launch vehicle field is Saturn, which, as I mentioned earlier, will enable us to place approximately 15 tons into orbit 300 miles above the surface of the earth—a capacity of an entirely different order of magnitude from anything that has been demonstrated to date by the Soviet Union.

Aside from the development of new and more powerful launch vehicles, NASA has formulated a 10-year program of space exploration. Our scientists and engineers have told us that there are no insurmountable scientific or technical barriers to sending a man on a round trip to the moon during the 1970's. This is the presently foreseeable goal of space exploration during the coming decade, and it will shape our entire program and determine its dimensions. It is, in fact, already determining it. Project Mercury, our manned satellite project, is the first step in this direction. If all goes as planned, some time late in 1961 the first Mercury astronaut will be boosted into orbit from Cape Canaveral and will circumnavigate the globe three times in 4½ hours before returning to join his earthbound fellow men. With that event, a whole new epoch in the human adventure will have begun; and everyone, from the simplest to the most sophisticated, will know it.

Project Mercury is NASA's biggest single effort to date, and it has been assigned the highest national priority. Project Mercury relies on the Atlas booster to place a manned capsule, weighing somewhat over a ton, into orbit at an altitude of 120 miles above the earth. This is the limit of our capability for manned space flight with presently available boosters developed in the military missile programs. But the needs of space exploration obviously do not stop there. Mercury is but the first limited, though very significant, step toward our long-range goal—manned flight to the moon and the nearby planets. Present plans contemplate that several years later it will be followed by manned flights around the moon—circumlunar flights, in the vernacular of the space experts. Such a venture will require launch vehicles having many times the thrust of the Atlas.

Here is where Saturn comes in. As presently conceived, Saturn involves the clustering of eight engines of types used in the Thor and Jupiter missiles to produce 1½ million pounds of thrust in the takeoff stage. Various combinations of upper stages will be employed in the later development of this vehicle. With the anticipated growth development of Saturn, it should ultimately be capable of sending men on a trip around the Moon, and then back to the Earth.

The next stage, beyond Saturn, is a vehicle which will enable man to land on the Moon and then return safely to Earth. The development of Nova is pointed toward that goal. It is too early to predict the time when that goal will be achieved, but it appears that it will have to wait until some time in the 1970's.

The vehicles which I have described will have other uses, of course. Their tremendous weight-lifting capabilities will permit us to place large useful payloads far into space, to land robot vehicles on the Moon and nearby planets, and to place scientifically effective payloads into orbits closely approaching the Sun.

To sum up, I think we can derive much satisfaction from the solid accomplishments of the past 2 years. The box score looks pretty good. But more important is the long-term program in which we are now engaged. Our present deficiency in the weight lifting capacity of launch vehicles will, we hope, soon be remedied. I want to reiterate most emphatically that this present deficiency in no way indicates that U.S. science and technology are inferior to that of the Soviet Union. It is simply the direct result of decisions made several years ago in connection with the development of ballistic missiles for our defense.

Our long-range program is designed to achieve the goals of space exploration with the greatest speed consistent with sound scientific and technical management. While we are not engaged in an event-by-event space race with the Soviet Union, we do have a program that we are confident will achieve for the United States a preeminent position in this new business of space exploration.

The spirit of the American people is the same today as it was in the days of Lewis and Clark, of Peary, of the Wright brothers, and of Lindbergh. They will expect and be satisfied with nothing less than leadership in this new venture. If we keep our sights on the real goals of space exploration—5, 10, and 20 years ahead—and pursue them with steadfastness, we can be confident of success.

A Study Is a Study Is a Study: Positive Action Is Needed in the Field of Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the March 31, 1960, issue of the Machinist:

RUNAROUND

Eight years ago, President Harry Truman set up a special Commisison to study the health needs of the Nation. IAM President Al Hayes was 1 of the 15 members of that Commission. After a year of painstaking study with hearings in many cities, the Commission published its findings in 5 big volumes covering 1,600 printed pages. That report underscored the need for public health insurance, especially for the aged.

Six years ago, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce set up a subcommittee under former Representative Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, to investigate the people's health. Three of the seven volumes of that testimony deal with the inadequacy of private health insurance policies.

Four years ago, the Health Information Foundation published the results of its nationwide survey on "Family Medical Costs and Voluntary Health Insurance," a 251-page volume.

Two years ago, the House Ways and Means Committee asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study and report on the health needs of the aged. That 117-page report was submitted by Secretary Flemming in April 1959.

Last year, a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee conducted hearings on the Forand bill to provide hospital, surgical, and nursing home care to social security pensioners. That testimony covers 720 pages.

This year, the Senate Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging has reported on the results of its hearings in seven cities across the Nation. Its volumes of testimony are packed with facts on the health needs of our senior citizens. Its 186-page report is backed by a 155-page appendix.

Last week, President Eisenhower let it be known that before his administration will support any bill to provide health insurance for the aged—or anyone else—he wants the subject studied.

It's like meeting yourself coming back or, as some like to call it, the runaround.

Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, Calls for Sound Constitutional Reform in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable Gaylord Nelson, has already established an outstanding record in our State, of which Wisconsin citizens in both parties are very, very proud.

Recently Governor Nelson called for a constitutional convention or, at least, for a study of the Constitution of Wisconsin, preliminary to a constitutional convention, so that our State can revise what is the oldest State constitution in America—a State constitution which has not been revised since 1848.

Governor Nelson made a very thoughtful and sound speech in connection with the matter of constitutional revision; and I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For many years, students of government and civic-minded groups such as the League of Women Voters have tried to stimulate interest in one of the most fundamental problems in the State of Wisconsin—the problem of constitutional revision.

There has been a general feeling that the State constitution should be revised, a feeling which I share. But past efforts to achieve revision have been sporadic and have failed to muster the popular support necessary to accomplish any major overhaul of the constitution.

At the beginning of an attack upon this problem, I propose an inquiry into the basic aspects of constitutional revision. I shall today appoint a temporary commission, composed of lawyers, scholars and public spirited citizens, to make a recommendation as to the need and desirability of revising the constitution. I shall also ask this commission to make a recommendation as to the best method of achieving constitutional revision if it is found that revision is necessary.

I think that this is an appropriate time to consider constitutional revision. Each recent session of the legislature has brought a larger number of proposals for amending the constitution. I am informed that a total of 45 resolutions proposing constitutional amendments were introduced, or acted upon for the second time, in the current legislative session. Of this number, eight were given first passage and two were given second passage. If these proposals are offered to the voters, it will be the second biggest package of amendments proposed in the history of the State. Only the 1911 and 1913 legislatures offered more.

The fact that so many amendments were proposed, and so many approved, indicates that there are many legislators and citizens who believe that changes are necessary. In addition, there is reason to believe that some provisions of the Wisconsin constitution are obsolete. Another important objective of constitutional revision would be the simplification of the language of the document, for which there seems to be a clear need.

An example is section 3 of article XI, which deals with county, municipal, town, and school debt limits in one monstrous sentence 141 words long. This sentence will be further complicated by the addition of 18 words if an amendment scheduled for a vote in November is approved. Another amendment given first passage in this section would increase the length of this sentence to 216 words.

The constitution is 112 years old. It has been amended 61 times. According to a University of Mississippi study published in 1957, Wisconsin has gone longer than any other State without constitutional revision; the last constitutional convention in Wisconsin was in 1848. Most States have held constitutional conventions during this century.

I wish to say, however, that I am not of the view that the constitution should be changed just because it is old. That alone is insufficient reason for modification. And I should not advocate the kind of changes that have been made by a few States in the direction of expansion; the effort should be abridgment and clarification and to restrict to principles. The most obvious fault of State constitutions is that they include provisions that should be matters of law.

A bill providing for a constitutional study commission was introduced this session by State Senator Henry Maier. This bill was referred to the legislative council, with a directive to the judiciary committee of that body to study it. I have discussed this referral with Assemblyman Molinaro, the council chairman, and with Earl Sachse, the executive director. It is their opinion that, because of the limited time for interim studies this year, nothing will be done by the council in this area on the scale proposed here. A resolution introduced by Senator Allen Busby directing a study of the article mentioned earlier also had been referred to the council. I shall suggest to the commission

that their studies be coordinated with any that are made by the council.

I shall ask the commission to undertake, in addition to making a broad recommendation on the necessity for revision, to answer certain collateral questions. I should like answers to these:

Are there provisions in the constitution that should be statutory instead of constitutional?

Are these provisions which are archaic and which could be eliminated?

Are there ways in which existing provisions could be simplified and clarified?

Is there an advantage to a complete overhaul of the constitution, as compared to piecemeal amendment?

Is the constitution a clean-cut embodiment of public policies expressing the enduring purposes of the state?

Is there a way of revising the constitution, apart from the holding of a convention, which might be preferable?

If the recommendation of the temporary commission is to proceed with plans for a constitutional convention, I will appoint a permanent commission to gather information as to proposed changes and to compile information for use by the public and the delegates to any such convention.

The procedure for constitutional revision through convention in Wisconsin is as follows: The legislature recommends to the electors to vote for or against a convention at the next general fall election; if a majority of the voters approve a convention, the next session of the legislature is obliged to call it.

If the temporary commission on constitutional revision recommends revision by convention, the question of adopting a resolution providing for a popular referendum should be presented to the 1961 legislature. It could go to the voters in the 1962 general election. If the proposal then were approved by the voters, the convention could be called by the 1963 legislature.

An alternative method of constitutional revision is possible under our State constitution. The legislature is authorized to submit amendments to the electorate for approval, provided that each amendment is first approved by two successive sessions of the legislature. There is no limit on the number of amendments which the legislature may send to the electorate for ratification. It is possible that the commission on constitutional revision might recommend something less than a wholesale revision of the existing document. If this happened, a convention would not be necessary.

I shall have to ask the members of the temporary commission to serve without pay and even without compensation for expenses; there are no funds available for this purpose. These members will be truly public spirited citizens.

In choosing the members of this commission, I have taken pains to assure a balance of conservative and liberal viewpoints, of varying philosophies. I have sought persons of high professional qualification and good reputation, and I have asked to serve only those who signified a strong interest in the questions I have posed. I am extremely grateful for their willingness to serve the public interest in this way.

The cochairmen of the commission are Justice Thomas E. Fairchild of the State supreme court, and G. Burgess Ela, a respected Madison attorney. I have asked David Fellman, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin and an authority on constitutional law, to serve as secretary.

The other members are Attorney General John W. Reynolds; Herbert Terwilliger, Wausau, an attorney and president of the Wisconsin Bar Association; Reynolds C. Seitz, Whitefish Bay, dean of the Marquette University law school and professor of constitutional law; Thomas N. Tuttle, a Milwaukee attorney; John William Calhoun, Fond du Lac, an attorney; Edward H. Snyder, Shorewood, an attorney; Mrs. Marshall Beaugrand, Racine, former State president of the League of Women Voters and president of the Racine Women's Civil Council; Irvin B. Charne, Shorewood, an attorney; Richard J. Gould, Green Bay, an attorney; John Conway, University of Wisconsin law professor and former revisor of statutes; Professor Willard Hurst of the University of Wisconsin law school; and William Riker, professor of government at Lawrence College, Appleton.

I leave you with this thought:

"Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant—too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment * * * I am certainly not an advocate of frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions * * * but I know that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with progress."

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson. I suggest that this is the proper approach to this subject.

Polish Constitution Day and Paderewski's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this year the 169th observance of Poland's Constitution Day coincides with the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the great Polish statesman, artist, humanitarian, and lover of liberty.

The final words attributed to Paderewski before his death on June 29, 1941 were: "Polska powstanie—Poland will rise again."

Mr. Speaker, this was the noble utterance of a man who defined the realization of a free and independent Poland as "the greatest aim of my life."

The indomitable spirit of that freedom-loving country, a spirit represented by the last words of Paderewski, has not been diminished during Poland's present time of troubles.

Let us hope that the day will soon come when the seed of liberty, deeply rooted in the hearts of the Poles, will again take flower and that Poland will once more know what it is to be free.

Mr. Speaker, I know the proud courage of the Americans of Polish origin of my own congressional district. Immigrants and sons of immigrants, they have displayed the exemplary citizenship on which a democracy depends by their activity and participation in the life of their communities.

In their churches, their work, their civic endeavors, their homes and their families, they demonstrate their fine qualities of faith, devotion, industry, and self-reliance. Having observed the Polish-Americans' worthy contributions to our country, I have no doubt that their relatives and friends in Poland will ultimately enjoy the freedom that should be theirs.

I am deeply confident that in time, as Paderewski said, "Poland will rise again."

Latin American Free Trade and American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Latin American Free Trade and American Industry," written by Seymour L. Linfield, and published in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of April 28, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICAN FREE TRADE AND AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(By Seymour L. Linfield, attorney at law, and president, Development Assistance Corp. (DAC), New York)

A seven-nation agreement for the establishment of a free-trade area in Latin America was signed in Montevideo, Uruguay, on February 18, 1960. Its signatories embrace 70 percent of Latin America's population, including Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay.

The almost total silence, at least until now, of the financial press of this country with respect to this treaty, is almost inexplicable. Its text, which has recently arrived in New York, merits careful consideration by American industry.

The "Latin American Free Trade Association" (LAFTA) represents the nucleus of a future Latin American common market. It is an important step toward the economic integration of Latin America, toward eliminating the economic limitations which flow from the political fragmentation of this subhemisphere.

The Montevideo Treaty is important for what it says, as well as for what it does not say. Perhaps most important, at the moment, is a clear understanding of the economic and political realities which underlie the treaty. The following initial observations are therefore in order:

I

What the treaty says

The Montevideo Treaty creates a free-trade zone covering 10 million square miles. It expressly aims to expand and diversify intraregional trade—now amounting to nearly $800 million, approximately only 10 percent of the region's total foreign trade—and to promote the complementarity of the economies of the area.

It provides for a gradual, progressive reduction of trade restrictions, on a nondiscriminatory basis, by periodic multilateral negotiations. Its obligations are directed to the liberalization of current trade, now consisting chiefly of primary commodities. Its objective is to eliminate all intraregional import duties and charges now hampering trade—whether fiscal, monetary, or exchange—within a period of not more than 12 years. It becomes effective 30 days after three nations have ratified it—with present

indications that at least Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay will ratify well before the end of the year.

II

What the treaty does not say

The treaty does not establish a common schedule, and does not irrevocably commit each signatory to include all of its goods within the common schedule. It does not apply to existing contracts relating to oil or its derivatives. It does not expressly apply to new products, although the door is wide open for the use of this preferential instrument, if the signatories so desire, for the development of such trade. It does not establish intraregional convertibility or a uniform system of trade payments. It does not establish a uniform code for foreign investment in the area.

III

The political consideration which generates a Latin American free-trade area

LAFTA is powered by the increasing realization throughout Latin America that the major economic problem of the region is its massive poverty; that countries with primitive techniques can become powerful industrial complexes; and, that poverty can be eliminated in generations by such rapid industrialization. The problem of increasing the per capita rate of economic growth exists within the frame of a Latin America which will have in 1975 close to 300 million people (probably exceed 450 million by the turn of the century), as against 193 million today. (The 1975 market, incidentally, will be as large numerically as the present aggregate population of the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Benelux and Scandinavian countries.)

IV

The economic necessity for a Latin American common market

The 1945–55 growth of the Latin American per capita product was 2.7 percent annually; between 1955–59, no more than 1.2 percent. There is widespread and growing recognition that a 2.7 percent annual rate of per capita growth cannot be maintained (let alone increased)—if the process of industrialization is carried out within the bounds of one country, and if each country is to seek agricultural self-sufficiency.

This would be true even if advanced agricultural techniques were introduced, industrialization were resolutely developed in all countries, capital investment were sharply increased, and extensive technical training developed at every production level. Moreover, it is recognized that a 2.7 percent annual rate of per capita growth does not compare with the recent experience of other countries which are rapidly industrializing—and many seriously question whether, even if achieved, it would meet the economic and social demands of Latin American development.

Generally speaking, there is today no Latin American country with a domestic market sufficiently broad to take full advantage of economies deriving from large-scale production techniques, specialization, and the grouping together of productive activities—although specific and isolated sectors of an economy may be able to do so. The biggest country market in Latin America, Brazil, has an annual purchasing power of $13.2 billion. This could be contrasted with a passenger-car market in the United States representing an annual purchasing power of $7.2 billion. In Latin America, only three countries—Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico—have a total annual purchasing power exceeding this figure.

Feasibility of import substitution

The process of import substitution within individual country markets is economically feasible with respect to consumer industries. It cannot develop soundly with respect to capital goods industries—machinery, equipment, intermediate products particularly in the chemical and petrochemical industries. This is because of their technical complexity and the need for specialization. With respect to such intermediate and final goods, this specialization can only occur within a broad market, if efficiency and lower costs are to be realized. The same advantage applies to agricultural commodities.

Today's annual production of capital goods in Latin America totals approximately $240 million. In order to maintain an annual average per capita growth of 2.7 percent, the 1975 requirements (at 1958 prices) would be $6,500 million. By that time, even granting the most optimistic estimates with respect to Latin American exports and the capital financing of the necessary imports, 60 percent of its annual requirements for capital goods would have to be supplied by the industries of the region.

It may be noted in passing that the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) estimates that if Latin America's gross product is to sustain its postwar rate of growth until 1975, the gross fixed investment would have to increase from the $8,650 million annually registered in 1954–56 to $31,550 million in 1975. Similarly, passenger-car demand would rise from the 150,000 imported yearly to 1.8 million; steel consumption from the 6.6 million tons of 1955–56 to 37.6 million tons; copper consumption from 70,000 tons a year to 540,000 tons; petroleum (and its derivatives) and coal consumption from the 47 million tons in 1955 to 201 million tons; chemical product consumption from $2.3 million in 1955 to $8.2 million; paper and paperboard consumption from $370 million in 1955 to $1,540 million; and cotton textile production from the current 634,000 tons annually to 1.6 million tons.

V

Payments and credits

The Montevideo Treaty was preceded in January 1960 by a meeting of government representatives of the central banks of the signatory powers. Agreement was there reached that, with respect to payments, the objective was to move to free monetary convertibility; that the coexistence of different payments and credits systems would not prevent the free functioning of the free trade area; that the free trade area should avoid the discriminations which might result from such different systems; and that the fullest use of appropriate credits to finance intrazonal trade should be facilitated. Studies would be instituted with respect to the best possible systems of payments and credits to achieve these ends.

Public reference was avoided with respect to the sharp disagreement at the conference between the International Monetary Fund and the U.N. Economic Commission on Latin America—whose membership, incidentally, in addition to the Latin American countries, includes France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States—concerning the best way to achieve a free payment system. The former—while taking no position on the contemplated treaty, inasmuch as it represented a trade agreement—strongly argued (with the support of Peru, Paraguay, and Bolivia) for a single exchange rate convertible currency, for convertibility of the area's earnings for purchases outside the area. It registered its opposition to any restrictions on payments (including bilateral payments agreements), its objection to any arrangement which would introduce currency discriminations or special arrangements for neighboring countries.

ECLA, strongly supported by Brazil and Uruguay openly and by Chile and Argentina privately, urged a highly nonconvertible payments system, in order to compel its members to purchase within the area. It criticized the IMF position as being based upon a theory of multilateral trade at variance with reality, in that foreign purchases from Latin America depend fundamentally on demand and on trade policy.

The matter was shelved for further discussion—with the date of the next central banks meeting to be considered during the current meeting in Montevideo, which started on April 1, of the Provisional Committee for the Establishment of the Latin American Free Trade Association. The results were thus viewed as a victory for IMF, which had already furnished the signatory governments with over $463 million in stabilization credits.

At this time, the nub of the dispute does not appear to be a significant problem. The Montevideo Treaty, completed within a month of the meeting of the central banks' representatives, was signed without any conditions being attached by the signatories. All, with the exception of Brazil, have de facto convertibility. Most are committed to the gradual elimination of bilateral payments arrangements. Within no more than a couple of years, assuming that LAFTA starts to function effectively, it may be reasonably expected that intrazonal payments will be on a convertible basis.

Under such circumstances, it is understandable that the discussion has begun to shift from consideration of special credits arrangements in the region toward consideration of the most suitable form and modus operandi of regional credits—and all this within an environment of increasing convertibility. The establishment of such a regional credit arrangement would act as a bridge from the existing bilateral payments schemes (with their reciprocal credit arrangements) toward multilateral trade and convertible settlements within the free-trade zone.

VI

LAFTA and the world economy

Whatever the foreseeably new problems for American industry, it would be short-sighted to view LAFTA primarily as an expression of the increasing division of the world into regional markets—including the European Economic Community, the European Free Trade Area, the countries of the Communist bloc. Although nearly all Latin American nations at present follow a protectionist policy, they all view closer intraregional economic association and complete integration as contributing to the development and expansion of the world economy. The Montevideo Treaty specifically seeks to place itself within the compass of GATT. Significantly, it does not, and is not intended to, preclude or replace broader multilateral arrangements.

VII

The timetable of LAFTA

The 12-year timetable may well be accelerated. Originally, the establishment of a free trade area was only intended to address itself to urgent trade problems affecting the southern countries of Latin America. The four southern countries—Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay—considered with favor a multilateral instrument, conforming to the provisions of GATT, which would utilize customs policy as a major means of maintaining and developing trade among the states concerned, so as to replace the existing practice of bilateral agreements with their trade, customs, and exchange limitations.

The adhesion of Mexico—which has but little trade with, and trade problems different than, the other signatories—transformed the treaty into the nucleus of a common market arrangement. Two chapters of the Montevideo Treaty—chapter II ("Expansion of Trade and Economic Complementarity") and chapter VIII ("Measures in Favor of Countries at a Relatively Less Advanced

Stage of Economic Development")—represent steps toward the permanent objective of a common market.

There is prospect that Colombia, Ecuador, and Panama may soon join the treaty. If the special treatment (which the treaty expressly permits) is provided, the opposition of Venezuela can quickly melt. Finally, it may be stressed that the considerations pressing for acceleration of the timetable of the European Common Market exist with equal force within the economy and politics of Latin America. This is equally true irrespective of whether the Latin American governments decide that the best means of achieving a common market is via a new general treaty or via utilization and development of the facilities provided by the Montevideo Treaty.

CONCLUSION

In assessing the significance of LAFTA, and the emerging Latin American common market, American industry may well consider the words which the London Financial Times addressed to British industry on the subject on February 4, 1960:

"The lesson in all this for British industry is clear. Although there will be a strong demand for heavy capital equipment in Latin America over the next 10 years or so, it will subsequently be more and more difficult to export any manufactured goods to the area. Therefore, if the United Kingdom is to retain a stake in the area, it must follow the example of her German and Japanese competitors and establish, or share in establishing, manufacturing industries within Latin America.

"The pace of change in Latin America, both political and economic, is rising rapidly, and unless more attention is paid by British industry to Latin American investment within the very near future, it may be too late to start."

Investment, high rates of growth, and rapid industrialization cannot but bring to the forefront such matters as the distribution of income, as well as active consideration of the social conditions under which such development takes place. American industry, no less than other industry, must give careful consideration not only to this matter of timing, but also to the conditions under which it seeks to participate in future Latin American economic development.

These two factors will determine its future role in Latin America.

East Coast District Metal Trades Council Opposed to Bushipe Reorganization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement received from the East Coast District Metal Trades Council:

The East Coast District Metal Trades Council, representing employees of the Navy in all east coast installations are unalterably opposed to the reorganization program now being implemented by the Bureau of Ships.

The consensus of those most closely associated with its true objectives is that it would eventually bring about the total destruction of the naval shipyards. It also indicates that a very small group of individuals within the Navy intend to force their will upon the shipyards, regardless of the damaging results.

The industrial management firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget are guilty of embarrassing the military by their critical report in 1950 and are also guilty of giving the military an opportunity to recover their prestige by a contrary report in 1959.

The civilian employees of the naval shipyards are gravely concerned with the logic and intent of this program and respectfully request and urge you to initiate and/or support a complete congressional investigation. We also urge you to seek a halt to the current implementation of this program by the Bureau until such time as the investigation may be completed.

The enclosed document was prepared for your information. The facts contained therein were taken, in part, from the Cresap, McCormick & Paget Reports of 1950 and 1959, personal interviews with responsible Navy officials and a consensus of civilian employees and union officials.

In 1949, the firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget was retained by the Bureau of Ships for a study, the primary objective of which was to determine "the practicability of developing and operating a program of performance measures and management controls" in naval shipyards.

The Cresap, McCormick & Paget report of April 1, 1950, which was submitted upon completion of this study, concluded that a program of performance measurement was feasible and set forth a series of recommendations to implement such a program. These recommendations embraced not only the subject of performance measurement but the related areas of production planning and shipyard organization.

The production, planning, and control program, hereinafter referred to as the P.P. & C. program, was initiated by, and implemented under the general guidance of the Bureau of Ships, on the basis of the recommendations made in the CMP report of 1950.

The P.P. & C. program was established at a tremendous cost to the Navy Department. However, in the very beginning, the Bureau of Ships doomed the program by ignoring they key recommendations contained in the CMP report of April 1, 1950.

These recommendations were in part, a strong implementation program, adequate staffing followed by master planning by the planning department and planning at the working level by the analyst and scheduler in the production shops.

Since the naval shipyards constitute a large and extremely complex industrial organization, any program as broad and important as P.P. & C. requires an aggressive, well-thought-out plan of installation in order to overcome the difficulties which are inherent in the basic enterprise.

The Navy implementation program did not achieve the high standard of performance required and suffered from the following basic weaknesses.

There was a failure to assemble a civilian industrial engineering staff adequate either in numbers or experience at the recommended levels of the organization, the Bureau, the production department and the shops.

As a consequence, the performance measurement aspect of the P.P. & C. program, so heavily emphasized by the CMP report, was underemphasized by inexperienced Navy personnel, in relation to certain other aspects, particularly planning procedures and budgetary control techniques. Instead of production planning and the ultimate in manpower utilization, it became a glorified bookkeeping system.

These basic differences are of overriding importance because job analysis and work measurement are fundamental to increasing shipyard productivity and improving control over costs, the most important objectives of production, planning, and control.

In 1959, the same firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget were retained by the Bureau of Ships to conduct another study, the true purpose of which is highly controversial. However, we are sure that the report is geared to permit the shipyards to maintain and improve the military control of all important positions, even though it may destroy them.

It is quite clear in the 1959 report that CMP has adopted the theory that the Navy will not implement the most important recommendations of 1949. Therefore, CMP, not wanting to lose a customer and the accompanying retainers, has given the Bureau of Ships the type of recommendations which will most conform to the Navy's inherent desire to protect the position of its transient engineering duty officers.

It is also quite clear that the firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget were unduly influenced and instructed in the type of report desired by the Bureau of Ships, in that the survey team conducting the 1959 audit included Bureau representation.

The 1959 CMP report indicates an almost complete reversal of concepts, not only in planning effort, but in organization structures as well. They were highly critical of transient engineering officers in 1949 and are critical of civilian shop masters in 1959.

This 1959 study was initiated by the ships cost analysis panel (SCAP), headed by Rear Adm. R. K. James, the present Chief of Bureau of Ships. A most desirable situation, whereby one can make certain recommendations to himself and then proceed to implement his own personal desires upon such a large and complex organization. It is not entirely a coincidence that the formation of the SCAP committee closely followed the recommendations from a committee in the Secretary's office that engineering duty officers be eliminated from the service.

Undoubtedly a complete appraisal of the initial recommendations of CMP by the Secretary's office would have caused considerable embarrassment to the Bureau of Ships. This factor alone establishes the Bureau's motive and desire to have a contrary report from this firm in 1959.

Current Bureau instructions have already implemented the procedures to eliminate the civilian shopmaster positions. This would be accomplished by grouping several shipyard shops under one manager (or master mechanic). Once again this maneuver will weaken the last civilian management obstacle to the placement of Navy officers in direct line of supervision of skilled craftsmen.

Any move by the Bureau to group one craft shop with another, or to use supervision from one craft over another, or to cluster as a first step toward combining distinct craft shops will result in the eventual loss of trade identity and skills. The absolute necessity of trade knowledge, skills and proper supervisory guidance will be lost to the Navy at a time when ship construction is becoming extremely complex.

Other Bureau instructions require the eventual disestablishment of certain support type shops because they are uneconomical to operate. Should this policy be carried to the extreme, one could advocate the elimination of the entire defense program as being uneconomical. The classification "support type shops" indicates the need for keeping them in existence. No shipyard can perform its mission without their services and product. It would be extremely illogical to assume that plants in private industry (if they existed) would set aside their steady flow of production just to accommodate irregular contracts from the Navy. We fail to see how the Navy could afford to keep a

ship at the dock indefinitely while awaiting a lapse in production in these private plants.

Any claims of great monetary savings in overhead or productive costs appear to be asinine. It is commonly recognized that to procure support services from plants outside the naval shipyards, the contractor would expect a nominal profit. The overhead functions within the shipyards would have to remain intact to produce plans, specifications and bids and it is very doubtful if any overhead officer personnel would be discharged simply because a few small shops were closed. Therefore, it appears that closing these shops will cost the Navy money; not save it.

In view of the foregoing we feel that the following questions should be satisfactorily resolved before the Bureau of Ships be permitted to continue with its reorganization program.

Does the Bureau of Ships possess an ulterior motive to wreck the naval shipyards and have the private shipyards obtain all the contracts by default?

Did the report of CMP in 1950 establish a practical system of planning, production, and control?

If not, why did the Bureau attempt to implement the program?

If not, why did the Bureau rehire CMP in 1959?

If so, why did the Bureau ignore the key recommendations of 1949?

(a) To hire an adequate staff of industrial engineers to operate P.P. & C.

(b) To provide for more training of officers if they wanted to utilize them.

(c) Continue to use low-grade officers in responsible positions.

Did the CMP report of 1949 recommend that planning at the working level be performed in the shops and the report of 1959 recommend that this planning be now performed by a central group in the planning department. If so, why the change?

If the Bureau was (or is) sincere in adopting a program of efficiency, why do they insist on eliminating the civilian management personnel who are continually correcting the mistakes of inexperienced officers?

CMP reversed themselves between reports of 1949 and 1959. A system almost identical to their recommendations of 1949 has been implemented in 1960 by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., a contractor of the Bureau of Ships. Why did CMP reverse themselves?

If CMP was correct in 1949, then they must be wrong in 1959. If they were wrong in 1949, then we must assume that they are experimenting in 1959.

Is the Bureau providing a proving ground for the inventions of CMP?

If CMP criticism is correct of the ability of military personnel to operate an industrial-type organization, what will become of the naval shipyards with the civilian master mechanics gone and the military of all levels making all the decisions without question?

Golden Opportunity for America in World Trade Fair Participation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the ever-growing program of trade fairs throughout the world, offers, I believe, a new, widening opportunity for business, industry, and agriculture, to find new markets for U.S.-produced commodities.

In 1959, over 500 American firms—including a number from Wisconsin—participated in the U.S. oversea fairs.

For 1960, U.S. exhibits are scheduled to participate in the trade fairs in 11 countries, including Japan, Italy, Morocco, Poland, Austria, Syria, Turkey, Afghanistan, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Tunisia.

The program, I believe, can and should be usefully and constructively expanded.

What are the advantages?

Fundamentally, the fairs offer a number of opportunities which would not, perhaps, be obtained as well in any other way.

These include: Opportunity to exhibit the high-quality products of our farms and factories in other countries; contacts with business and industrial representatives from other than the host country; taking advantage of more and more showplaces, to reflect what can be produced by a free people operating under a free way of life; for example, the American exhibit in New Delhi, India—portraying the theme "Food, Family, Freedom, and Friendship," was attended by an estimated 3⅓ million people.

And finally, the fairs also offer opportunity for establishing people-to-people contacts, not just for commercial purposes, but for establishing better relations and understanding between Mr. and Mrs. Citizen of different countries.

Overall, the international fair program offers new opportunity—and a new horizon—for American enterprise.

Recently, the La Crosse Sunday Tribune published a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Golden Opportunities for America in World Trade Fair Participation."

Reflecting a constructive analysis of this new potential market-finding practice, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Sunday Tribune, Apr. 24, 1960]

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICA IN WORLD TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION

In progress right now in Milan, Italy, is the world's largest trade fair and some 550 American companies are among the 13,500 from some 50 countries which are exhibiting their wares.

Simply as a fair, the exposition is remarkable. It embraces some 40 miles of display front in the very heart of busy Milan, which is itself the geographic center of the European Common Market.

The 1960 additions to exhibition space at Milan are themselves larger than many trade fairs around the world. From America's viewpoint, however, the interest in Milan's show is that it represents one more ambitious effort among a continuing series to promote U.S. products in foreign markets.

This country's productive power is, of course, tremendous. Our economy always has flourished best when we had ample outside outlets to supplement our domestic markets, yet rising industrial levels around the globe make it tougher and tougher to gain and hold such outlets abroad.

Showing foreigners what we have in well-thought-out exhibits in both regular and special trade fairs in countless places is clearly the most direct and positive way to compete successfully in the unceasingly difficult struggle for a part of their markets.

Systematic, carefully planned American representation in trade expositions abroad is therefore now an established official U.S. Government policy and has been for some time.

Though not too many Americans hear about it, an Office of International Trade Fair exists in Washington to guide and shape and advance these efforts.

In 1960, besides Milan, there will be exhibits sponsored by this agency in at least 13 other countries. Greater stress than ever will be put on the quality and the performance of American products.

So long as our participation continues to be as well managed as it has been under our trade fair agency the result should be not only economic benefit to this country, but sound propaganda advantage as well.

It is a solid cause that warrants the support of our businessmen everywhere.

The Unemployment Compensation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article which appeared in the April 1960 issue of the Reader's Digest magazine dealing with the unemployment compensation system.

The article raised a number of questions about the goals of the unemployment compensation system and about the manner in which the system is administered. The Department of Labor has prepared a reply to these questions and to the charges made in the article.

In the belief that persons interested in the unemployment compensation system would like to consider the views presented by both sides—namely, the charges made by the author of the article in the Reader's Digest and the reply to those charges prepared by the Department of Labor—I wish to include in the RECORD the text of the statement submitted by the Department of Labor.

The statement follows:

THE FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS

WHAT IS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Unemployment insurance is a cash payment which compensates eligible workers for a portion of their wage loss when they lose their jobs. The objective is to aid unemployed men and women while they are looking for work, by providing weekly income for a stipulated period of time. Moreover, by sustaining the purchasing power of consumers, unemployment insurance contributes significantly to the stabilization of the whole economy.

WHO HAS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROTECTION

There are three permanent unemployment insurance programs available to workers through the local offices of the State employment security agencies. They are:

1. The program based on both Federal and State laws which protects over 40 million workers in commerce and industry.

2. Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees (UCFE), based on Federal law alone, which protects 2,400,000 Government workers.

3. Unemployment insurance for members of the Armed Forces (UCX), which is based on Federal law alone.

Railroad workers are also protected by unemployment insurance based on Federal law administered by the Railroad Retirement Board rather than the State employment security agencies and the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. Therefore, the program for railroad workers is not discussed in this publication. For information concerning this program, contact should be made with the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, 844 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

THE LAWS BEHIND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Unemployment insurance depends on both Federal and State laws. It was established by the Social Security Act of 1935 as a Federal-State program. The Federal act levies a 3-percent tax on payrolls of all employers in commerce and industry who employ four or more workers during 20 or more weeks of the year.[1] The Federal act further provides that when a State has an approved unemployment insurance law, its employers can credit the taxes they paid to the State against the Federal tax up to a maximum of 90 percent. The Federal tax is 3 percent on the first $3,000 of each worker's annual earnings, but in effect it is reduced to 0.3 percent by the tax credit provision.

In the beginning of the program the tax rate on covered employers in all States except Michigan and the District of Columbia was 2.7 percent of payrolls.[2] Now in all States except Alaska employers who experience little or no unemployment in their establishments may receive a lower State tax rate than 2.7 percent. The Federal act further provides that the employer can get credit not only for the rate he actually pays under the State law but also for the rate that he is excused from paying under the State experience rating system. Thus, even though the employer may pay less than 1 percent tax to the State, he continues to pay the Federal Government only 0.3 percent. In the year 1959, the average annual employer State unemployment insurance tax rate was 1.7 percent. This average reflects a wide range of tax rates from nothing for some employers in some States to a high of 4.5 percent under certain circumstances in other States.

Each State is required to deposit the taxes it collects under its State unemployment insurance law in the unemployment insurance trust fund in the U.S. Treasury. A separate account is kept for each State and the State may withdraw funds at any time for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits.

Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954

The Federal tax is collected by the U.S. Treasury. Under the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954, these funds are earmarked for the purpose of financing both State and Federal employment security administrative costs. Any funds left at the end of the year are used first to maintain a $200 million fund for advances to States with low unemployment insurance benefit reserves. If it is not needed for this purpose, the funds are distributed to the States to be added to their reserves for paying benefits, or, if authorized by a State legislature, for paying administrative costs.

Grants to States for administration

Congress appropriates money for grants to States from the proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax for administration of the employment security program—employment service—farm and nonfarm—and unemployment insurance programs.

FEDERAL FUNCTIONS

Federal functions relating to the unemployment insurance program are chiefly the responsibility of the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor.

The Federal law places upon the Secretary of Labor the duty of studying and making recommendations as to the most effective methods of providing economic security through unemployment insurance and as to legislation and matters of administrative policy concerning such insurance.

Technicians of the Bureau develop general suggestions to all States on legislation and administration and, on a State's request, provide individual advice and help on specific problems. Because the Bureau receives and summarizes reports from all the States, it serves as a clearing house for information on their legislative, interpretive, operating, and statistical experience. It is also responsible for developing recommendations for Federal legislation.

It is also the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor to determine whether State unemployment insurance laws and administration comply with Federal requirements for tax-offset purposes and also for Federal grants to pay administrative costs. The Bureau determines, within the limits of congressional appropriations, the amounts required by the States to meet necessary and proper costs of administering the State laws.

STATE FUNCTIONS

The payment of benefits to unemployed individuals is the responsibility of the States. The decision as to the amount and duration of benefits, the requirements an individual must meet to be eligible for benefits, the conditions under which disqualifications will be issued, what employers and employment will be covered, and the tax rates assessed on employers are prerogatives of the States. As is to be expected, the provisions in the unemployment insurance laws differ widely from State to State.

Coverage

State laws in 27 States follow the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by limiting the program to employers of 4 or more persons. Twenty States extend the program to employers of one or more in covered industry; and four States to employers of three or more workers. Some States use the dollar amount of the employer's payroll as a sole or alternative factor in determining whether or not he is subject to the law.

Nearly all State laws also follow the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in excluding agricultural workers, domestic employees, public employees, and employees of nonprofit agencies and institutions, though a few jurisdictions cover some of these groups.

Benefits

All State laws provide for weekly benefits for a certain number of weeks. The States vary widely, however, in the formulas by which weekly benefit amounts and the number of weeks payable are determined.

The benefit formulas

The benefit formulas of all States relate to the worker's length of employment and earnings in covered employment. Specifically these are earnings during a 1-year base period prior to the worker's unemployment. They are the basis for determining benefit eligibility, weekly amount, and, in most States, duration of benefits. This determination establishes his benefit entitlement for a 1-year period, or benefit year, beginning in most States on the date the worker files his first claim.

The majority of States compute the weekly benefit amount as a fraction of wages in the calendar quarter of the base period in which the individual had the highest earnings. The fraction is generally designed to yield a benefit amount which is 50 percent or more of a worker's average weekly wage. However, each State law establishes a ceiling on the amount of the weekly benefit and no worker may receive a benefit larger than this ceiling. The State maximum dollar amount may act to prevent many workers from receiving a benefit equal to 50 percent of their regular wage. The lower the weekly maximum, the greater the percentage of individuals whose benefit amount fails to meet the 50 percent goal. Eleven States provide allowances for dependents in addition to the worker's basic unemployment benefit.

Forty-five laws provide a basic maximum weekly benefit of $30 or more. Allowances for dependents are generally a flat amount (now $1 to $6 a week) for each eligible dependent. All these States set a maximum dependents' allowance as to the total amount payable.

Duration

In 39 States potential duration of unemployment benefits is determined individually on the basis of the claimant's total earnings or weeks of employment during his base period. The remaining 12 States provide a flat potential duration for all eligible claimants.

Most States which vary duration individually have a minimum of 10 or 12 weeks although several provide as few as 6 or 7 weeks of benefits in a benefit year. All specify a maximum number of weeks payable, as low as 20 weeks in one State and as high as 39 weeks in another. Most provide a maximum of 26 weeks and 8 States pay more than 26 weeks.

Among States with uniform potential duration for all eligible claimants seven States provide 26 weeks, one State 30 weeks, and five States from 20 to 24 weeks.

After the worker has exhausted his benefit rights in the current benefit year, he can receive no further payments until his new benefit year begins. However, six States have special provisions which provide for longer potential duration when unemployment exceeds specified levels. Under such circumstances regular duration is extended by 50 percent in five States and 25 percent in one.

Determining eligibility for benefits

Claimants are not eligible unless they have earned a minimum amount of taxable wages or had a minimum amount of covered employment in the base period. These requirements are set to ensure that only workers with substantial attachment to the labor force can become eligible. All State laws also provide that the worker who is not able to work or is not available for work is not eligible to receive benefits. Eight States, however, have modified this requirement so that claimants who become unable to work after they have registered for unemployment benefits continue to be eligible unless they refuse work that would be suitable were they not sick or disabled.

Every State requests information from the worker's last employer or employers regarding the circumstances of his leaving his job before acting on his claim.

To apply for benefits, an unemployed worker must—

Go to the nearest public employment office.

Register for work and file a claim for unemployment insurance benefits.

Continue to report to the local employment office as instructed, usually weekly, to file continued claims for unemployment ben-

[1] Principal groups exempted from coverage are agricultural workers, domestic workers, State and local government employees, and most employees of nonprofit organizations.

[2] 3 percent in the District of Columbia and Michigan. In New York employers who were subject to the State law but not the Federal law were taxed at 3 percent.

efits and for interviews concerning his job-hunting efforts and other evidences of availability for work and ability to work.

Disqualification provisions

Disqualification provisions in all the laws specify conditions under which an otherwise eligible claimant may have payment of benefits postponed—or, in many States, reduced or canceled. Grounds for disqualification include the claimant's voluntarily leaving his job without good cause or—as specified in some States—without good cause attributable to the employer; discharge for misconduct connected with the work; and refusal, without good cause, of suitable work offered him by an employer or to which he has been referred by the employment service. All States disqualify workers who are unemployed as the result of a labor dispute. In two States, Rhode Island and New York, benefits are paid after a fixed number of weeks of disqualification. In the majority of States, the worker is disqualified for as long as the stoppage of work due to the labor dispute exists. In the others, benefits are denied for as long as the dispute is in active progress. There are a number of other miscellaneous disqualifications found in some of the State laws, such as those denying benefits to workers who quit for marital reasons.

Rights of appeal

Among the requirements of the Social Security Act for Federal financing of the State administration of unemployment insurance is a provision in the law for "opportunity for a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal, for all individuals whose claims for unemployment compensation are denied." All State laws provide for such appeal tribunals; all but four provide for two appeal stages before cases can be appealed to the State courts.

In all States, not only individuals whose claims are denied but employers who are interested parties have a right to appeal decisions on claims.

Penalties

Any individual who willfully makes a fraudulent claim may be subject to any combination of the following:

Repayment of benefits fraudulently received.

Postponement or cancellation of future benefit rights.

Fine.

Imprisonment.

The table below provides some pertinent statistical information on the benefit operations of State unemployment insurance programs during calendar years 1958 and 1959:

Item	1958	1959
New claims	9,919,312	7,924,376
Total disqualifications	1,919,565	1,721,192
Individuals receiving benefits	7,940,688	6,112,152
Weeks compensated (total unemployment)	109,430,582	70,850,335
Total amount of benefits paid	$3,512,732,767	$2,279,017,369
Average weekly wage, covered workers	$86.54	[1] $88.65
Average weekly benefit amount	$30.58	$30.41
Average weekly insured unemployment	2,547,113	1,759,511
Average weekly total unemployment [2]	4,700,000	3,800,000
Amount of benefits obtained fraudulently	$4,926,792	$6,113,639
Fraudulent benefits as percent of total benefits paid [2]	[3] 0.284	0.174
Amount of fraudulent benefits recovered	$3,106,964	$3,565,779
Number of claimants penalized for fraudulent statements	74,988	80,442

[1] Average weekly wage of covered workers during fiscal year 1959.
[2] Based on Bureau of Census data.
[3] Percent of benefits paid in preceding year.

ANALYSIS OF READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE, "THE SCANDAL OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION," APRIL 1960 ISSUE

1. Page 37, column 2, page 38, column 1:

The article cites the case of a retiree from a Pittsburgh industrial plant who looked forward to leisurely retirement, but filed a claim for unemployment compensation and "during the next 7 months this man picked up $35 every week * * * without doing a lick of work. Then * * * he automatically qualified for another $33 for 30 more weeks. It added up to over $2,000, all tax free, and all in addition to his regular retirement income."

The facts:

This claimant cannot be identified in our records. If the author of the article will provide the Pennsylvania agency with the name of the claimant, and if as stated in the article the claimant did not want work, the claimant will be liable for prosecution for fraud. Action could be taken for the recovery of the fraudulent benefits and a fine imposed. The benefits would be fraudulent because for each of the 60 weeks he is said to have received benefits, he had to sign a statement that: "I was able to work and available for suitable work." In addition, every fifth week for which he claimed benefits, he received a special interview at which he was asked what he had been doing during the prior 5 weeks. These interviews are for the purpose of identifying claimants who are not entitled to benefits.

Pennsylvania's law and those of 30 other States do not prohibit individuals in the labor market from receiving unemployment insurance while drawing a pension. Administratively, however, the States investigate more carefully the availability for work of retirees than of those not receiving retirement pay. (See point 10.)

2. Page 38, column 1, paragraphs 3 and 4, "Standards Collapse":

"The planks on which it (unemployment insurance) was built years ago have been so warped by the pressures of our growing welfare bureaucracy that hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted on loafers."

The facts:

All laws in the beginning and today require any individual receiving benefits to be available for work. This is frequently paraphrased as meaning "ready and willing to work." From the beginning and still today an available individual has been regarded as one who does what a reasonable person in his circumstances would do to get work. Loafers, etc., have never been legally entitled to benefits. Any claimant may be offered any job known to the employment service which the agency regards as suitable for him in terms of his past employment and training. A claimant who refuses such an offer, without cause acceptable to the agency, is subject to a disqualification for work refusal.

The statutory causes of disqualification and the period of disqualifications have been generally made more severe. Thirty-five States have elaborated on the four original causes of disqualification. The maximum period of disqualification has increased in many States. For example, in 1938 the maximum disqualification for voluntary leaving in any State was 9 weeks. The most common was five or less. Now 22 States disqualify for more than 6 weeks, and 16 States disqualify for the duration of the unemployment.

Throughout the article are innuendoes that there are many payments which were not intended by the original law but which have been made possible by existing law. Benefit payments are made only by State employment security agencies under the terms of State laws. At almost every session the provisions of the State laws are reviewed by the legislators, and if they deem it necessary amendments are enacted. The State laws and procedures have been tightened over the years to give greater assurance that only workers genuinely in the labor market receive benefits. The qualifications, for example, in terms of earnings and length of employment, which a worker must meet to be eligible for benefits have steadily risen. Originally not one State held special extended interviews to explore the worker's continued availability for work. All States have now adopted this procedure.

3. Page 38, column 1, last paragraph:

"In Wisconsin, a mine-hoist operator demanded sick leave for 'arthritis,' only to go touring country fairs as a sulky driver in harness races. Eight weeks later, when he showed up for work, he was fired for misconduct. At that point he applied for benefits, and it was finally ruled that his behavior should not prevent him from receiving compensation."

The facts:

Mulford Callam v. *Montreal Mining Co. and Industrial Commission* (Circuit Court, Dane County, Sept. 9, 1957) (BSSUI,[3] MC-15.05-17).

The initial determination in this case denied benefits on the ground of misconduct discharge. On appeal, the examiner reversed this determination and allowed benefits. The commission, in turn, reversed the examiner and denied benefits. Finally, the circuit court allowed benefits, without disqualification.

Callam, the claimant, worked in a mine for about 8 years as a hoistman. He suffered from chronic rheumatoid arthritis which had grown progressively worse. In the latter part of June 1955, on his doctor's orders, he asked for a sick leave from his superintendent. The superintendent told him that the company did not grant sick leaves but that, if his doctor recommended he take off, Callam should do so and return when he was able. Callam absented himself from work for 8 weeks after June 30, 1955. He stayed at home the first 3 weeks recuperating. He then left the city with his family for a tour of area and county fairs at which he entered and sometimes drove a harness-racing horse in races. Callam came home on August 24, 1955, and reported for work. He was told that his employment had been terminated. On August 4 and 5 the employer had tried unsuccessfully to reach Callam by telephone and in person. On August 5 the employer had sent him a registered letter asking that he report for work or obtain a leave of absence within 15 days or his employment would be ended. Callam never received this letter, although he had left a forwarding address. The court pointed out that considerable latitude needed to be left to an employee's discretion as to whether or not he is able to continue at work.

"Callam did not think he was able to return to work until August 24 and he had medical evidence to back up his contention. There is no contrary evidence other than the commission's conclusion that driving a harness race in two 3-minute heats was just as strenuous as operating a mine hoist. * * *

"The commission in effect has substituted its discretion for that of the workman. Perhaps Callam was mistaken in his judgment as to when he could return to work but does that constitute misconduct under the statute?"

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the Boynton Cab case "flatly holds that the term 'misconduct' does not include 'mere mistakes, errors in judgment, or in the exercise of discretion' on the part of a discharged worker, and we think at best that nothing more than a mistake or an error in judgment on the part of Callam is here involved."

Comment:

This is a court decision and not an administrative determination.

[3] Benefit Series Service, Unemployment Insurance.

The court based its decision on a definition of "misconduct connected with the work" that was laid down by the Wisconsin Supreme Court in 1941 in what has become the leading American case on the subject.

The mine superintendent told Callam to follow his doctor's orders and absent himself from work until he was able to return. Nothing in the facts indicated that what he did was contrary to his doctor's orders. Medical evidence did indicate that he was unable to return to work until August 24, 1955. In other words, he did just what his superintendent had told him to do.

4. Page 38, column 2, paragraph 1:

"There's the girl who worked in a musical comedy in New York for about a year, then took a vacation in Miami. She stayed on as a nightclub dancer at $100 a week for 6 weeks. When the show headed for Las Vegas, she quit and went back to New York. Her homecoming was sweetened with jobless aid."

The facts:

New York: Unemployment insurance appeal board, decision No. 60, 435–57 (August 16, 1957; BSSUI, VL–315–5).

The initial determination and the referee both disqualified the claimant for voluntarily leaving her employment without good cause. The appeal board reversed them and allowed benefits.

The claimant, a dancer, was 18 years old at the time she filed her claim. Her first job after leaving school was with a musical comedy in which she worked for about a year. When this job ended she went to Miami for a vacation, but obtained a job there in a night club and worked for 6 weeks until April 13. This employment was terminated when the night club closed at the end of the season. She had been hired for the run of the show in Miami, Fla. Her contract of hire did not obligate her to perform in the same production with an employer elsewhere. She declined to go with the show to Las Vegas for these reasons: She did not want to travel to Nevada. The salary would have been about $102 or $105 a week, out of which she would have had to pay her own living expenses in Las Vegas. She was one of the last employees to be hired and would be one of the first to be terminated in the event of a layoff. Her mother disapproved of her traveling to a distant part of the country because of her age. The appeal board concluded that she should not be disqualified because her contract of hire did not require her to accept the Las Vegas offer and because her youth and limited traveling experience were a good ground for her refusal to travel and to be employed in a distant part of the United States.

Comment:

When this claimant's musical comedy employment ended and she decided to vacation in Miami, she did not claim any unemployment benefits. However, when a chance came to work while in Miami she took advantage of it.

The testimony in the case showed that this 18-year old was living with friends in Miami. This kept her living costs down and provided chaperonage. In Las Vegas she would have had to live at a hotel where her costs would be higher and the guardianship of family and close friends would not be available.

5. Page 38, column 2, paragraph 2:

"After classes let out for the summer vacation, a Georgia schoolteacher who was paid by the year collected unemployment in North Carolina. He claimed that his monthly school checks were for work he had done in the school term."

The facts:

North Carolina: Appeals deputy decision, docket No. 548–UCV–57 (July 12, 1957, BSSUI, TPU–105–43).

The claims deputy denied benefits to the claimant on the theory that he was not unemployed; the appeals deputy reversed him and allowed benefits. This claimant was a Korean veteran and filed his claim for benefits under the program provided by the Congress in the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

The claimant had been teaching school in Georgia. After he lost this job, he moved to North Carolina in search of employment. Under the claimant's teaching contract with the Warrenton Elementary School, Warrenton, Ga., he had been required to and did perform services from September 1, 1956, to June 1, 1957. The school, however, paid its teachers, including the claimant, monthly on a 12-month a year basis. Claimant was released from his teaching job on May 29, 1957. After that he no longer had any obligation to the Warrenton school and was free to take other work and was willing to do so. His checks, after May 1957, were considered wages that he earned and accrued during the September 1–June 1 period.

Comment:

The North Carolina law (sec. 96–8 (10) (a)) says that "an individual shall be deemed totally unemployed in any week with respect to which no wages are payable to him and during which he performs no services." The pay checks which this claimant received during the summer of 1957 were for work performed during the 9-month school period. They made him no less unemployed than if the school had paid him the same total salary but divided it into 9 equal monthly checks.

6. Page 38, column 2, paragraph 3:

"In Hollywood, a 12-year-old child actor spurned parts as an extra paying up to $28 a day, yet was declared eligible for unemployment benefits. Why? The youngster was accustomed to speaking roles at $100 to $150 a day, so lesser parts were beneath him."

The facts:

California: Unemployment insurance appeals board, benefit decision No. 6574 (January 30, 1959, BSSUI, AA–195–23).

The initial determination and the referee's decision denied benefits to the claimant from August 18, 1957, on the ground that he was not available for work. This was reversed by the appeal board.

The claimant, a 12-year-old actor, had 7 years' experience in movies and TV production. During 1951–53 his maximum annual earnings had been under $700. He earned $1,858 in 1954, over $5,000 in 1955, and again in 1956. As of October 7, 1957, he had earned over $4,900 in calendar year 1957. His normal rate of pay as an actor was from $100 to $150 a day or from $350 to $400 a week. The number of days which he had worked as an actor during the past several years had exceeded, to a considerable degree, those worked by the average child who received work in the entertainment field. In 1957, when he filed his claim, minimum rates for extras were $21.51 per day and $97.15 per week.

During the past few years, there had been a surplus of children seeking extra work and Central Casting Corp., the agency through which the major studios usually employed extras, had generally not been accepting their requests for registration for extra work.

Actors and their agents generally considered that for an established actor who had attained normal rates of pay above the Screen Actors Guild minimum (as was the case with this claimant) seeking work as an extra would lower his professional prestige, harm his acting career, and destroy his established rates of compensation.

"In the present case, the claimant has firmly established himself in the acting profession and has consistently, over a period of several years, secured a substantial amount of work and income in the entertainment field. In addition, he has attained a stature in his profession which allows him to consistently command rates of pay in excess of those set forth in the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by the Screen Actors Guild. Under these facts, * * * we find that there existed for the claimant a reasonable labor market and one which offered the claimant reasonable prospects for continued regular employment therein. Also, in view of the claimant's established position in the entertainment industry, his currently established rates of compensation and, based upon his recent employment experience, his apparent prospects for continued regular employment at such rates, it is our further opinion that the claimant's exclusion of work as an extra player, which paid wages of $21.50 or $28.33 per day, was not an unreasonable restriction."

Comment:

The basic criterion used by the Board to determine the availability of child actors for work has been whether or not they have firmly established themselves in the entertainment field.

The California board decided three other child actor cases on the same day as in this case—Nos. 6575, 6576, and 6577. In 6575 and 6576 benefits were allowed. In 6577 benefits were denied even though the claimant who had done free-lance work in motion picture, radio, and TV production for about 4 years, was willing to accept all types of work which he could perform in the entertainment and modeling fields, including extra work at the minimum scale. This claimant had earned about $575 in 1955, about $3,500 in 1956, and about $2,500 in the first 8 months of 1957. The appeal board said that these earnings indicated that he had not sufficiently established himself in the entertainment and modeling fields so that he could expect to secure employment on a reasonably regular or full-time basis.

7. Page 39, column 1, "Upsurge in Benefit Payments":

"Of the $23 billion in jobless pay handed out during the past two decades, nearly half has been eaten up in just the last 5 years."

The facts:

The article omits the reasons why the amount of benefits paid out in recent years has been considerably greater than in earlier years. There are two major reasons for the rise: (a) a larger number of workers are now covered; and (b) the benefit amount, which is based on the going wage structure, has steadily increased to reflect the constant rise in the level of wages. The article omits the further fact that the rise in benefit amounts has not kept level with the rise in wages. The article also omits the fact that the 5-year period referred to included the 1958–59 recession.

8. Page 39, column 1, paragraph 2, "Bureau Dominates the Unemployment Compensation Program":

Throughout, the article implies and on page 39 states that the program "has long been dominated by Federal officials who are engaged" in a continued effort to cut down the authority of the States.

The facts:

Any examination of the tremendous variation in State unemployment compensation programs reveals the falsity of any charge of Federal domination. It is obviously ridiculous to say that 50 State legislatures and the Congress of the United States are dominated by the Bureau of Employment Security in Washington.

9. Page 39, column 2, "Bureau Dominates Allocation of Funds":

"The BES then channels cash back to the States for their administrative expenses, retaining an average of $6 million a year for its own expenses."

The facts:

The funds are collected by the Internal Revenue Service, and appropriations out of these funds are made by the Congress for the States' administrative expenses. Con-

gress also appropriates the money for Bureau expenses. This is the same process by which other Government agencies obtain their funds.

10. Page 39, column 2, paragraph 3, "Retirees":

"In Pennsylvania * * * workers who had retired on pensions were showered with $20 million in unemployment payments during a 3-year period."

The facts:

Because of the strong implications of withdrawal from the labor market, the States investigate more carefully the continued eligibility and availability for work of retirees than they do with regard to claims by younger workers. In addition, a number of States have special disqualifications for workers receiving pensions. But not all retirees are in the same situation. Some are forcibly retired from one job—and continue working for many years afterward in other jobs. Others are not interested in working. The personal circumstances of each must be carefully investigated and weighed. The worker who retires voluntarily from his last employment may be disqualified for voluntarily quitting his job without good cause. More eligibility for retirement has never been accepted in any State as good cause for quitting a job. Unless the worker has other and substantially better reasons for quitting, the voluntary retiree will be disqualified. By contrast, the worker who is forced to retire is in no different situation from any other worker who is laid off. He has lost his job for a reason for which he is not responsible even though he may be receiving a pension or old-age insurance payments. A typical example of the State approach to the determination of the rights of retirees under usual availability provisions is this statement by the New York Division of Employment:

"Cases of workers who have been retired for age by an employer are closely examined. The amount of pension paid by the employer or the union and of old-age insurance benefits under the Social Security Act and ascertained and weighed in determining such worker's availability, that is, his desire to work. Particular emphasis is given to cases where acceptance of work would entail forfeit of such payments. Restrictions by claimants regarding the type of work and wages sought are evaluated against the prospects of finding employment. An active search for work is required in these cases.

"If a worker retires voluntarily, especially strong evidence is required to demonstrate a later return to the labor market and possible eligibility for benefits.

"Facts examined in making determinations on the availability for work of pensioners include these:

"The circumstances of separation from previous employment, that is, voluntary or mandatory separation.

"The willingness of the claimant to accept such suitable employment as is obtainable in the current labor market in the light of conditions surrounding the employability of older workers.

"Physical capacity of the claimant to do the kind of work for which he is otherwise qualified.

"The reasonableness of the restrictions imposed by the claimant as to wages, type of work, location (travel, transportation), hours, etc.

"The kind and extent of efforts made by the claimant to obtain employment.

"The amount of pension and old age benefits received and their effect on a genuine desire to work, the conditions of continued receipt of such payments, and the willingness of the claimant to forfeit the entire amount, or any part of it, if necessary, to accept employment."

11. Page 40, column 1, paragraph 1, "Seasonal Workers":

"In one city 85 women, mostly housewives, work 8 months of the year. * * * In the spring the plant closes down for the summer. Since no other factories in the area have openings, these women can collect as much as 30 weeks' compensation."

The facts:

Information from Pennsylvania is to the effect that these women are actively in the labor market during the off season and that a number, in fact, do get some work. The workers are regularly tested for their willingness and ability to work. Since they regularly work 8 months of the year, they could not possibly draw 30 weeks of benefits (over 7 months). They would be disqualified immediately if they refused to return to work at the beginning of the season.

12. Page 40, column 1, paragraph 2, "Ill-Considered and Loose Legislation":

"One of the worst abuses in Pennsylvania is a scheme of benefit distribution whereby certain claimants can collect for two 30-week periods without lifting a finger in between. They draw the double bonus because of a loophole they have discovered."

The facts:

This is not a loophole in the Pennsylvania law. There are only 13 State laws which have specific statutory provisions to prevent payment of benefits in a second benefit year without intervening employment.

The article assails the provisions which permit workers to draw benefits continuously from the end of one year through the beginning of the next benefit year. The article does not explain that benefits are payable in any year only on the basis of earnings and employment in a recent base period. The worker, therefore, cannot receive benefits in 2 consecutive years unless he has had sufficient earnings in two consecutive base periods. It is only the accident of when the long-unemployed worker was laid off that determines whether he will have a period of idleness between his periods of benefit entitlement or whether the first period of benefit payments will run into the next. The article also overlooks the fact that the longer a worker remains unemployed the more stringent becomes the State investigation of his availability.

13. Page 40, column 1, paragraph 3, "Employer Appeals":

"In a recent 12-month period more than two-thirds of their (employer) appeals to referees and the board of review were turned down."

The facts:

The article omits the fact that three out of four workers lose their appeals when they appeal to referees and the board of review.

14. Page 40, column 2, paragraph 1: "Consider the case of an inspector in a plant handling defense work. Because he failed to check the measurements on an important machine, $2,000 worth of material had to be scrapped. He was fired. Nevertheless, benefits were granted by a board of review even though the record showed that the inspector had been issued previous warnings by the company because of his carelessness."

The facts:

Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Board of Review, decision No. B-47651, May 21, 1958 (reaffirmed October 10, 1958).

The claimant had worked as a floor inspector in a plant manufacturing parts for jet engines for about 6 years. His basic functions were to approve machines, check the piece which the machine was producing against a blueprint, and master the gage on the job. On January 16, 1958, he failed properly to gage the pieces on the job. As a result, the pieces produced were scrapped. Checking the operation of the machine periodically was the duty of the machine operator as well as the claimant. The machine operator was suspended for 3 days. The claimant was discharged for his failure properly to set the gages and failure to make proper inspection of the machine. The board, through its referee, held three separate hearings at which the employer was represented by its accounting firm and several members of its managerial staff. Fifty-three pages of testimony were taken. After considering the testimony, it was the board's conclusion that there had been a failure to prove any deliberate and willful action on the part of the claimant. "We feel that the claimant's actions were actions of misjudgment and as such do not constitute misconduct within the meaning of the act."

Comment:

The three hearings held in this case indicate the detailed care with which the facts were explored by the referee and the board of review. The testimony taken showed conflict as to the extent and nature of previous warnings and commendations that had been given to the claimant. Dispute existed also as to the workload given to the claimant and the ability of one person to do an adequate job of inspection on the number of machines assigned in an area so large as the one which the claimant had to cover. The board's decision was a factual conclusion in the face of the parties' disagreement on the details of the claimant's duties, conduct, and precise cause of separation.

15. Page 40, column 2, paragraph 2, "Pennsylvania TUC Exhaustions":

"For 6 months (in Pennsylvania) every person who had run through all his compensation hauled in an additional 15 weeks."

The facts:

This false statement implies that no matter what the duration of benefits is, the unemployed workers will continue to draw benefits to the very end of the period. The "additional 15 weeks" of benefits referred to by the article were paid out under a Federal law passed by the Congress during the 1958 recession to help workers who were not able to find jobs during the recession within the number of weeks during which the State paid benefits. Seventeen States including Pennsylvania participated in this Federal program. As a matter of fact, of the 251,000 Pennsylvania claimants who began to draw TUC benefits, as many as 115,000—or 46 percent—dropped out before the end of the 15-week period. Clearly, workers continue to draw benefits only while they cannot find work.

16. Page 40, column 2, paragraph 3, page 41, column 1, "Periods of Short Disqualification":

The article is critical of 5- and 6-week disqualification periods and attributes them to "BES-promoted laxity." The cases selected for discussion are misconduct cases involving dishonesty. "In Pennsylvania * * * in 4 years more than $45 million had been squandered on persons who voluntarily quit work or were fired for misconduct."

The facts:

The unemployment insurance program was not set up to punish workers for dishonesty or for any other reason. That is a function of the criminal courts. The unemployment insurance program should only deny benefits to a worker for as long as his unemployment is the result of his own unreasonable actions. Obviously, a good deal of guessing must necessarily take place in trying to predict how long a particular individual's unemployment will be attributable to his own actions. Instead, the Bureau looks to the experience of the average worker. The Bureau's recommendation—and that of many States and students of the program—is that the disqualification in each State should be as long as, or slightly longer than, the period it normally takes workers in that State to find work.

The reference "that only 18 States now bother to impose heavier disqualifications for aggravated misconduct" carries a misleading implication. Originally, no State had such a provision.

17. Page 41, column 2, paragraph 1:

"In Rhode Island a woman clerk married a man from Mississippi and quit her job to live in the South. When she claimed unemployment compensation, her employer objected—but an administrative ruling declared that it is a woman's duty 'to live where her husband designated.' For that reason she got unemployment benefits."

The facts:

Rhode Island: Board of review, appeal No. 5029 (March 14, 1958; BSSUI, VL-155.2-39).

The initial determination denied benefits for voluntary leaving without good cause. The claimant's appeal was decided by the board, without any intermediate referee stage.

The Reader's Digest version is correct in the facts. The board said:

"We have held in previous cases that where a claimant is required to leave her job to join her husband who moves to or is a resident of another State she is acting under a duty imposed upon her by law to live where her husband designates. Accordingly, in doing so, claimant is fulfilling an obligation to the law. Claimant is acting from a compelling reason which in our opinion justifies a voluntary leaving. There is no basis for the imposition of a penalty for voluntary leaving without good cause under the facts in this case."

Comment:

The initial determination, made by the State employment security agency's staff, disqualified the claimant when the employer objected. The claimant appealed from this to the board. The board, composed of a public representative, a labor representative, and an industry representative, unanimously reversed this disqualification.

The board's decision was in accord with an earlier court decision.

In 1953 the Rhode Island Superior Court had approved a decision that a clerk who left Rhode Island to be near her marine husband at a California camp for 2 or 3 months before he left for oversea duty, had left her work with good cause (*Champagne* v. *Department*, P.A. No. 2846).

18. Page 41, column 2, paragraph 2:

"In New York Mrs. Sheila Shaw drew 9 weeks of unemployment compensation after she quit her $45-a-week clerk-typist job to become a bride. Her employer appealed. When the case finally reached the supreme court appellate division, the employer was turned down. The court put marriage in the same class 'as an illness or other event of important personal consequence to the worker.'"

The facts:

New York: *Matter of Shaw* (Appellate division, supreme court, July 31, 1958; 6 A.D. 2d 354; 177 N.Y.S. (2d) 1, affirmed by the court of appeals without opinion, 158 N.S. (2d) 128 (1959)).

Benefits were allowed this claimant without disqualification, at all levels, from the initial determination to the court of appeals.

Shiela Shaw had been employed as a clerk-typist for 2 years by the General Mutual Insurance Company in Albany. She left her job to be married and to live with her husband in North Tonawanda, New York, some 280 miles from Albany. She was married on July 23, and did not look for work until August 23, when she filed her claim. Ultimately (on October 29), she found a job as a typist.

The court pointed out that the statute did not define the meaning of "good cause." "Usually it would be expected to be some cause connected with the employment itself; unsatisfactory hours or wages, strain of the work, transportation or other related difficulties." However, said the court, when the statute is read in context, it is clear that leaving employment "for good cause" may exist because of conditions which have no direct bearing on the work itself. The court pointed to such things as personal illness, illness in the family which may require the individual's help, his desire to continue his education, or an inheritance of enough money so that the individual would not be required to work for a while, as examples of reasons that might constitute a temporary withdrawal from the labor market in good faith.

"Thus, leaving employment for good cause may be integrated with a temporary withdrawal from the labor market; and while they may not be fully coextensive, not every bona fide temporary withdrawal from the labor market would be 'good cause' for leaving employment (having enough money not to need to work, for example), it would seem that 'good cause' ought to be read as a cause having some reasonable foundation.

"We think marriage ought to be treated as such a cause as well as illness or other events of important personal consequences to the workers. This is especially so where it is manifest that the woman who is married intends to return to the labor market.

"The bride of the Victorian era would no doubt regard her marriage as a permanent withdrawal from the labor market, if, indeed, she had ever been in it; but the economics of modern marriage require that many married women work and they intend to remain and do remain in the labor market after marriage."

Comment:

This claimant filed her claim only after she was settled in her new home and ready to go to work. She was married on July 23 and filed her claim 3 weeks later. The court emphasized the claimant's actual return to the labor market and the fact that she did find a job.

19. Page 42, column 1, "Labor Dispute Disqualification":

In the midst of a discussion of laxity in disqualifications for which the article blames the Bureau occurs this sentence: "In scores of labor disputes strikers collect benefits completely contrary to the original intent of the law." The next sentence refers to 25,000 strikers in New York who received benefits. The implication is twofold: (a) The Bureau recommends the New York type of disqualification, and (b) this type of disqualification is to be found in many States.

The facts:

The disqualification of workers for unemployment due to a labor dispute, or for any other reason, is determined by State legislators who regularly review the State unemployment insurance laws.

Actually, only two States now have such a limited disqualification for unemployment during labor disputes. Moreover, the Bureau does not recommend this type of disqualification. The Bureau believes the disqualification should continue as long as there is a causal relationship between the stoppage of work and the unemployment.

20. Page 42, column 2, paragraph 1, "Number of Fraud Cases":

The article points out on page 42, column two that in the last 3 years, "170,000 cases of fraud were officially reported. Yet BES statistics show only 32,000 prosecutions and 25,000 convictions. The officially admitted take by gypsters: More than 12 million dollars."

The facts:

The amount of fraud is small and many cases are detected before benefits are paid. This statement gives a false impression as to amount of fraud and as to the effectiveness of State activity. For the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 overpayments as the result of fraud amounted to about one-fifth of 1 percent of all benefits paid. The article is particularly remiss in not mentioning that regardless of prosecutions two-thirds of the benefits paid out as the result of fraud was recovered. Also the article fails to mention that penalties are imposed by the State agencies even if they decide not to prosecute. Although the figures the article cites refer to claims which were not detected until after benefit payments had been made, these penalties are levied on all fraudulent claims including those that are detected before benefits are paid. During these 3 years almost 200,000 administrative penalties were imposed.

21. Page 42, column 2, paragraph 2, "BES Refusal To Disclose State-by-State Fraud":

The article refers to the more than 30,000 benefit random studies as "detailed investigations in 41 States" and adds that "BES simply refuses to disclose the total amount of fraud in any one of these States."

The facts:

The cases to be investigated were selected with the objective of testing the basic claims methods in the State and not to measure the extent of fraud throughout a given State. The results have value in improving local office functions but have no relationship to the amount of fraud in a State since the sampling method is not done on a statistically sound basis for that purpose. For this reason, and to avoid misuse of the data, the Bureau informed all the States in September 1954 when it sought this information from them that "Information obtained from survey reports to the Bureau which identifies an individual State will be released only with the agency's specific consent." The writer of the article was told this and was invited to write to the individual States for the material if he so desired.

22. Page 42, column 2, "The Federal Advisory Council":

"The Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, a group of citizen consultants hand-picked by BES and the Labor Department."

The facts:

The Federal Advisory Council is a statutory body consisting of equal representation from management, labor, and the public. The management members are selected by the Secretary of Labor taking into consideration lists submitted by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; the labor representatives are selected from a similar list prepared by the AFL-CIO. The public members are selected by the Secretary of Labor. See attached list for members of the council.

MEMBERSHIP OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, JULY 1, 1959

Fedele F. Fauri, dean of the School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Chairman.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. Eveline M. Burns, professor of social work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 2 East 91st Street, New York, N.Y.

Lester B. Granger, executive director, National Urban League, 14 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

William Haber, professor of economics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Arthur A. Hitchcock, executive director, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1605 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

John Holden, national service director, American Veterans of World War II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Dale Yoder, professor of industrial relations, division of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES

Raphael M. Dorman, manager, division of industrial relations, Bechtel Corp., 22 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert T. Garrison, vice president, Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., 530 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Harold Keller, director of association relations, General Dynamics Corp., 445 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

J. Wade Miller, manager, central services division, W. R. Grace & Co., Dewey & Almy Chemical Division, 62 Whittemore Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.

John Post, manager, industrial relations department, Continental Oil Co., Houston, Tex.

E. F. Scoutten, vice president and director of industrial relations, Maytag Co., Newton, Iowa.

E. D. Starkweather, vice president, North American Aviation, Inc., International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

John Zuckerman, farmer, Post Office Box 630, Stockton, Calif.

EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

Harry Boyer, president, Pennsylvania CIO Council, Dauphin Building, Harrisburg, Pa.

George Brown, political education director, Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, 506 Labor Temple, Portland, Oreg.

Jacob Clayman, administrative director, Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Raymond Munts, assistant director, Department of Social Security, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. J. Haggerty, president, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Kenneth J. Kelley, secretary-treasurer, Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Leonard Lesser, director, social security activities, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Jesse C. McGlon, general vice president, International Association of Machinists, 808 Glenn Building, 120 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.

"Birds of Texas"—Book by Roger Tory Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call attention to a publication entitled "A Field Guide to the Birds of Texas," prepared by the noted author and ornithologist, Roger Tory Peterson. The book has been published under the sponsorship of the Texas Game, Fish, and Oyster Commission, and has been reviewed in Time magazine for May 2, 1960. Senators will enjoy the publication itself more than the account of it which will accompany this statement, because it contains some beautiful illustrations of rare birds, including whooping cranes, road runners, Mexican eagles, and other birds of that area, which are not found in other parts of the Union.

It was necessary to get the sponsorship of the Texas Game, Fish, and Oyster Commission in order to make it feasible to publish the book, because it could not be financed privately. Already more than 6,000 copies have been sold, and the book bids fair to become one of the best sellers in the United States. The publication really comprises three volumes bound in one.

Time magazine calls Roger Tory Peterson one of America's top bird men.

I think it speaks well for the growing cultural development of the American people that already more than 6,000 copies of the book have been sold without any high-powered sales campaign.

This book fills a need of decades. In my own boyhood, I sought such a book, but there was none then. I commend Mr. Peterson for his stimulating scholarship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in Time magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RARAE AVES

A new bestseller is in the making. Without advertising, and despite a sales system that seems designed to discourage all but the most determined customers, the Texas "Field Guide" has sold more than 6,000 copies—better than some bestselling novels. The author: Roger Tory Peterson, 51, the U.S. top birdman, whose wrinkle-ringed blue eyes (no spectacles except for close work) can distinguish between a harlequin duck and a common scoter half a mile away.

The latest Peterson publishing venture had its origins in a bad case of frustration. Though Texans were confident that they had the most, the biggest and the rarest North American birds, with the whooping crane ready to whoop agreement each fall, they felt neglected during the last quarter-century, when bird watching in the United States developed from a risible oddity to an often rugged sport. The trouble was an embarrassment of riches. A Yankee or Floridian could count on identifying any bird he saw with nothing more cumbersome than his binoculars and a single pocket volume, Peterson's Eastern "Field Guide to the Birds." An Idahoan or Californian had the same assurance with Peterson's "Field Guide to Western Birds." But Texas is where, ornithologically, East meets West, and North America meets near-tropical Mexico. The conscientious Texas birder needs both Peterson books—or all three volumes of Richard H. Pough's "Audubon Bird Guides"—and by the time he had riffled all the pages, the exciting "lifer" (i.e., a new bird) had probably flown away still unidentified.

Five years ago, the Texas Game and Fish Commission asked Birder Peterson to do something about the situation, put up $60,000 and now can boast the best bird guide in the Western Hemisphere (but for 3 years the book can be bought only from the Game and Fish Commission; money must be sent with the order to Austin, Tex.—no c.o.d.'s). The Texas guide demonstrates once again why the Peterson volumes are rarae aves in the book trade. When the first modest edition of the Eastern volume appeared in 1934, it sold an unexpected 7,000 copies in its first year, more than the National Audubon Society's total membership at the time (now 33,000). Since then Peterson's Eastern guide has sold more than 525,000 copies, is running at 46,000 a year, while the Western guide has sold 165,000.

The success of the Peterson guides lies in their difference from earlier bird books, which were primarily artistic (like Audubon's) or coldly scientific treatises on dead specimens in museums. Peterson, a sometime art student and teacher, got the idea (from Ernest Thompson Seton's "Two Little Savages") for schematic representations of birds as they are usually seen—at a distance, in flight or bobbing on the water. He has refined the idea into what he calls "the Peterson system."

Under this system, major groups of birds are distinguished by obvious, overall characteristics. As he points out in the Texas volume, for instance, loons are "open-water swimming birds with pointed, daggerlike bills. Larger than most ducks * * * float low in water"; despite its name, the common loon is "rare south of Corpus Christi." Shrikes are "songbirds with hawklike behavior and hook-tipped bills"; the loggerhead species is widespread in Texas, but the Northern shrike has been recorded in only 5 of the State's 254 counties.

After these broad strokes come successively finer, heavily italicized distinctions: the blue-gray gnatcatcher looks like a miniature mockingbird. A very tiny, slender mite, even smaller than a chickadee, blue-gray above and whitish below * * * long, contrastingly colored tail. It migrates through the whole of Texas, winters in the southern part, breeds in the northern. The black-tailed gnatcatcher has less white on tail. Among the robin's maculate cousins, the reddish tail is the hermit thrush's mark. The deadpan statement, "red eye is of little aid," has nothing to do with liquor but refers to the red-eyed vireo—better characterized by the gray cap and the black-bordered white eyebrow stripe.

All in all, Author Peterson, who is credited with the all-America record for having seen 572 species of birds in a single year, finds Texas bird life more varied than any other State's. It includes such bait for bird watchers as the caracara (an oddball falcon that eats carrion), the chachalaca (only guan in North America), the roadrunner (a giant, snake-killing cuckoo) and the jaçana (a long-toed "lily trotter"). Altogether, there are 487 different basic species which occur regularly, plus 55 accidentals (recorded fewer than five times), for a grand total of 542 species. This leaves California, notes Birder Peterson, "a poor second with nearly 100 fewer specimens."

The Role of a Responsible Opposition in a Democracy: An Address by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 22, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to hear a discussion of the role of opposition parties in a democracy by three men who are leaders of the opposition party in their respective countries.

The men were the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, leader of the Democratic Party in the United States; the Honorable Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party; and the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, leader of Canada's Labor Party.

The occasion was the meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., on April 22, 1960.

Governor Stevenson delivered an address on this occasion which, in my

opinion, deserves the attention not only of my colleagues in Congress but all those who publish, write, and read American newspapers.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this excellent address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 22, 1960

As my two honorable friends and I share this platform, it will no doubt cross the minds of some of you that we have something in common; we are demonstrably and obviously out of office. However, like George Orwell's pigs, some of whom were more equal than others, I will yield to no one in my claim that I am more out of office than they are.

This is partly due to the fact that they are in parliament and are the chosen leaders of their parties, and confidently expect at some point to take over the political leadership of their nations. And I do not. But it is also due to the fact that while they are out of office, I am out of an office which probably did not exist in the first place. I defy anyone to improve on this.

I never liked the title "titular head"; it always reminds me of an agitated and unattractive little bird. And to be "titular head" of the party which does not occupy the White House is to be almost as much of a ghost as those who are popularly supposed these days to write all our speeches. You have no position, no office, no authority, no staff, no salary, and no responsibilities, save perhaps to help pay off the last election debt.

A MULTIPARTY SYSTEM IN TWO PARTY DRESS

Moreover, any vestigial claim to party leadership is disputed—very naturally, I may say—by congressional leaders in their legislative role. On them falls, it can be argued, the full brunt of opposition if their party is out of power. They take up the essential dialogue of criticism and investigation. They harry and attack. They prepare the positions from which, 4 years later, a new campaign can be launched to capture the seat of executive power.

But parties out of office are at best a loose alliance of jealously independent politicians with an eye on the next election and even the presidential nomination. Our American party system has more pluribus than unum in it and except for the purposes of presidential campaign is really a multiparty system in two party dress. So to have an acknowledged leader a party has to have a President.

SEVEN YEARS OF DIVIDED POWER

And latterly we have fallen into a new dilemma. For the first time in our history, we have had 7 years of divided power. The President does not command a majority in Congress. He can only secure action with the concurrence, indeed the close cooperation of the opposition. If, to use a British phrase, the Queen's government is to be carried on, they are obliged to abandon in part the roles of critics and watchdogs and become partners in transacting the great business of the state.

This is all the more essential at a time when the challenges of the times are vast. But the result of divided government is to blunt the issues, confuse responsibility, and in some measure muzzle the opposition upon whose vigor the vitality of our system in great measure depends.

One consequence of this unexpected development in our traditional system is surely to enhance the need for some spokesman or office or organ which can speak for the party in its extra-congressional and national life, however loosely organized it is. And it is here, I believe, that the titular head of the party has a continuing responsibility to attempt to focus issues and participate in the great debate.

Of course, he does not stand alone. There are other party leaders outside Congress with as much or greater resonance. And to further help fulfill this role the Democratic Advisory Council was created after the 1956 election and has contributed much thoughtful partisan comment on public affairs. (Indeed, if our current presidential contests are correct in their hint that Presidents are to be picked from steadily younger age groups, who knows—by the year 1990, we may confidently expect that the next Republican President will be checked and balanced by no less than four vigorous and determined ex-Democratic Presidents—a new hazard added to that already appalling office.)

ENGINE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS OUT OF FUEL?

It is not only the mechanics of our division of powers and the new fashion in ticket splitting that has complicated the role of the opposition in America. There is evidence enough to suggest that public opinion at large is not too enamored of the critical approach. We are, I think, witnessing something new here in the democracies of the West. In the past, critics of social evils, of obvious injustice or privilege or oppression could mobilize behind their protest something like a majority vote. Most people were poor and oppressed and helpless. The vote was their first instrument to register their protest, the first force, other than violence, given them to redress their wrongs. But our modern mass electorates are verging on the comfortable—and to many freedom has come to mean freedom from political responsibility. "Don't let them take it away"—with all its connotations of conservatism (and distasteful memories for me), is more appealing than "Let's build a better world." The engine of social progress has run out of fuel—the fuel of discontent. I suspect all three of us here today have found how difficult it is to struggle for change and challenge and reform as the waves of affluence and the high tide of consumption breaks over the modern electorate.

The style of our age reinforces a quiescent mood. It is a style framed by consumption and designed to increase it. Clearly if you want to sell something, you don't first make the customer mad at you. The voices wooing us from the ether and the screen, telling us of what we owe ourselves, of the admiration we shall excite and the prestigious groups to which we shall belong, and the high executive posts to which we shall succeed—strengthened with so-and-so's breakfast foods, ennobled with so-and-so's cosmetics, invigorated with so-and-so's whisky—these are voices telling us of ease and success and the smiling side of life. It is not always life as we know it. But it is life as we may wish it or think it ought to be.

SLOGANS AND HALF-TRUTHS ENDANGER VIRTUE OF SELF-CRITICISM

And the temptation is overwhelming to indulge in the "soft sell" and wrap up the critical issues of the atomic age and the Communist challenge, of residual poverty, old age, urban decay, racial minorities, under the bright labels of "peace" and "prosperity."

Go further and tie a tag on those who still raise a critical voice, of "disloyalty," or "lack of confidence," of "selling our great country short," and under all the slogans and half-truths the vigor of the virtue of self-criticism may be washed away.

I do not believe free government can survive on less than the truth. In the first place, democracy depends upon an unforced consensus of public opinion. In the short run, no doubt, agreement can be reached on the basis of some passion or prejudice or deception. But they cannot last. As Lincoln reminded us, you cannot fool all the people all the time. The only long-term assurance of democratic unity is attendance to the facts, respect for reality, an abiding devotion to truth, "to cherish," as Jefferson said, "the spirit of the people."

TRUTH VERSUS SOVIET CENSORSHIP

Again, truth is the only possible operating principle for an open society. Perhaps dictators with all their capacity to control and blinker can govern for long periods on the basis of deception. The Soviets have contrived to keep alive a concept of an encircling hostile capitalist coalition that blinds their people and endangers world peace. But they must use every formidable means of censorship to do so. And how long will that last against disarmament with inspection and all the other mounting pressures toward an open society in this shrinking world?

And so it goes. Any government in the West which opts for deceit must sooner or later opt for control and censorship as well. We had an icy premonition of this risk during our shameful McCarthy interlude. His myths of universal conspiracy and ubiquitous disloyalty were quickly translated into blacklists, spying and informing, administrative and academic purges, and other repellent symptoms of totalitarianism.

But our great need for truth lies in the fact that nowhere else can men and nations find genuine security. We all know in our personal lives that there is no greater danger to our health and sanity than delusions about ourselves, our significance or our status. And so it is with nations. They must command the facts about their strength, their resources, their standing, their risks, and their opportunities. Otherwise, they have no means of judging policy, estimating risks, or steeling themselves for decision. A nation that disregards truth puts its very survival in question.

HOUSECLEANING ROLE OF OPPOSITION

So I think the role of the opposition is not just to oppose as Senator Taft used to say, but to expose—to shed light on what has been obscured by the incumbents. In the stress of day-to-day business, all governments face the temptation to push the unsuccessful or the unattractive issues under the rug. All, at one time or another, succumb. So the opposition must engage in a perpetual and vigorous process of national housecleaning. Congressional investigation, public debate, personal pressure, and inquiry all play their part. The rugs are shaken. The issues reappear and the administration itself is helped to perform better by facing, not evading, the difficult decisions.

Naturally, the effectiveness of this activity depends upon the honesty of the opposition's own endeavors. If we ask that government should not rely on prejudice or delusion or deceit, equally its critics must eschew these weapons. If I may illustrate the point from recent experience in Washington, I would say that the opposition had an obligation to expose a lot of fictions about our foreign and domestic situation that have grown up in recent years. And, as for investigating committees under opposition leadership, many recent and useful contributions come to mind:

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' Joint Congressional Economic Committee's disclosure of waste in the Defense Department.

Senator KEFAUVER'S exposures of exploitation in the drug industry.

Congressman OREN HARRIS' disclosure of the Adams-Goldfine relationship, the television scandals, and shabby ethics in the regulatory agencies.

Congressman JOHN MOSS' investigation of governmental secrecy.

Senator HENRY JACKSON'S studies of the Soviet challenge and our shortcomings.

Senator FULBRIGHT'S Foreign Relations Committee has provided us outstanding regional studies.

How few would know about the inner workings of our defense program or our economy, or the conduct of our foreign policy, if it were not for such responsible opposition.

DEPLORES SPECIAL BRAND OF POLITICAL PURITY

Traditionally the opposition has sought to smoke out corruption. Chairmen of regulatory commissions who accept benefits from those they are supposed to regulate, presidential assistants with dubious business associates, high officials exploiting office for private gain—all these are legitimate targets. But I would hope that in the next campaign neither party will lay claim to some special brand of political purity and that none of the contestants will suggest that the mess in Washington is made uniquely by men of one political complexion. To uncover corruption is part of our service to truth. To tie a political tag on it is not.

There is another kind of opposition that doesn't meet the test but is very effective for discrediting the party in power. A classic example was the variety of Republican views on foreign policy at the end of the Truman administration. They ranged all the way from the internationalia of Lodge and Ives, through the Asia first doctrines of Taft and Knowland, to the Fortress America isolation of Mr. Hoover. It represented no coherence, no party responsibility, but it bewildered the voters and insured an attack on the administration from some direction all the time. Having a fist full of policies and even issues may help the party out of power and be smart politics. But is it responsible; is the party ready and able to govern?

If the opposition owes it to our free system to operate within the limits of good sense, good taste and fair play, I would like to suggest similar standards for the Government too. The temptation to resent outside criticism when you are on the job is, I know, immense. The critics appear to be incompetent bunglers with no intimate knowledge of the complexities and difficulties, simply trying—so you darkly suspect—to make everything more difficult. Yet I do not believe our system can work well unless the Government concedes to the opposition some at least of the attributes of good faith.

RECALLS PROPOSAL IN 1956 FOR SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

This meeting of the A.S.N.E., reminds me of another example, because it was here just 4 years ago that I proposed suspension of the testing of the big nuclear bombs, to stop the headlong progression of lethalness and break the arms race deadlock. I do not believe these sober suggestions deserved the rude obloquy heaped on them by even the President and Vice President—especially since these gentlemen have subsequently agreed to a testing moratorium, but only after Russia took the lead and got the credit.

Similarly I do not believe that my warnings of Russia's growing economic strength back in 1956 and earlier should have been dismissed—as they were by the Vice President—as aid and comfort to the enemy and evidence of my disbelief in our economic system.

I could cite many other examples just from my own brief but brutal political experience. When you can't answer something, make a countercharge to discredit your opponent and divert attention is an old technique. But is it responsible, especially at the level of great national issues? In short, we must be able to attack and probe and criticize without incurring instant accusations of bad motives, bad faith, and insufficient patriotism. These debase and distort the great debate upon which the vitality of our system depends.

PRESS SHARE THE BLAME FOR NATIONAL COMPLACENCY

If the people are complacent and unconcerned about the good health of our system the press must share the blame. I am not concerned with the Republican partisanship of the press, but I am profoundly concerned with its respect for the party system and its obligation to help make it work effectively.

Large sections of opinion are skeptical of politicians and political opposition needs to be reinforced about specific evils or virtues. I am even going to resist any temptation to berate you for unequal treatment of Republicans and Democrats in the news. Nor will I mention your ill-concealed zeal at certain sacrificial festivals of recent years. Instead I just want to exploit today's mood of mutual forgiveness and charity by reminding you that a responsible press can be a great help to the opposition by giving it an adequate hearing. And there have been two recent hopeful signs of objectivity: The New York Post, a Democratic paper, exposed the indiscretions of a Democratic borough president in New York City; and a Republican paper, the New York Herald-Tribune, exposed the indiscretions of the Republican chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

And if responsible news reporting is essential to an effective opposition, an irresponsible or frivolous press obstructs the system and diverts the public. A good example came to me in Latin America this winter. I took time out somewhere to read a collection of American papers of the week of February 15. Khrushchev was in India. Mikoyan was in Cuba. The French exploded their atomic bomb. The latest Chinese production figures were released. An antiquated school building in New York collapsed. The Geneva talks on bomb testing were making some progress. If the generals testifying in Washington were right, our country was in second place militarily. Eisenhower said he was puzzled that some people were worried.

YET THE HEADLINES ASK "WHEN WILL JACK PARR MAKE UP HIS MIND?"

All these events were important to us and to our children. Yet the big news in most of those American dailies that week was: When will Jack Paar make up his mind? And when that burning question was finally resolved, Dr. Finch's murder trial took over the front pages.

The Government, the ins, then, must be measured by the same standards of responsibility as the opposition, the outs. And the press must call 'em as it sees 'em, not as it would like to see 'em. For make no mistake about it, the essence, the key to free society lies in the strength and critical effectiveness of the opposition. It is our proud claim that the only society that is truly tailored to the stature of man is a free society. But why is this? Why should we not say that man needs a good society or a moral society or even, Heaven help us, an adjusted society? Why do we seek freedom first and why is the principle of a critical opposition part of its essential operation?

The answer, I think, is to be found in our deepest insights into man's sublime but divided nature, in the paradox of his needs and capacities and the perpetual drama of his struggle to realize his nature to the full. We are born to grow into truth by experience, by learning and failing and learning again. Truth is not a birthright. We are not born to it as we are to appetite or mobility. We have to seek it and learn it, and this is precisely our freedom. It is not a vain search, for truth can be known. But it is a genuine search.

MISTAKES MUST BE CHALLENGED

Since, then, we are bound to err in our search for truth, error must be made real to us. Our mistakes cannot be left unchallenged, or our own search for truth will be checked. Nor have we any right to be silent when we see error, for we are inhibiting others' growth in the truth. It is this sense of truth made available to all by rational inquiry, by searching question, by honest criticism, by refusing nothing to the probing intellect, that is one of the glories of our way of life.

And it therefore should not surprise us that only in the West has the dialectic of truth and error come to be incorporated directly in the processes of government—administration and opposition, between them checking, correcting, revising, and even in the attack assisting each other to their moments of political truth. Indeed, our party system which grew up virtually undesigned and unplanned, first in Britain and then in America, seems almost a spontaneous product of our profound and subtle realization that truth is an unfolding and a discovery, a child of human trial and error—never an inheritance, never a possession, never an unearned right.

OUR VIRTUE, LIKE OUR TRUTH, IS NOT A HERITAGE BUT A STRUGGLE

True, this dialectic depends upon the honest pursuit of truth. Reason is the instrument of our search, not passion or ambition or prejudice—or folly. And since we are prone to all these things, opposition as a principle of our political life represents another of our insights into the nature of man.

In spite of all his gifts and powers and aspirations, it is not good to tempt a man beyond his strength. Our virtue, like our truth, is not a heritage but a struggle. No moral achievement is entirely safe, for each day we face again the choice of doing as well or doing better—or doing much worse.

In this striving, it is a matter of experience that some strains are almost too great for human fortitude—and of these strains, none is more testing than that of prolonged and unquestioned power.

I am aware, indeed I might almost attest the truth, of the rephrasing of Lord Acton's dictum: "All power corrupts; being out of power corrupts absolutely." What is certain is that the possibility of alternating the government—which only the acceptance of opposition secures—is essential to the health of both—to those who govern and to those who would. If succession to power is the consequence of successful criticism, this fact in itself should sober the critics, keep their attacks within the limits of the practicable, weight them with the sense of coming responsibility, weaken the pull of the lunatic fringe.

DEPENDENCE OF ONE POLITICAL PARTY ON THE OTHER SHOULD NOT BE LOST FROM SIGHT

And for the government itself, the certain knowledge of accountability checks the arrogance and insensitiveness, the opportunism and the greed which the vista of unopposed authority creates. But if succession to power is also sometimes the consequence of dishonest and irresponsible criticism, then the whole democratic system is corrupted and enfeebled. So I think the press has a special responsibility to police the duel and enforce the standards of political performance and accountability.

All this, I know, is likely to be forgotten in the heat of the fight, at the height of the partisan struggle, and above all in the big show of the presidential election. But it is essential to the health of our great commonwealth that the dependence of each party on the other in some real measure for its honesty, its vigor, its trust, and its purpose, should never be wholly lost to sight.

The chorus of political rhetoric will be rising in the months to come. We shall not be mincing words on either side. Yet to every honest man in the fight the politicians must be ready to say: "My brother, my other self—mon semblable, mon frère—together we are building the liberty and strength of the Republic, together we are creating the conditions under which men can be governed and still be free."

Seventieth Anniversary of the Evening Telegram, Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout U.S. history, the role of our newspapers has had a profound effect upon American life—upon our thinking, knowledge of day-to-day events, economic, educational and cultural progress and planning to meet the challenges of the future.

Overall, the newspaper, too, has become a great influential institution in our way of life to us individually—informing and enlightening the minds and lives of our people at home, school, office, farms, and wherever people work, play, and live.

With such influence, of course, goes hand in hand a great responsibility.

Fortunately, the great newspapers of this country have risen to the challenge and in a splendid way for the most part have discharged their tremendous responsibility to the American people.

At this time, I would like to pay particular tribute to an outstanding newspaper serving the citizens of Wisconsin and surrounding States—the Evening Telegram of Superior, Wis. Recently, the Telegram celebrated its 70th anniversary. As all of us sometimes do, the Telegram forgot its own birthday.

We recognize, however, that the real marks of progress are measured in accomplishments—not in years. By such a yardstick, the Telegram can indeed be proud of its history and service to its reading public.

On its 70th anniversary, I believe it deserves the highest congratulations upon its splendid work. With such commendation go best wishes for a bright future of continued outstanding service to the people of Wisconsin, surrounding States and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Telegram entitled, "Not a Question of Age, but Remembering, for Us."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Telegram, Apr. 26, 1960]

TELEGRAM BIRTHDAYS—NOT A QUESTION OF AGE, BUT REMEMBERING, FOR US

Some people prefer not to discuss their age in leap year.

Some prefer not to discuss age at all.

The Eevening Telegram has been inclined to brag a bit about its own age, leap year or no leap year.

But, the 1960 leap year is proving embarrassing to this newspaper. It's not a question of age, however, but rather that of remembering its birthday at all—and its 70th at that.

First of all everybody around the newspaper who knew it completely forgot that last week Wednesday it marked up the seventh consecutive decade of publishing. That equals 70 years. The Telegram had published 314 issues. So, on that day the Telegram's "folio number" on page 1 should have read, "Volume 70, No. 314." Then, Thursday would have been New Year's to the Telegram, starting off the day with "Volume 71, No. 1."

The Telegram publishes every day of the year except Sundays but there are chances of a variation from the 313 issues. First some years have 53 Sundays. Then there is leap year with an extra day. The publishing year from April 21, 1959 to 1960 had only 52 Sundays. However, that same period had an extra publishing day, February 29. It was a close miss, though. April started on Friday. If it had started on Thursday instead—oh well, figure that out for yourself.

This may sound as if there should have been some system to take care of the numbering. There was a system, that is years ago. But even as late (or early) as 1908 or thereabouts there was confusion. The actual numbering is taken care of in the composing room. Elmer Olsen, who started working on the Telegram in 1899 and, except for one or two leaves of absence including war service, spent his life with the paper, early became assisant foreman in the composing room. He figured out a way to make what he considered a permanent record of the Telegram's birthday.

One of the building supports in the composing room was a sturdy wooden beam. It was painted a light color and offered a good space, high as Elmer could reach where he could record the date, April 21, 1890. The newspaper started on a Monday. That became the historical record until a fire scorched the post and obliterated the record.

By that time the date was pretty well fixed in many minds and some years later when the Telegram moved into its present quarterms, memory continued to serve pretty well with the help of some arguments now and then. Anyway, the posts in the new quarters were of cast iron, get painted once in awhile and writing on them is taboo.

This is by way of telling you that if during the past several days you have been confused by the "folio numbers" being out of line, don't let it disturb you. Just forget about the numbers and go by the day and date. Maybe that's the way you have been doing it and if so you needn't read this explanation at all. Just check the front page numbering. It should read: "Volume 71, No. 5." The Telegram is therefore 70 years and 6 days old today. . Or will it be tomorrow?

Statehood Brings Rising Economy to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, there is general interest concerning the impact of statehood on Hawaii. The Honolulu Advertiser in its April 24 issue contained an article by a distinguished United Press international correspondent relating the effects statehood has had on Hawaii's economy during the past year.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD SENDS ECONOMY RISING
(By Wendel Burch)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Hawaii and its people are making big news these days. Thousands of words are written and published every week about our islands. But what do visiting newspaper and magazine writers tell others about the 50th State and its people? And where do they think Hawaii is going? The following article, by a distinguished United Press International correspondent, will appear in newspapers throughout the world.)

HONOLULU, HAWAII.—One year after statehood—is booming, bewildering, and busting out all over.

A year ago March 12, Congress voted statehood for Hawaii. What is it like in the islands on this first anniversary?

Records are falling in every field, planners are plucking blueprints to bits, kamaainas (island-born residents) are shaking their heads, tourists are peeking into every nook and cranny, politicians are at once suffering and reveling in such problems as the need to make 400 or more job appointments.

Smiling businessmen rush off to expanding offices while task forces from mainland organizations hasten to make proper contacts.

Where else would you find a 7-story apartment, with penthouse, planned on 20- by 40-foot property? Or earth movers, tractors, and bulldozers painted shocking pink? Or a top-floor restaurant on a small skyscraper that will rotate on the hour, every hour?

Waikiki Beach hotels are crowded, despite building projects that have piledrivers working alongside many of them, or drills clatteringly biting into the hard coral foundation underlying the light soil cover.

New construction in the hotel field this year will add approximately 2,200 rooms in the Waikiki area, and projects are underway on the other islands to accommodate hundreds of added travelers. All kinds and classes of construction are underway. Among them is a church financed and operated hotel where no liquor will be served.

There are innumerable housing and suburban development projects underway. Lots even are advertised in New York newspapers, and one such sale brought in a reported $500,000 for property not far removed from the scene of the volcanic eruption on the big island of Hawaii.

The Henry Kaiser organization is gouging out a vast new community near Koko Head, beyond Diamond Head on Oahu, for some 50,000 persons. The cost is estimated at $350 million.

In the Kailua area of Windward Oahu, across the mountains from Honolulu, hundreds of new homes have been built in a project named "Enchanted Lake," with hundreds more planned or being erected in surrounding communities.

Government costs are rocketing upward, along with everything else. The city and county of Honolulu will spend eight times as much this year as it did in 1940. The area must spend $10 million for new schools or additions, out of a $40 million budget.

Rural development presents a great challenge to each of the major islands in the 50th State. And recreational facilities must be developed in anticipation of a population increase from 522,000 persons to 705,000 by 1970, with 1 million distinctly in the offing.

Among plans under study are those for a new $6,500,000 harbor passenger terminal; a $2,500,000 small boat harbor improvement; a general transportation development master plan; a $200 million capital improvement program for the city of Honolulu in the next 6 years; a $10 million sewage treatment plant; and a multimillion-dollar project to replace overcrowded International Airport.

Construction now is the second ranking industry in the islands, although a certain

leveling off is anticipated as a result of the decline in demand for luxury-type apartments and housing, and a drop in military work.

Just to keep everything normal there are plenty of problems confronting the State. Sugar and pineapple, long major revenue producers and sources of employment, are facing almost certain declines. There is an urgent need for diversification.

Tax problems are multiplying as budgets increase and demands rise. Long-entrenched interests are being nudged and pushed by new and outside capital.

Honolulu's central business district is plagued by narrow streets, buildings whose median age is 42 years, and buildings desperately inadequate for modern merchandising or office operation.

Nevertheless, Hawaii is doing just fine as the newest State, and the air of excitement, enthusiasm, and assurance pervading its residents is unmistakable. Culturally they look forward to an immensely important role as the U.S. meeting point in the Pacific with Asia.

The Inflation Issue of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Scripps-Howard newspapers have been running an informative and interesting series of articles on the big issues of 1960. The decisions voters make next November are likely to go far toward determining their destiny for the rest of this century.

Because the integrity of the American dollar means so much to so many—in terms of success and security, in fact, it means everything to everybody—I take this means of calling to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Scripps-Howard article on inflation as an issue in 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WE BELIEVE (THE INFLATION ISSUE OF 1960)

Inflation is just another term for high cost of living. Practically everyone is against it—except the sharpshooters who can juggle credit to make money out of it. But, while damning inflation, many in public life continue to press for the things which cause inflation. This is something the voter should watch closely in this 1960 election.

There's nothing very mysterious about the nature or causes of inflation. It is what happens when the buying power of money goes down.

In the United States it has gone down more than half in 20 years. A dollar that was worth 10 loaves of bread, for example, in 1940, is worth less than five today. The value of the dollar still is falling.

Thus a man who earned $1 an hour in 1940 now has to have better than $2 an hour to break even—even more than that since higher hourly rates raise his tax brackets. The $100 pension on which he planned, then, to retire now will be worth only as much food and clothing and shelter as $48 will buy. So inflation steadily whittles away the savings and the living standards and the security of all who work for wages.

Inflation is a vital election issue of 1960 because it lies almost entirely within the control of the National Government. The policies followed by the President and the Congress to be elected in November essentially will determine whether there will be more, or less, inflation. Basically—through a multitude of decisions on spending and debt—they decide what money is worth.

Currencies have been inflated to the point where they had little value, or none at all, simply by printing more of them. The prewar German mark, which is worthless, and the French franc, recently revalued, are good examples.

Printing a new government bond has similar effect—identical in the case of short-term paper which is the same as currency. Anything that increases the supply of spendable money without proportionately increasing the supply of goods for which it may be spent is inflationary.

All Government spending tends to be inflationary. The effect is multiplied when the Government borrows. Each new bond issue becomes the basis for additional cash and credit with the effect of creating new money out of thin air.

The new administration can fight inflation by spending less, or encourage it by spending more—especially by borrowing and spending more. Governmental policies are not the only factor in inflation, but they are the primary one.

There is a fairly simple test for the candidate:

If he promises new projects, more spending, glosses over the debt, he leaves no doubt about it. He stands, in fact, for more inflation, cheaper money, dwindling pensions and savings, perhaps a dollar worth only two loaves of bread.

Necessity of Adequate Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although our farm folks often give considerable thought to having an adequate water supply, when we live in the city for a considerable period of time we generally come to take water pretty much for granted. It is almost always there when we need it, and at very reasonable cost.

Recently the Honorable W. W. Munn, mayor of Big Lake, Tex., wrote an article entitled, "Water Is Worth What It Costs." Mayor Munn reveals that he was strongly impressed with the demand for water by his constituents when the city water supply failed.

His extremely interesting article was published in the March 1960 issue of Town and City, a magazine widely read by city officials and employees. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYOR WHOSE CITY RAN OUT SAYS: "WATER IS WORTH WHAT IT COSTS"

(By W. W. Munn, mayor, Big Lake)

I would like for you to think with me for a short time about the importance of water. We, as human beings, have to have water at any cost to exist. We take water for granted, for all we have to do is turn a faucet. And as a result of water's being too convenient, we use more.

As of now, water will not become a chemical on the shelf as some of our other natural resources are.

The biological makeup of man is such that he requires so much water each day to exist. Over in the short-grass country of the southwest part of this State, I suppose that in the past more men have been killed over water and fence lines than anything else.

I would like to give you some figures briefly on water used here in the United States. It is not my plan to bore you with figures from a complete detailed survey.

1. There are 19,000 publicly and privately owned water utilities in the United States.

2. There are only 115,000 employees in this industry. Compared wtih other industries, the number of people employed will be low.

3. The per capita consumption in 1940 was 122 gallons per day.

4. The per capita consumption in 1959 was 140 gallons per day.

5. The estimated per capita consumption in 1975 will be 160 gallons per day.

Of all water utilities, privately or publicly owned, 86.4 percent serve towns of less than 5,000 population. This is the category my community comes under. Towns with less than 10,000 population are served by 93.3 percent of all water utilities.

All but 2.7 percent of water utilities serve towns of less than 25,000 population.

Water is the biggest bargain in the family budget today. I could make this statement and it would be correct if water rates were increased 300 percent. A rate increase of 50 percent is urgently needed now. Most publicly owned water systems need rate increases. These rate increases should be based on system requirements at present and for at least 5 years in the future.

Some of the problems which must be faced by water utilities:

In towns of 10,000 population or over—

1. One out of five water utilities is deficient in supply.

2. Two out of five are deficient in transmission capacity.

3. One out of three is deficient in pumping capacity.

4. Two out of five are deficient in treatment capacity.

5. Ground and elevated storage show deficiencies of 29 percent and 43 percent, respectively.

6. Distribution system improvements are required in 57 percent of the water systems.

To help remedy this situation, an analysis by a competent trained consultant should be done every 4 or 5 years at the minimum.

Demands on water supply:

The population increase in the United States from 132 million in 1940 to 175 million in 1958, has occurred almost entirely in urban areas. This population depends on public water supply. The demand for water has increased from 82 million gallons in 1940 to 125 million gallons in 1958.

Right now we do not have a water shortage. The shortage is in storage and pumping facilities and pipelines. These facilities have been inadequate since 1940. Water utilities supply houses, stores, offices, and factories with about 20 billion gallons of water per day, or an average of about 140 gallons per day for every man, woman, and child. Water needs will increase about 270 percent in the next 25 years.

Have you ever lived in or been in a city when you ran completely out of water, even drinking water? Well, I was mayor of Big Lake when we ran completely out. Now, if you do not think you are on the spot when that happens, you are mistaken. If a fire had started, we would have had to let it burn to the ground.

How are you going to finance these improvements?

If you will pardon the local reference, I have a project I would like to tell you about. We, as a community are very proud of it. Several years ago a few far-thinking and public-minded people talked over our water supply. We had a supply of water, but it was very bad. The water contained a high percentage of magnesium sulfate. Now if I remember my chemistry correctly, that means epsom salts. There was a source of good water about 25 miles north of town. Hydrologists told us there was plenty of underground water.

As a city, we could not finance this project. We had a large outstanding bonded indebtedness with a total tax valuation of about $3.5 million. The estimated cost of the project was $800,000. The city could not do it. So the people created, through legislation, a countywide water supply district. The creation of the district was voted on by the people of the county and carried. In passing, I would like to say that the project was contested, and went to the supreme court of Texas.

Right now, I am happy to say the project is completed and the city of Big Lake is purchasing water from the county water supply district, and we have plenty of good water. In planning this new water supply, it was set up to take care of our needs for 15 years with an estimated population of up to 15,000. This plan is working out very nicely for both the city of Big Lake and the county water supply district.

Goals for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, above and beyond all of the major issues facing this body and our Nation is the paramount problem of how to secure, for ourselves and our posterity, an honorable and lasting peace.

Nowhere have I found a more intelligent and comprehensive approach to this supreme issue of our time than in the policy statement on peace submitted to the Democratic Midwest conference in Detroit, Mich., March 26, by the able and articulate Patrick Lucey, Democratic chairman of the State of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

GOALS FOR AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

PEACE

Whereas the furthering of human dignity, the advancement of the rights which we hold to be self-evident, and the achievement of a better life for all people is dependent * * * upon an honorable and lasting peace; and

Whereas an enduring peace requires the progressive development of the health, the vitality, and the viability of independent societies throughout the world; and

Whereas mankind has invented a means of total self-destruction and obliteration, so that an atomic holocaust hangs like the sword of Damocles over the world; and

Whereas civilization might be reduced to a heap of radioactive rubble because of a miscalculation of intent, of capabilities, or even of the meaning of a blip on a radar screen; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has recently joined in the international concern over the arms race and may be ready for a meaningful first step toward an arms-control agreement; and

Whereas the administration's response to all of the above has been to compound confusion with contradiction, symbolized in the ever-widening gap between the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission: Now, therefore, the Democratic Party assembled at its midwest conference hereby

Resolves, That an honorable and lasting peace is the paramount and overriding imperative of our time, and that the Democratic Party dedicates the full strength of its resources to the attainment of such a peace, and that it commits itself among other specific objectives, to the following:

1. Seek to assist the underdeveloped countries:

The United States must join with other prosperous nations to help our less fortunate neighbors achieve viable, independent economies and the minimal requirements for decent living. We must revalue and reassess the assumption of our foreign aid program which accents the military at the expense of economic development. We condemn the administration's distortion of the great aims of our aid program initiated under President Truman.

Countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America need our help. That is the point. We must not give aid as a cynical expedient, but rather as a part of a genuine attempt to better the human condition throughout the world. Larger but more effectively managed programs of capital and technical development are a must.

While remaining mindful of the needs of the south Asia region as a whole, India's economic and social development is of particular, pivotal importance. Much of uncommitted Asia and Africa look to India as democracy's alternative to totalitarianism.

India has a population equal to that of Africa and Latin America combined; it has the Gandhian tradition of freedom, a democratic government, and the resources and talent for greatness.

It is imperative that we help India achieve a satisfactory measure of economic growth and political stability.

2. Seek a progressive, practical, and effective program of disarmament:

(a) The prelude to such a program should be an atomic test ban agreement now, covering all detectable tests, and a 1-year moratorium on all underground tests, coupled with a joint, international research program to develop, and refine detection devices during that period. The U.S.S.R. has agreed in principle to open its territories to a number of control stations, with international inspection teams, including Americans; it has agreed to the principle of mobile inspection of suspected test violations; and it has now agreed in principle to the concept of a partial test ban based on the detectability of further tests.

We urge our Government to test out the recent Soviet proposal by constructive counterproposals. We believe that an out-of-hand rejection of the Soviet offer would be a mistake. If the Soviet Union agrees to a controllable ban on large tests, let us agree to a limited moratorium on the undetectable small tests on the condition of a solution to the problem of test-site inspection and on agreement of the Soviet Union to its readiness to participate in a joint research effort to solve the problems of detection. Such arrangement offers the best hope of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to further nations. We call on the United States to take the lead in the fight for the control of these weapons of mass destruction.

(b) In the missile age detection by inspection and controls on the potential launcher's territory should be vigorously pursued in all negotiations. Lightning detectability diminishes the threat of a lightning surprise attack.

Therefore, early warning devices, although not disarmament, are crucial to limiting the probable use of armaments, and reducing the danger and likelihood of war, which is the goal of any sound disarmament program.

(c) With the Soviet Union and other arms-exporting countries, we should promote a regional arms embargo on the shipment of weapons to trouble areas such as the Middle East and Latin America, and promote regional disarmament wherever possible.

(d) Total nuclear disarmament, encompassing the control and cutoff of nuclear weapons production, the eventual reduction and liquidation of stockpiles, and the regulation of the use of outer space, will take time. The present allied offer put forth at the Geneva 10-nations' disarmament talks, while a proper step in this direction, is too limited and not advanced in sufficiently credible or persuasive terms.

(e) While continuing our best efforts toward a nuclear rollback, we must strive for an immediate ban on the equally intolerable bacteriological and chemical warfare.

(f) We must remember that our ultimate goal is the abolition of all wars, not just nuclear ones. Further, there is always the danger that limited wars won't stay limited. Therefore we must also aggressively pursue a conventional weapons disarmament agreement.

(g) History shows that armaments races lead to war. Yet commonsense shows that half-cooked, unilateral, unplanned disarmament can also lead to catastrophe. Therefore, in the interest of peace, we must approach conferences with the Communist governments with an equality of strength and bargaining power. After all, we are invited to the summit not because of our virtue but because of our power.

Despite an expenditure of $350 billion for defense during the past 8 years, over and over again we hear the charge—from responsible people within the administration—that this country's defense effort is inadequate. How inadequate and in what ways is a matter of argument, but that it is inadequate is a matter of fact.

3. Seek to relieve tensions the world over:

(a) Europe: As long as a nation's soil is inhabited by alien troops against the will of its inhabitants and in areas of high tensions, peace and stability have not yet been achieved.

Recognizing that proposals for a mutual thinning out of foreign troops from central and Eastern Europe need further study, we must keep alert to the possibility that effective and mutually advantageous proposals might be accepted by all nations concerned. Should the Soviet Union agree to such a proposal, the spirit of freedom in East Germany and Eastern Europe would have a new chance to emerge.

(b) China: Disarmament and inspection programs which exclude China are either unrealistic or incomplete.

Short of diplomatic recognition we can take steps to improve mutual news coverage; to permit trade on the same terms that we allow with the Soviet Union, and to promote an atmosphere of gradual acceptance of the two-China theory which will help put the existence of an independent Formosa on a better, long-term basis.

It is of the utmost importance that we should stop the kind of go-it-alone policy we have pursued in Quemoy and Matsu; in the future we should consult and try to concert our policies with the principal, free powers in the area concerned.

4. Seek to strengthen institutions of world order and the rule of law:

Today's world is politically, economically, and socially interdependent. Therefore, in the final analysis an honorable and lasting peace will only be found on the universal substitution of the rule of law for the rule of force in the world community. To build toward that end the United States should:

(a) Make more use of the United Nations for economic aid, technical assistance, border patrols, and other appropriate activities.

(b) Repeal the so-called Connally amendment, which diminishes the prestige and effectiveness of the World Court.

(c) Encourage international working agreements such as the European Common Market. We should also strengthen the World Bank and the International Development Association so that the economically strong can increase their contributions to and investments in the underprivileged countries.

(d) Encourage international exchange programs at all levels, with friends and foes alike. Such informal programs, designed to promote communication and understanding among the peoples of the world, can be of immeasurable help in moving the world toward peace.

5. Seek to develop domestic policies for peace:

We must organize resources and manpower for peace as we do for war. Today our peace-effort is inadequately manned and is haphazardly scattered throughout the executive branch. We need:

(a) Arms Control Research Institute (Peace Agency). We must establish a high-level agency of scientists, experts, and specialists in the problems of disarmament to help develop our programs, guide our policies, and service and spark our negotiators.

(b) A planned transition to a peacetime economy. We should now formulate and publicize the blueprint for a truly peacetime economy. When a just peace is insured the $40 to $50 billion now spent for defense can mean investment in the public welfare, tax relief, more funds for economic development abroad, reorientation of defense industries, and research for peaceful purposes.

(c) The encouragement of foreign trade through such devices as investment guarantees, tax advantages, lowering tariff barriers, and international cooperative arrangements directed toward reducing various forms of trade obstacles and discrimination.

(d) A renewed national sense of purpose and strength. We need massive material and spiritual efforts to give our people the sense of direction, public values, and purposes which they have sought in vain for almost 8 years.

Such efforts will include an increased program for education, an economic takeoff which will get our economy growing fast enough to meet the needs of the years ahead at home and abroad, and a positive program for the provision, development, and guarantee of human rights and dignity in the deepest sense of that word.

To maintain our leadership in this diversified world, the quality of American life at home must command the respect and admiration of the many races and peoples which populate the globe. We must demonstrate the ability (1) to use our human and material resources effectively to provide the greatest opportunity for the fulfillment of present and future needs and aspirations, for no nation that fails to understand the need for intelligent planning in the modern world may expect to be a leader in the modern world; (2) to respect differences in ideas, in religion, and in color for a second-class citizenry at home not only weakens our sense of national unity but is a threat to our world leadership; and (3) to enlarge in every possible way reciprocal social, economic, political, religious, and cultural contacts with other peoples.

In this interdependent world no nation can live alone. The choice is to cooperate or to perish.

Improved Schools in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 29, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morrilton's Challenge," published in the Arkansas Gazette of April 26, 1960. The article relates to the development of a very fine model school district in Morrilton, in my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 26, 1960]

MORRILTON'S CHALLENGE

The Morrilton school district is approaching the end of the fourth—and next to last—year of a curriculum enrichment program begun in 1956 by Winthrop Rockefeller, and within a few months must make the tough and important decision of whether to assume the entire financial burden of dramatically improved schools or let standards slump again.

The New York Times, discussing Morrilton's school system earlier this month, defined the big decision soon to confront voters of the district as "a test of civic pride." There is, certainly a large measure of civic pride involved, because much genuine pride has come with the knowledge that the system is a model.

But the district's voters have already substantially passed the test of civic pride. Before Mr. Rockefeller began the enrichment program, in which he already has spent more than a million dollars, Morrilton's school tax levy stood at only 26 mills. Since 1956, voters have joined in the improvement program by approving bond issues for more construction and voting a tax increase to 38 mills. Mr. Rockefeller's gifts have been a $750,000 elementary school and $100,000 each year for the district's operating fund.

The results have been impressive. In the year before enrichment began only one of the system's 12 grades achieved the national level in reading. Only one grade equaled the national level in arithmetic. By the end of the 1958–59 year 11 grades had reached the national level in reading and all 12 in arithmetic. Some additional teachers were hired, but the higher standards have been achieved largely with the same instructors, many of whom now attend seminars and summer courses in technique improvement.

Failure of the district's voters to raise the tax again next year—to an estimated 50 mills—would mean a drastic cutback in personnel and the elimination of such so-called enrichment "extras" as art instruction, industrial arts, adult and special education and the loss of the school psychologist.

Mr. Rockefeller's generous program stemmed from his desire to make Morrilton a pattern for the rest of Arkansas—an example for other districts to follow in their struggle to improve public education. That many benefits are already in will be attested to, we are sure, by graduates of the enriched system, once they begin to compete with other young people in their freshmen year in college.

But the incalculable benefits would come if Morrilton's voters, when the time came, could somehow tighten their belts further to meet the price demanded by high education standards today. Our guess is that the district's benefactor, himself, doesn't know whether it can be done. What he surely knows is that in no other investment could the potential return so clearly justify the risk.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.